

The West's Feet of Clay

Transmuting the Pillars of Liberty from Gold into Dross

Jin Seock Shin

A Senior Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for graduation
in the Honors Program
Liberty University
Spring 2011

Acceptance of Senior Honors Thesis

This Senior Honors Thesis is accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation from the Honors Program of Liberty University.

Steven Samson, Ph.D.
Thesis Chair

Stephen Witham, M.A.
Committee Member

Darin Gerdes, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Brenda Ayres, Ph.D.
Honors Director

Date

Abstract

This study seeks to support the centrality of the Judeo-Christian heritage to the growth and sustenance of liberty, a form of individualism limited by moral values. The pillars of liberty—self-government, private property, representative government, and limited government—reflect the structural contributions made by the Judeo-Christian heritage. Unfortunately, much of Western civilization suffers from a spiritual crisis, which has introduced and exacerbated fractures in the pillars. Pitirim Sorokin's social and cultural analysis of Western civilization provides a framework to better understand the fractures evident in the history of liberty in Europe and America, and developed in each pillar of liberty—fractures that reaffirm liberty's dependency upon the Judeo-Christian heritage.

The West's Feet of Clay: Transmuting the Pillars of Liberty from Silver into Dross**Introduction**

This study seeks to support the centrality of the Judeo-Christian heritage to the growth and sustenance of liberty. Liberty, established on the pillars of self-government, private property, representative government, and limited government, is so dependent upon the contributions of the Judeo-Christian heritage that the history of liberty in Europe and America, and the current fractures in the pillars of liberty, demonstrate that liberty struggles to survive without the sustaining influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage.

Before attempting to establish the necessary connections, this study will define liberty as a form of individualism characterized by private autonomy and limited by a set of moral values. Thereafter, in order to portray liberty's dependency upon the Judeo-Christian heritage, this study will address the Judeo-Christian contributions to the pillars of liberty—self-government, private property, representative government, and limited government.

The study recognizes that, today, much of Western civilization has rejected God, and that it has ushered in a spiritual crisis that has introduced and exacerbated fractures in the pillars of liberty. Applying Pitirim Sorokin's social and cultural analysis of Western civilization as a framework of interpretation, this study will portray and develop the present fractures in the pillars of liberty and it will link them to the declining influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage. It will first outline Sorokin's three cultural stages—ideational, sensate, and idealistic cultures—and apply the framework to the history of liberty in Europe and America. Then it will apply the framework to the present fractures

in the pillars of liberty to depict liberty's struggle for survival in a Western civilization deprived of the sustaining influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage.

Definition of Liberty

Liberty has undergone much change through the course of history. Without a proper understanding of the specific form of liberty, one cannot understand both the context and nature of this study. Even though this understanding of liberty has changed over time, Western civilization is indebted to a liberty characterized by individualism and limited under the restraint of moral values.

The definition of the word "liberty" has undergone a crucial change over history. In the *Oxford Dictionary of English*, "liberty" is defined as the "the state of being free within society from oppressive restrictions imposed by authority on one's behaviour or political views."¹ The modern understanding heavily emphasizes the extent of the freedom from an external force—an absence of physical limitation on the individual.

Noah Webster's 1828 American Dictionary, however, defines the same term as

Freedom from restraint, in a general sense, and applicable to the body, or to the will or mind. The body is at liberty, when not confined; the will or mind is at liberty, when not checked or controlled. A man enjoys liberty, when no physical force operates to restrain his actions or volitions.²

Thereby, it gives dual emphasis to the external as well as the internal character of liberty—freedom to both the body and the conscience of the individual. Liberty understood in both its external and internal sense is essential to developing an understanding of the freedom dependent upon the Judeo-Christian heritage.

1. *Oxford Dictionary of English*, 2nd Rev. ed., s.v. "Liberty."

2. *Noah Webster's 1828 American Dictionary*, s.v. "Liberty," available from <http://www.1828-dictionary.com/d/search/word,liberty>; Internet; accessed 25 February, 2011.

Francis Lieber in “Anglican and Gallican Liberty,” identifies two types of liberty that developed in Western civilization. For the purpose of establishing a form of liberty that most parallels the Judeo-Christian heritage, this writer focuses on what Lieber labels “Anglican liberty.” According to Lieber, “Anglican liberty distinguishes itself above all by a decided tendency to fortify individual independence, and by a feeling of self-reliance.”³ The Western concept of respect for the individual and the rights of the individual is contained in this understanding of liberty. It is not surprising that Lieber identifies “self-reliance” as the essence to Anglican liberty.⁴ It is through this self-reliance and the valuing of the individual that Western civilization distinguishes itself from the rest of the world.

The liberty characterized by limitless individualism, however, seems to produce a callous society that is contrary to the community-orientated society advocated by the Judeo-Christian heritage.⁵ A return to Webster’s 1828 definition of liberty indicates that one of the conditions for the establishment of liberty is “when no physical force operates to restrain his actions or volitions.”⁶ Webster stresses the absence of a physical force, but

3. Francis Lieber, “Anglican and Gallican Liberty,” in *New Individualist Review*, ed. Ralph Raico (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1981), available from http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=2136&chapter=195437&layout=html&Itemid=27; Internet; accessed 27 February 2011; see also Ralph Waldo Emerson, “Self-Reliance,” in *Essays and English Traits*, vol. 5 of *The Harvard Classics*, ed. Charles W. Eliot (New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909-1914), available from <http://www.bartleby.com/br/00501.html>; Internet; accessed 1 April 2011, which states: “It is easy in the world to live after the world’s opinion; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude.” Emerson places high value in one’s ability to remain true to oneself regardless of the pressure to conformity. Lieber incorporates this value of “self-reliance”—internal liberty—into his concept of Anglican liberty.

4. Lieber, “Anglican and Gallican Liberty.”

5. See Emerson, “Self-Reliance,” which states: “No law can be sacred to me but that of my nature. Good and bad are but names very readily transferable to that or this; the only right is what is after my constitution, the only wrong what is against it.” Emerson portrays not only a seemingly callous society, but also a society that lies on the threshold of relativism.

he leaves room for an internal force of restraint. This is in line with the understanding of liberty that limits the individual with the restraint of a higher moral authority. According to George Weigel in *Against the Grain: Christianity and Democracy, War and Peace*, Thomas Aquinas viewed freedom, as “the capacity to choose wisely and to act well as a matter of habit—or, to use the old-fashioned term, freedom is an outgrowth of *virtue*.”⁷ Thus, Aquinas limited his definition of liberty within the context of virtuous acts. Weigel fittingly labels such form of liberty as the “freedom for excellence.”⁸ Weigel identifies the virtue towards which the freedom for excellence is directed as “the union of the human person with the absolute good, who is God.”⁹ Thus, the purpose of man in his freedom is to strive towards a relationship with God. Weigel’s analysis is reminiscent of Micah’s instruction to the Israelites: “And what does the Lord require of you? To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God” (Micah 6:8, NIV).¹⁰

The modern understanding of liberty limits its purview to the external realm; however, a return to the meaning of liberty as understood by classical authors delineates an understanding of liberty in both its external and its internal nature. This contributes to not only a fuller understanding of individual freedom, but also a view of liberty that is limited under the restraint of a higher moral authority. It is liberty characterized by individual freedom restrained under moral values, which owes its dependence upon the Judeo-Christian heritage.

6. Noah Webster’s *1828 American Dictionary*, s.v. “Liberty.”

7. George Weigel, *Against the Grain: Christianity and Democracy, War and Peace* (New York: Crossroad Book, 2008), 161.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*, 162.

10. The New International Version (1984) will be used throughout, unless noted otherwise.

The Four Pillars of Liberty

There are certain elements of Western civilization that have been fundamental to the preservation of liberty, characterized by individualism restrained under moral values. Self-government, private property, representative government, and limited government provide the foundation for the growth and sustenance of liberty. These elements are henceforth referred to as the pillars of liberty. Each pillar owes much of its development to the contributions made by the Judeo-Christian heritage so that liberty itself is dependent upon the Judeo-Christian heritage.

The Pillar of Self-government

The pillar of self-government is established from the inception of the Judeo-Christian heritage. Réme Brague in “Liberty and the Judaeo-Christian Inheritance,” identifies principles of liberty in the creation narrative of the Old Testament. He sees in creation, specifically, the seventh day in which God rested from His creative work and gave leisure to His creation, evidence to man’s God-given freedom.¹¹ Brague continues: “God does not interfere any more with what He has created. On the contrary, He somehow sets His creatures on a free footing.”¹² God leaves man and creation, free from His direct interference, to practice self-government not as a privilege but as a God-given right. Man may pursue ends that are contrary to God’s nature, but, regardless, God gave man the liberty to decide for himself. In man’s existence, Brague sees the key concept of freedom: “the property of existing and acting according to a nature of its own.”¹³ The

11. Rémi Brague, “Liberty and the Judaeo-Christian Inheritance,” in *Liberty and Civilization: The Western Heritage*, ed. Roger Scruton (New York: Encounter Books, 2010), 52.

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Ibid.*, 53.

creation narrative does not directly expound upon the philosophical outline of liberty, but rather it inherently contains one of the fundamental principles of liberty—self-government—for the reader's discovery.

The election of Benedictine abbots held on Thorney Island in 1033, recounted by Charles W. Colson in *The Faith: What Christians Believe, Why They Believe It, and Why It Matters*, demonstrates the Judeo-Christian application of self-government. The monks elected Father Cassian to serve as the leader of the monastery, but Cassian refused to accept the position. He refused not because he was unworthy of the position, but because he felt that his time had not come.¹⁴ Cassian demonstrates the ability to restrain himself from the pleasures of authority by submitting his desires before the will and time of God. Such self-restraint—the ability to limit one's desires before a higher authority—epitomizes the character of self-government imparted by the Judeo-Christian heritage.

The principle of self-government is also prevalent in the work ethics embodied in Calvinism. Goh Keng Swee, the former deputy Prime Minister of Singapore, when asked in 1972 for his single solution to the economic problems of a poor country, responds that a country needs a “demanding, narrow-minded, intolerant form of the Protestant religion, such as one of the more extreme Calvinist sects.”¹⁵ His reasoning is that such a religion would end the reckless monetary habits and bring honesty to the public sector.¹⁶ Even

14. Charles W. Colson and Harold Fickett, *The Faith: What Christians Believe, Why They Believe It, and Why It Matters*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008), 212.

15. Goh Keng Swee, “Speech by Dr Goh Keng Swee Minister of Defence at the Opening Ceremony & Dinner of the General Conference of the Methodist Church in Malaysia and Singapore,” Speech, Singapore Conference Hall Restaurant, Singapore, 13 November 1972, *National Archives of Singapore*, available from <http://stars.nhb.gov.sg/stars/public/viewPDF.jsp?pdfno=PressR19721113b.pdf>; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011, 5. Goh served as the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore from 1973 to 1984.

16. Ibid.

though he does not address the spiritual renewal that Christianity brings to the individual, Goh recognized the practical changes Christianity, more specifically Calvinism, brings to its adherents: self-government and self-accountability.

The Chinese Economist Zhao Xiao, in his interview with Evan Osnos, further underscores the idea of self-government as one of the fundamental characteristics of Christianity. In the interview, Zhao discusses the benefits Christianity would bring to the Chinese economy. He identifies Christianity as the key contributor to the market success of the West, because Christianity motivates men to work for the glory of God rather than mere profit.¹⁷ He argues that such transcendent value motivates the entrepreneur to pursue not only proper business conduct but also innovation.¹⁸

Christianity holds man accountable for his actions before God and this accountability translates into the protection of liberty from the encroachments made by his fellow man. Consequently, the pillar of self-government is not only inseparable from the Judeo-Christian heritage but also significant for the formation of a market, based on trust.

The Pillar of Private Property

The pillar of private property is not necessarily an exclusive Judeo-Christian concept. According to David S. Landes, in *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some are So Rich and Some So Poor*, the synthesis of the jurisprudence adopted from the classics, the Germanic barbarians, and the Judeo-Christian heritage gave support to the

17. Zhao Xiao, "Extended Interview: Zhao Xiao," interview by Evan Osnos (n.d.) *Public Broadcasting Service*, n.d., available from http://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/china_705/interview/xiao.html; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011.

18. Ibid.

institution of private property.¹⁹ It is, however, still important to understand the Judeo-Christian contribution to the private property in order to account for the unique character the Judeo-Christian heritage imparted in the West's understanding of private property.

The Judeo-Christian heritage is steeped in the implicit recognition and explicit protection of the institution of private property. The Decalogue makes it explicitly clear: "You shall not steal" (Deuteronomy 5:19, NIV). According to Marshall D. Ewell in *A Review of Blackstone's Commentaries*, the Genesis account of God giving man dominion over the earth is the "only true and solid foundation of man's dominion over external things."²⁰ It is through God's just authority, evidenced by His gift to man, that man can lay claim to property. Thus, the Judeo-Christian heritage recognized the institution of private property even since the creation account.

Landes also traces the principle of private property back to the Old Testament. He cites Moses' defense of his lawful practice of power: "I have not taken so much as a donkey from them, nor have I wronged any of them" (Numbers 16:15, NIV); and Samuel's response to the Israelites' call for a king: "Whose ox have I taken? Whose donkey have I oppressed?" (1 Samuel 12:3, NIV) to demonstrate the integral connection

19. David S. Landes, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some are So Rich and Some So Poor* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999), 33; see also *Ibid.*, which delineates the story of Clovis and the vase of Soissons to demonstrate the Germanic principle of private property: "what's yours is yours and what's mine is mine."

20. Marshall D. Ewell, *A Review of Blackstone's Commentaries*, quoted in Rosalie J. Slater, *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*, American Revolution Bicentennial ed. (San Francisco, CA: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1980), 225; see also William Blackstone, *Blackstone's Commentaries: With Notes of Reference to the Constitution and Laws, of the Federal Government of the United States; and of the Commonwealth of Virginia*, vol. 1, ed. George Tucker (Union, New Jersey: The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd., 1996), 40, which states: "For he has so intimately connected, so inseparably interwoven the laws of eternal justice with the happiness of each individual, that the latter cannot be attained but by observing the former; and, if the former be punctually obeyed, it cannot but induce the latter." Thus, according to Blackstone, man can only achieve happiness by observing God's laws, in this case, the right to private property. This strengthens the understanding as to why people value and derive pleasure from obtaining private property.

between private property and human authority.²¹ Their defense based on the arguments that they had not violated anyone's property, gives implicit recognition to the sanctity of private property as an institution beyond the jurisdiction of civil authority.

According to Landes, the understanding of private property as an institution outside the jurisdiction of civil authority permeated Europe after the entrance of "heretical" sects, which stressed the importance of "personal religion and the translation of the Bible into the vernacular."²² As the common man began to read the revelations of God for himself, he came to realize and value the implicit principles, such as the principle of private property, found in the Bible. It is no surprise then that Landes notes how the transfer of private property required the completion of intricate documentation as a testament to the non-violation of another's property rights.²³ In such a manner, the Judeo-Christian heritage protected the institution of private property.

Central to the Judeo-Christian contribution to private property is the concept of conscience. James Madison demonstrates this concept in his essay, "On Property." In his essay, Madison regards conscience as the most sacred type of property, which derives authority from natural law.²⁴ He identifies not only the external understanding of

21. Landes, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations*, 34.

22. Ibid., 35; see also Ibid., 34-35, which lists, "the Waldensians (Waldo, c. 1175), the Lollards (Wiclif, c. 1376), Lutherans (1519 on), and Calvinists (mid-sixteenth)" as examples of the heretical sects that challenged the Church—the "privileged religion of the autocratic empire."

23. Ibid., 35.

24. See James Madison, "On Property," *The Founders' Constitution*, 29 March 1792, available from <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch16s23.html>; Internet; accessed 6 February 2011, which states: "Conscience is the most sacred of all property; other property depending in part on positive law, the exercise of that, being a natural and unalienable right. To guard a man's house as his castle, to pay public and enforce private debts with the most exact faith, can give no title to invade a man's conscience which is more sacred than his castle, or to withhold from it that debt of protection, for which the public faith is pledged, by the very nature and original conditions of the social pact."

property—the physical and tangible form of property such as land and money—but also the internal understanding of property—the spiritual and intangible form of property such as opinions, free speech, and even the “free use of his faculties.”²⁵

Rosalie J. Slater, in *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*, outlines the relationship between Christianity and conscience to support and further develop Madison's view of conscience as a sacred property.²⁶ Slater notes that the real value of private property is “dependent upon [man's] conscientious use of [his property].”²⁷ She demonstrates that even external property derives value only through the investment of man's conscience—his time and talent. Property, both external and internal, assumes a spiritual understanding of life, which the Judeo-Christian heritage provided from the time of the early church and during the Middle Ages. Under such understanding of private property, an attack on private property constitutes an attack both to man's physical possession and to his conscience. It is not surprising that Karl Marx identified private property as the greatest obstacle to socialism.²⁸

25. Ibid.

26. See Slater, *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*, 228, which states: “Thus we can see the Christian inheritance of property—from the first century when ‘liberty of conscience’ became more important to men than their very lives. We remember the Pilgrims fleeing from England, rather than submit to *infringement* of their rights of conscience. And here we find the founding fathers reminding us that ‘we have a property’ in our rights—and that the right to conscience is the most important. As we were reminded in the writings of Neander, liberty of conscience did not exist until Christianity appeared in the world. With its appearing the individual became important—and his most sacred possession was his conscience.”

27. Ibid.

28. See Karl Marx, *Capital: The Communist Manifesto and Other Writings*, ed. Julian Borchardt (New York, Carlton House: 1932), 335, which states: “In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

“We Communists have been reproached with the desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labour, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence.”

The Pillar of Representative Government

The pillar of representative government partly owes its establishment to the institution of private property. John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton²⁹ in “The History of Freedom in Christianity” notes that representative governments arose in Western civilization because of the unlawful nature of taxation without representation, as it violates the rights rather than the privileges of individuals.³⁰ Private property, as explicated above, includes both the external and internal dimensions of one’s possession. It is an extension of the private individual as he or she imparts value into the property with his or her conscience, talents, and time. Consequently, if any authority wants to use or take another man’s property—an extension of the property owner’s conscience—that authority needs to obtain the consent of the individual.³¹

The requirement of the individual’s consent to the use of private property is also recorded in Greek and Roman society.³² The Old Testament, the foundation of the Judeo-Christian heritage, however, preceded the Greek and Roman view towards the right to private property as an inviolable institution. According to Lord Acton in “The History of

29. Hereon referred to as Lord Acton.

30. John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, “The History of Freedom in Christianity,” in *Essays on Freedom and Power*, 2nd ed. (Grenco, IL: The Free Press, 1949), 66-67; see also Colson, *The Faith*, 209-215, which explains how the parliamentary democracy of Western civilization began with Christian foundations in a Benedictine monastery on Thorney Island in 1033.

31. See Slater, *Teaching and Learning America’s Christian History*, 238, which affirms this principle in her statement: “Men *therefore* in Society having Property, *they have such a right to the Gods, which by the Law of the Community are theirs, that no Body hath a right to take their Substance or any part of it from them, without their own Consent; without this they have no Property at all. For I have truly no Property in that, which another can by right take from me, when he pleases against my Consent.*”

32. See Paul A. Rahe, “The Constitution of Liberty within Christendom,” *The Intercollegiate Review* 33, no. 1 (Fall 1997), 33, which points out that the Greeks, in what they called *oikonomia* or household management, practiced self-governance. The Romans also recognized, though contemptuously, *res privata* or the realm of the private individual (Ibid.). Rahe uses these concepts to demonstrate the practice of self-governance in Greek and Roman culture; however, these concepts, in their interconnected nature to property, demonstrate the Greek and Roman recognition of private property.

Freedom in Antiquity,” the government of the Old Testament Israel was formed not through arbitrary coercion but through covenant.³³ Even before the Greeks and the Romans, the Old Testament Israelites were already familiar with the concept of voluntary consent in establishing legitimate authority in the form of government. Addressing the issue of justifying authority, Helen Silving, in “The Origins of Magnae Cartae,” states, “The source of the requirement of an account is . . . a positive affirmation of the value of man’s freedom from submission to any rule—a freedom which even God himself cannot invade without specific ‘justification.’”³⁴ Thus, the foundation of Israel’s government was based not on any secular force but on God and His voluntary agreement with the people of Israel.

It is no surprise then that the representative form of government became pervasive throughout Western civilization during the Middle Ages.³⁵ Lord Acton explains how the Church infatuated the minds of the barbarian intruders with ideas that seemed “infinitely vaster, stronger, holier than their newly founded States.”³⁶ Moreover, with its newfound influence, the Church taught that the principle of election should be used to justify the

33. Dalberg-Acton, “The History of Freedom in Antiquity,” 33.

34. Helen Silving, “The Origins of Magnae Cartae,” *Havard Journal of Legislation* 3, no. 1 (1965), 120.

35. See Dalberg-Acton, “History of Freedom in Christianity,” 66-67, which notes how representative government that were “unknown to the ancients became universal during the Middle Ages.” Lord Acton notes further that during this era the principle of the inseparable nature of taxation and representation became understood as a right to all (Ibid., 67).

36. Ibid., 61.

power of the State.³⁷ The Middle Ages—the apex of the Judeo-Christian influence on Western civilization—introduced Judeo-Christian concepts of representative government.

According to Colson, the Benedictine election remained the same from around the year 530, when St. Benedict composed the election rules, to the eleventh century.³⁸ Under this rule, each monk received one vote, regardless of his social class.³⁹ Furthermore, the monks nominated the candidates by shaping their hands into a “D” and indicating their choice with a nod in the direction of their preferred candidates.⁴⁰ Therefore, the Benedictine election process preceded and even anticipated the modern Western concept of equal representation and the consent of the governed. As if to highlight the Christian influence on the establishment of representative government in Western civilization, the British Houses of Parliament are located at the very location on which the Benedictine elections took place.⁴¹

The Pillar of Limited government

Even though the concept of liberty had existed during the times of the antiquity, it was only through the rise of Christianity that Western civilization inherited the pillar of limited government to protect individual liberty. John Eidsmoe, in *God and Caesar: Christian Faith and Political Action*, notes that most pagan cultures fused the institution

37. Ibid.; see also Ibid., 61-62, which points out that through such Church teachings, “the Councils of Toledo furnished the framework of the parliamentary system of Spain, which is, by a long interval, the oldest in the world.”

38. Colson, *The Faith*, 209.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid., 210; see also Ibid., which notes that monks cupped their right hands and formed the shape of the letter “D” to symbolize their hope in electing a leader like St. Dunstan, who reestablished Christianity in England preceding the destruction caused by the Danes’ invasions.

41. Ibid., 210-211.

of the state and the church—religious cult—under the authority of the government so that the supreme authority achieved god-like status.⁴² Under such government, the civil authority has no limits to its jurisdiction. Consequently, civil authority enjoys jurisdiction to both the seen and the unseen realms of life.

Lord Acton points out that even though the institutions that are associated with liberty such as governments existed during the classics, the novelty of limited government became only apparent with the rise of Christianity exemplified in Christ's words "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's" (Matthew 22:21, NIV).⁴³ Christianity was revolutionary in that it placed the State in a separate but subsidiary jurisdiction under God. Consequently, when Constantine adopted Christianity in order to consolidate his power, he inadvertently undermined the scope of his absolute authority.⁴⁴ Through Christianity, the revolutionary concept of limited government spread into Western civilization, and the Christian church served as a direct counterpart to the secular authority of the Roman Empire.

The concept of limited government is prevalent in the political history of Old Testament Israel. According to Lord Acton, even when the Israelites introduced kingship into their statecraft, the purpose of the king and his government conformed to the authority of God and to the establishment of God's ideal form of government.⁴⁵

42. John Eidsmoe, *God and Caesar: Christian Faith and Political Action* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1989), 10.

43. Dalberg-Acton, "The History of Freedom in Antiquity," 56-57; see also *Ibid.*, 57, which credits Christianity for imparting "to liberty a meaning and a value it had not possessed in the philosophy or in the constitution of Greece or Rome before the knowledge of the truth that makes us free."

44. Dalberg-Acton, "The History of Freedom in Christianity," 58-59.

45. Dalberg-Acton, "The History of Freedom in Antiquity," 33; see also Deuteronomy 17:15-18, in which God lays out the law limiting the authority of Israel's king.

Furthermore, kings derived their authorities not by divine right but by consent.⁴⁶ Lord Acton adds that the Old Testament prophets cited God's laws to denounce rulers who exceeded the limits of their jurisdiction.⁴⁷ Sovereignty lay with God, and human authority remained accountable to God and His laws.

Implicit in the concept of limited government is the principle of the rule of law. In fact, Silving claims that the Old Testament is the direct source for the principle of rule of law.⁴⁸ She develops her argument by explaining how in the Old Testament all sources of authority, both man and God, were obliged to justify their authority.⁴⁹ As Silving notes: "The source of the requirement of an account is thus not doubt regarding the inherent justice or perfection of the act of authority itself, but a positive affirmation of the value of man's freedom from submission to any rule—a freedom which even God himself cannot invade without specific 'justification.'"⁵⁰ The idea of the sanctity of individual liberty is so significant in the Old Testament that no authority, not even God, can intrude upon the institution of liberty without justification. Therefore, all forms of authority including God are under the rule of law.

46. See 1 Samuel 10:17-25, which portrays Samuel's presentation of Saul to the Israelites, as their king. Note that Samuel presents Saul to the people and the people respond with their consent; see also 2 Samuel 5:3, NIV, which states: "When all the elders of Israel had come to King David at Hebron, the king made a compact with them at Hebron before the Lord, and they anointed David king over Israel." Note that the elders, as representative of Israelites, give consent to David's kingship.

47. Dalberg-Acton, "The History of Freedom in Antiquity," 33; see also Silving, "The Origins of Magna Cartae," 121, which reaffirms how in the Bible kings are under the law and "usurpation of power by the ruler, consisting of his exceeding the bounds established by popular consent, is presented in the Bible as a sin punished by God."

48. *Ibid.*, 119.

49. *Ibid.*, 120.

50. *Ibid.*

The concept of the rule of law and limited government is demonstrated in the Magna Carta, which was originally signed in 1215 and subsequently reaffirmed several times. The 1297 charter, confirmed by King Edward I, states:

In the first place we grant to God and confirm by this our present charter for ourselves and our heirs in perpetuity that the English Church is to be free and to have all its rights fully and its liberties entirely. We furthermore grant and give to all the freemen of our realm for ourselves and our heirs in perpetuity the liberties written below to have and to hold to them and their heirs from us and our heirs in perpetuity.⁵¹

The charter implores on the authority of God and the written law to guarantee the liberties of Englishmen.⁵² It limits the authority of the King under the sovereignty of God and the law. Thereby, it explicitly confirmed the idea of the rule of law and limited government into the Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence.

Judeo-Christian Synthesis of the Pillars of Liberty

The pillars of liberty are invariably dependent upon the structural contributions made by the Judeo-Christian heritage. According to M. Stanton Evans, in *The Theme is Freedom: Religion, Politics, and the American Tradition*, Christianity “suffused the whole with a common outlook and gave to Europe its distinctive view of statecraft.”⁵³

Beyond the individual contributions made to the pillars of liberty, the Judeo-Christian

51. Article 1, “Magna Carta,” 1297, trans. Nicholas Vincent, *National Archives and Records Administration*, 2007, available from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/magna_carta/translation.html; Internet; accessed 20 February 2011; see also Silving, “The Origins of Magnae Cartae,” 125, which notes that the Magna Carta inadvertently departed from the Biblical understanding of the rule of law. Rather than viewing the rule of law as a separate source of authority that binds God in His Covenant with His people, the Magna Carta placed God and the law as an equal source of authority (Ibid.). Regardless of the misunderstanding, however, the Magna Carta still exemplifies the Judeo-Christian heritage in its respect for the rule of law as a limiting force on power.

52. See Ibid., 128, which in addressing the significance of the Magna Carta notes: “the significance of the Magna Carta lies not so much in the immediate social implications of its particular provisions, as in the general spirit which it reflects—that of ‘justification of authority,’ indeed, of all authority, and the subjection of authority to a state contract and to limitation by law.”

53. M. Stanton Evans, *The Theme is Freedom: Religion, Politics, and American Tradition* (Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, 1994), 28.

heritage has acted as the synthesizing agent that imparted a distinctive character to the governance of Western civilization. Evans continues:

It was on this ground of underlying unity that the Protestant Burke sprang to the defense of Catholic France against the secularism and atheism of the Jacobins—arguing that the civilization of the West was “virtually one great state having the same basis of general law,” founded chiefly on the precepts of religion.⁵⁴

Even though the English and the French view of religion and statecraft differed, Burke recognized the common foundation upon which the two nations were formed. He recognized the underlying Judeo-Christian heritage that shaped Western civilization.

The pillars of liberty—self-government, private property, representative government, and limited government—are indebted to the conceptual contributions made by the Judeo-Christian heritage. In addition, Christianity served as the synthesizing agent to these pillars to impart a distinctive character on Western civilization.

A Spiritual Crisis in the West

Today, however, much of Western civilization forgets, ignores, and flagrantly denies the contributions of the Judeo-Christian heritage to the formation of Western civilization. The increasing detachment from the Judeo-Christian heritage has introduced a spiritual crisis in the West that numerous scholars identify and strive to explain.

Whittaker Chambers, in his autobiography *Witness*, speaks of a “faith that inspires men to live or die . . . the vision of Man without God.”⁵⁵ Chambers is referring to the vision of Communism but this is the same vision that continues to shape much public and personal decision today. It is part of man’s struggle over the acknowledgement of God or man as his sovereign. Chambers continues: “The crisis of the Western world exists to the

54. *Ibid.*, 29.

55. Whittaker Chambers, *Witness* (Chicago, IL: Regnery Books, 1985), 9.

degree in which it is indifferent to God.”⁵⁶ This struggle, and the resultant declining influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage, is responsible for the present crisis in Western civilization.

Harold O. J. Brown, in *The Sensate Culture: Western Civilization Between Chaos and Transformation*, also identifies the interconnected nature between the crisis in the West and the Judeo-Christian heritage. He states:

The crisis, due to the disintegration of the form of culture that has dominated the Western world for nearly six centuries, has led to a loss of vision, a loss of a sense of calling and purpose, and, most importantly, to a loss of the three “permanent things” of which Paul spoke: “Faith, hope, love, these three” (1 Cor. 13:13).⁵⁷

Such is the state of the Western civilization today—a civilization without a direction, a civilization depleted in spirit. The Judeo-Christian heritage, which had been instrumental in the establishment of the pillars of liberty and in synthesizing Western civilization, no longer holds such sway over the West.

Many scholars have tried to explain the cause of crisis in Western civilization from the Judeo-Christian perspective. Alexander Solzhenitsyn outlines his view on the decline in his seminal Harvard address, “A World Split Apart.” He associates the source of the problem to the Enlightenment and its introduction of humanism, the elevation of man to the center of reality.⁵⁸ Solzhenitsyn continues:

56. *Ibid.*, 17.

57. Harold O. J. Brown, *The Sensate Culture: Western Civilization Between Chaos and Transformation* (Dallas, TX: Word Publishing, 1996), 210; see also *Ibid.*, 14, which recognizes the interconnected relationship between Western civilization and Christianity. In recognition, he fittingly points out: “In actual fact, however, Western civilization is so permeated by Christianity that the crisis of Christendom is inevitably also the crisis of Western civilization, and the world so permeated by Western civilization that the crisis of the West becomes the crisis of the world” (*Ibid.*).

58. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, “A World Split Apart,” 8 June 1978, available from <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/augustine/arch/solzhenitsyn/harvard1978.html>; Internet; accessed 6 February 2011.

[W]e have lost the concept of a Supreme Complete Entity which used to restrain our passions and our irresponsibility. We have placed too much hope in political and social reforms, only to find out that we were being deprived of our most precious possession: our spiritual life.⁵⁹

The rejection of God has resulted in the loss of a standard by which man is able to make judgments. Relying on himself, man as the subjective definer of his standard has lost any sense of duty towards his fellow man resulting in the abuse of freedom, now conditioned according to the image of those in power—man has become the measure of all things.

Pope Benedict XVI⁶⁰ attributes the crisis not to the absolute rejection of God, but to the separation of reason and faith in Christianity. Benedict XVI gave a lecture called “Faith, Reason and the University: Memories and Reflections” at the University of Regensburg in 2006. In the speech, he briefly recounted his university experience, and gave his own perspective to the problems faced by the West.

The premise of Benedict XVI’s argument lies in the Greek word, *logos*. Apostle John introduces the Book of John with the words: “In the beginning was the Word [λόγος], and the Word [λόγος] was with God, and the Word [λόγος] was God” (John 1:1, NIV). According to Benedict XVI, “*Logos* means both reason and word—a reason which is creative and capable of self-communication, precisely as reason.”⁶¹ He sees this passage as an amalgamation of faith and reason, which was confirmed in the formation of the Septuagint, and ultimately led to Byzantine Emperor Manuel II Paleologus’s

59. Ibid.

60. Also known as Joseph Alois Ratzinger, but hereon referred to as Benedict XVI.

61. Joseph Alois Ratzinger, “Faith, Reason and the University: Memories and Reflections,” *The Holy See*, 12 September 2006, available from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060912_university-regensburg_en.html; Internet; accessed 6 February 2011.

confession: “Not to act ‘with *logos*’ [—reason and faith—] is contrary God’s nature.”⁶²

Thus, Benedict XVI’s understanding of Christianity is focused on the interaction between reason and faith, without which Christianity loses its strength and accounts for the societal decline.

Both Solzhenitsyn’s and Benedict XVI’s understanding is founded upon the separation of two realms of reality. For Solzhenitsyn it is the dichotomy between the physical and the spiritual realms of society, and for Benedict XVI it is the schism between reason and faith within Christian theology. Even though the root cause to which they attribute the crisis and the decline of Western civilization are different, the basic premise of their arguments remains the same: man’s unwillingness to incorporate the intangible with the tangible, to accommodate the sovereignty of God in his life.

As if foreshadowing the direction of liberty in Western civilization, Chambers states: “Religion and freedom are indivisible. Without freedom the soul dies. Without the soul there is no justification for freedom.”⁶³ In analyzing the views of scholars, the consensus is that there is a crisis in Western civilization—a spiritual crisis of man rejecting God and consequently rejecting the Judeo-Christian heritage, the foundation to the pillars of liberty.

Sorokin’s Model as a Framework of Interpretation

In addition to the spiritual crisis, a Western civilization that rejects the Judeo-Christian heritage produces fatal fractures to the pillars of liberty. To better understand the appearing fractures, this study applies the Pitirim Sorokin’s framework of cultural and

62. Ibid.

63. Chambers, *Witness*, 16.

social analysis of Western civilization. In *The Crisis of Our Age*, Sorokin identifies three stages of culture—ideational, idealistic, and sensate—to explain the rise and decline of Western civilization.⁶⁴ He characterizes all other cultural institutions such as the arts, sciences, ethics, law, truth, and most significantly, liberty, under the three broad cultural stages.

Ideational Culture

The basis of ideational culture lies in its focus on the unseen, spiritual, and supernatural aspect of reality. The *Oxford Dictionary of English* defines “ideation” as “the formation of ideas of concepts.”⁶⁵ Ideational culture, however, constitutes something deeper than mere ideas. It constitutes the internal or spiritual dimension of reality. Sorokin describes it as a culture of “an infinite, supersensory and super-rational God, omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, absolutely just, good and beautiful, creator of the world and of man.”⁶⁶ Thus, one can define ideational culture by the precepts of a reality that lies beyond the realm of the senses and reason. Ultimate reality revolves around the realm of intuition and faith.

This emphasis on the unseen aspect of life affects one’s understanding of truth. Ideational truth, according to Sorokin, is the truth of faith—truth that one derives not through one’s senses but through “divine intuition and inspiration.”⁶⁷ Truth comes through the intervention and revelation of God and consequently, “it is regarded as

64. Pitirim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 2nd rev. ed. (Oxford, England: Oneworld Publications Ltd, 1992), 18-19.

65. *Oxford Dictionary of English*, 2nd Rev. ed., s.v. “Ideation.”

66. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 18.

67. *Ibid.*, 67.

infallible, yielding adequate knowledge about the truth of faith.”⁶⁸ B. G. Brander in *Staring into Chaos: Explorations in the Decline of Western Civilization* points out that ideational culture gives greater emphasis to theology than the natural sciences.⁶⁹

The focus on the supernatural, unseen aspect of life also translates into a unique perspective on liberty. According to Sorokin, “Ideational liberty is inner liberty, rooted in the restraint and control of our desires, wishes and lusts.”⁷⁰ Under ideational liberty, individuals are not free from all restraint. Comparable to the freedom of excellence identified by Weigel in Aquinas’ view of liberty and explicated above in detail, ideational liberty involves restraint on individual freedom. Individuals conform to the restrictions placed by ethical and moral frameworks instilled by the dominant religion. Sorokin associates ideational liberty with “the liberty of Job with his imperturbable ‘The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the lord.’”⁷¹ Such an idea of liberty contrasts sharply with the liberty promoted by contemporary culture, as a freedom to pursue all of one’s desires without any external limitations.

68. Ibid.

69. B. G. Brander, *Staring into Chaos: Explorations in the Decline of Western Civilization* (Dallas, TX: Spence Publishing Company, 1998), 256; see also Ibid., 262, which notes that during this period great scholarship took place in the synthesis of Greek thought and Christian doctrine; see also Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 88, which argues for the relevance of intuition and faith as a valid form of truth. Sorokin points out: “Intuition lies at the roots of any science, from mathematical axiom to the natural sciences. The deductive and inductive superstructure of science rests not upon logic or the testimony of the senses but upon the ultimate intuitional verities.” Furthermore, he argues that many solutions to problems in philosophy, humanities, and social sciences were found as a result of intuition, and he cites Henri Poincaré’s discovery of a Fuchsian functions, and Isaac Newton’s discovery of the law of gravitation, among those of other great scientists, to support his argument (Ibid., 91-92).

70. Ibid., 143.

71. Ibid.

Sensate Culture

The view of liberty as limitless freedom is the product of the increasing influence of the sensate culture, which is in direct contrast to the ideational culture. While the ideational culture focuses on the unseen, spiritual, supernatural aspects of life, the sensate culture focuses on the seen, physical, natural aspects of life. According to Sorokin, such a culture focuses on the senses as the sole method of determining value to the world.⁷² The sensate culture does not recognize anything that lies beyond the purview of man's senses.

Consequently, sensate truth reflects reality as experienced through the senses. Sorokin states: "If the testimony of our senses shows that 'snow is white and cold,' the proposition is true; if our senses testify that snow is not white and not cold, the proposition becomes false."⁷³ He underscores the uncompromising nature of the sensate culture in completely rejecting anything that cannot be verified by the senses. In fact, Sorokin maintains that the sensate culture dismisses truth determined by the supersensory, and discredits reason unless empirical evidences support it.⁷⁴

Sensate liberty is also the direct opposite of ideational liberty. Brander points out that a key characteristic of the sensate people is the use of the physical world to satisfy their desires.⁷⁵ Consequently, according to Sorokin, when ideational liberty strives to

72. Ibid., 18.

73. Ibid., 67.

74. Ibid., 72.

75. Brander, *Staring into Chaos*, 259.

restrain man's desires, as noted above, sensate liberty never ceases to expand the means by which man can satisfy his desires.⁷⁶ Sorokin continues:

Such a liberty leads to an incessant struggle of men and groups for as large a share of sensate values—wealth, love, pleasure, comfort, sensory safety, security—one can get. Since one can get them mainly at the cost of somebody else, their quest accentuates and intensifies the struggle of individuals and groups. Sensate liberty is thus mainly external.⁷⁷

Sensate liberty is an embodiment of the self through an emphasis on rights. Individuals and social groups promote rights to secure their means to gratify their unrestrained human desires.

Idealistic Culture

The contours of the ideational and sensate cultures, however, overlap and in the transition between the decline of ideational culture and the rise of sensate culture or *vice versa*, the two cultures produce what Sorokin calls the idealistic culture. The essence of idealistic culture is that it is “partly supersensory and partly sensory—that it embraces the supersensory and super-rational aspect, plus the rational aspect and, finally, the sensory aspect, all blended into one unity, that of the infinite manifold, God.”⁷⁸ The idealistic culture is unique in that it blends the truths found through faith, reason, and senses into a single framework of life.

76. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 143; see also Weigel, *Against the Grain*, 165, which identifies William of Ockham's view of freedom as one defined by will, because “choice is everything—for choice is a matter of self-assertion, of power. Will is the defining human attribute. Indeed, will is the defining attribute of all of reality.” Therefore, Ockham viewed freedom in light of no restriction in the pursuit of will and human desires.

77. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 143-144; see also *Ibid.*, 144, which points out that in order to secure their rights and other desires, groups and individuals either enter into contractual relationships or create privileges for themselves.

78. *Ibid.*, 18.

Consequently, Sorokin notes that idealistic truth is a synthesis of faith and physical reality—the ideational and sensate truths—through reason.⁷⁹ Idealistic truth does not focus entirely on the ideational truth that focuses on the supersensory nor on the sensate truth that focuses on the senses. Instead, it focuses on reason, which synthesizes the two opposing yet partially accurate forms of truths.⁸⁰

The extent to which ideational truth should hold sway is debatable. Sorokin argues that even though the ideational and sensate truths hold some precepts of reality, they cannot coexist if one or the other is considered as an exclusive form of truth.⁸¹ Therefore, he advocates a balance between the ideational and sensate truths, possibly using reason as a vehicle to achieve this synthesis. Brander, however, considers even idealistic truth, a synthesis of both the ideational and sensate truths, as a form of partial reality.⁸² Brander considers truth derived from faith, the senses, and even reason, which synthesizes both these forms of truths, as inadequate, and he leaves man into a bleak state of reality without a reliable source of truth.

Like idealistic truth, idealistic liberty is a synthesis of the ideational and sensate liberties. Sorokin credits the rise of the 1215 Magna Carta to the growing influence of the sensate culture and liberty in Western civilization.⁸³ Under the idealistic culture, Western civilization synthesized the freedom that sought to limit the desires of man, with the

79. Ibid., 68.

80. See Ibid., 68, which is adamant that both forms of truth, ideational and sensate, give true perceptions to reality, which idealistic culture synthesizes these truths using reason.

81. Ibid., 69.

82. See Brander, *Staring into Chaos*, 264, which states: “No culture possesses all the truth, complete and infinite . . . Each system is only partly true, and therefore also partly false, partly adequate and partly inadequate for maintaining human life and society.”

83. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 144.

freedom that sought to secure the rights of man. In a sense, idealistic culture blessed Western civilization with a form of liberty that fused elements of both freedom of excellence and Anglican liberty. This form of liberty externalized into contractual relationships. Even though the influence of ideational culture ultimately declined with the rise and growing influence of the sensate culture, the synthesis of the two cultures brought forth the concept of securing tangible rights through social contracts guaranteed by God and His laws.

Sorokin's three cultural stages in Western civilization—ideational, sensate, and idealistic cultures—provides a framework with which to better understand the shifting cultural stages apparent throughout the history of Western civilization. It provides a framework with which to better understand the fractures present in the pillars of liberty, consequent of the declining influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage in Western civilization.

Early Indications of Senate Fractures

As Western civilization transitioned from an ideational culture to a sensate culture, fractures became apparent in the pillars of liberty. The history of liberty in both Europe and America implicitly demonstrates the introduction and growth of the fractures in the pillars of liberty as society departs from its Judeo-Christian heritage.

European Experience

Before the rise of the sensate culture, the Judeo-Christian heritage defined the social relationships in Western civilization. According to Branders, the prevailing relationship—the social bonds extended towards orthodox Christians—was based on

loyalty and trust rather than on contractual agreements.⁸⁴ Francis Fukuyama in *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, does not directly address the trust based relationship of feudal Europe. He, however, recognizes that “one of the most important lessons we can learn from an examination of economic life is that a nation’s well-being, as well as its ability to compete, is conditioned by a single, pervasive cultural characteristic: the level of trust inherent in the society.”⁸⁵ Trust, based on voluntary association and built upon the Judeo-Christian heritage, was central to the Middle Ages. It was through such relationship that Europe engendered in a cohesive society.

The level of trust extended towards people depended upon their religious beliefs. According Lord Acton, during the Middle Ages faith was central to the cause of every State to the extent that “it came to be thought that the rights of men, and the duties of neighbours and of rulers towards them, varied according to their religion.”⁸⁶ It was under

84. See Brander, *Staring into Chaos*, 337, which states: “From around the time of Charlemagne in the eighth century to the days of Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century, the familistic relationship prevailed in medieval society. *Fidelitas*—loyalty—held social groups together, from paternalistic ties between king and dutiful subjects, to familylike bonds between great warriors and youths admitted to their armies, to relationships within the church in which all men were brethren and popes addressed monarchs as ‘good children’ and ‘dearly beloved sons.’ The society was thought of as one body and one mind, a kind of *corpus mysticum*.” Brander portrays a harmonious image of feudal European society dominated by Christianity. It merely provides further evidence to support liberty’s indebtedness to the Judeo-Christian heritage.

85. Francis Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, First Free Press Paperback ed. (New York: Free Press Paperback, 1996), 7; see also *Ibid.*, 50-51, which examines America, among others nations, to support his claim. Though America is sometimes regarded as individualistic to the point that there are little or no social bonds in American community, Fukuyama recognizes that strong and dynamic networks of private organizations that, though weakened today, have contributed to a strong community hold America together (*Ibid.*). It is because of the trust that results from the network of private organizations that America had been able to establish a socially and economically a dynamic society.

86. Dalberg-Acton, “History of Freedom in Christianity,” 67; see also *Ibid.*, which states: “society did not acknowledge the same obligations to a Turk or a Jew, a pagan or a heretic, or a devil worshipper, as to an orthodox Christian.” Depending upon one’s religion, one enjoyed different levels of rights and duties in society.

the precepts of Christianity and for the cause of the Christian faith that Western civilization defined the contours of the social relationships.

Sorokin traces the shift away from the ideational towards the sensate culture to the end of the twelfth century.⁸⁷ As the influence of the ideational culture represented by the Judeo-Christian heritage grew weaker, the relationship between rights and duties changed. Lord Acton notes that the State began to work for its own ends rather than the ends of faith, and that Machiavelli systemized the pursuit of secular ends into statecraft.⁸⁸ According to Lord Acton, Machiavelli recognized that “the most vexatious obstacle to intellect is conscience, and that the vigorous use of statecraft necessary for the success of difficult schemes would never be made if governments allowed themselves to be hampered by the precepts of the copy-book.”⁸⁹ Macchiavelli viewed conscience—the matter of man’s heart—to be the greatest obstacle to centralizing power.

It is no surprise then that, with the declining influence of Christianity in political thought, monarchs pursued their personal desires in complete disregard of all moral principles. Lord Acton outlines the disappearance of morality in politics, supporting his argument with examples of Charles V, who paid for the murder of an enemy; Ferdinand I and Ferdinand II, Henry III and Louis XIII, who dispatched powerful subjects that

87. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 18.

88. Dalberg-Acton, “History of Freedom in Christianity,” 67-68.

89. *Ibid.*, 68; The phrase “precepts of the copy-book” is used by Lord Acton in reference to Rudyard Kipling’s poem, “The Gods of the Copybook Headings.” Kipling’s copybook “headings” are moral axioms—spiritual truths—that remain in man’s conscience and haunt the man who turns away to follow the pleasures of the world: “When all men are paid for existing and no man must pay for his sins
“As surely as Water will wet us, as surely as Fire will burn,
“The Gods of the Copybook Headings with terror and slaughter return!” (Rudyard Kipling, “The Gods of the Copybook,” lines, 37-40, 1919, *The Kipling Society*, available from http://www.kipling.org.uk/poems_copybook.htm; Internet; accessed 4 April 2011).

threatened their rule; Elizabeth and Mary Stuart, who tried to overthrow each other.⁹⁰

Lord Acton laments: “The way was paved for absolute monarchy to triumph over the spirit and institutions of a better age, not by isolated acts of wickedness, but by a studied philosophy of crime and so thorough a perversion of the moral sense that the like of it had not been since the Stoics reformed the morality of paganism.”⁹¹ As the State moved away from the ends of the Judeo-Christian heritage and towards the ends of secular authority, monarchs in Western civilization ignored the restraints of morality to systematically violate the freedom of its subjects and its equals.

The State even began to use the Church for the ends of the State rather than the ends of faith. The Reformation is commonly perceived as a conflict between the Protestants and the corrupt Catholic Church; however, Lord Acton attributes the resistance against the Reformation to the unholy alliance between the Church and the State, which used religion to further secular power.⁹² In a sense, the Church could no longer represent the Christian faith, because it had become a vehicle through which the

90. Dalberg-Acton, “History of Freedom in Christianity,” 67-68.

91. Ibid; see also Kenneth Minogue, *Politics: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 37, which presents a contrasting view, which argues that it was necessary for the monarchs to practice the new form of politics in order to consolidate their power from “[m]any of these subjects who were now literate and had very definite religious and political views of their own.” What Minogue calls the “art of the state,” diverts the ends of the State away from establishing justice to a skill of maintaining power (Ibid.). Consequently, Lord Acton associates the cause of the change in statecraft to the declining influence of Christianity, whilst Minogue associates it to the growing need to preserve power. But the fact that monarchs are concerned with the need to preserve their power indicates that they are putting their sensual desires before the ideational need, which further underscores the proposition that the change in statecraft arose due to the declining influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage. Consequently, Minogue’s view does not discredit, rather it strengthens, the arguments of this paper.

92. Dalberg-Acton, “History of Freedom in Christianity,” 69; see also Ibid., which viewed that the kings of France, Spain, Sicily, and in England subjugated the spiritual realm, the church, for the cause of absolute monarchy; see also James Kurth, “The Protestant Deformation and American Foreign Policy, 22 April 2001, available from <http://www.phillysoc.org/Kurth%20Speech.htm>; Internet; accessed 6 February 2011, which points out that by the eighteenth century even the Protestant States pursued “secular goals of territory, wealth, and power.”

State achieved its own ends. Lord Acton points out that the head bishops in Germany wanted and the Pope even urged Charles V to accept the demands of Luther, without success.⁹³ Despite the objections made by the Church, the State remained uncompromising to the calls for reform. The Church remained powerless before the State. Consequently, the Reformation was a conflict between those who held power under the premise of sensate culture and those who wanted reform towards ideational culture, the true realm of the church. Even though the Church and the State were separate and responsible in different jurisdictions, the policy of the State reigned over religious ends—sensate ends reigned over ideational ends.

American Experience

The American colonial experience also demonstrates how the absence of the Judeo-Christian influence produces dire consequences to liberty. Evans credits Virginia with creating the first representative institution in America with its establishment of the House of Burgesses in August 1619.⁹⁴ To fully appreciate Virginia's protection and extension of representative government, however, one has to address the struggle overcome to achieve such ends.

Elizabeth I sent Sir Humphrey Gilbert a letter patent on June 11, 1578 sanctioning his attempt to establish a Crown colony in Virginia. The letter patent, however, indicates that it is the Crown and not God that granted the rights of Englishmen to the colonist.⁹⁵

93. See Dalberg-Acton, "History of Freedom in Christianity," 69, which states: "Charles V had outlawed Luther, and attempted to waylay him; and the Dukes of Bavaria were active in beheading and burning his disciples, whilst the democracy of the towns generally took his side."

94. Evans, *The Theme is Freedom*, 212.

95. See "Letters Patent to Sir Humfrey Gylberte," *The Avalon Project*, 11 June 1578, available from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/16th_century/humfrey.asp; Internet; accessed 26 February 2011, which states: "And wee doe graunt to the sayd sir Humfrey . . . and to all and every other person and persons,

This may account for the reason Slater notes that this document laid the precedent for a monarchical transfer of “the *Rights of Englishmen* to new territories.”⁹⁶ The colonists who derived their rights from the Crown rather than from God were helpless before the whims of the monarchy.⁹⁷

In addition to the fact that it derived its rights from secular authority, the Virginia colony was founded to achieve secular ends. In comparing the foundational differences between the Virginia colony and the Plymouth colony, Slater associates Virginia with the “human ambition for gold and gain.”⁹⁸ In contrast, she associates Plymouth with the “application to civil government of the church covenant—the right of men to associate and covenant ‘in ye name of God.’”⁹⁹ Unlike the Plymouth colony, which the Pilgrims found with the purpose of establishing a civil government, based on Biblical principles for the liberty of conscience, the Virginia colony was formed with the purpose of achieving material gain.

being of our allegiance . . . that they and every or any of them being either borne within our sayd Realmes of England or Ireland, or within any other place within our allegiance, and which hereafter shall be inhabiting within any the lands, countreys and territories, with such licence as aforesayd, shall and may have, and enjoy all the priveleges of free denizens and persons native of England, and within our allegiance: any law, custome, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.”

96. Slater, *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*, 191; see also Donald S. Lutz, *The Origins of American Constitutionalism* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 24, which points out that the letter patent required the colonists to “pledge loyalty to the Crown.”

97. See Slater, *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*, 192, which notes how James I dissolved the influential London Company and tried to impose laws shaping Virginia's government; how Charles I tried to curtail the freedom of the colonists; and how the British parliament attempted to impose itself over the colony.

98. Ibid.; see also “The First Charter of Virginia,” *The Avalon Project*, 10 April 1606, available from, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/va01.asp; Internet; accessed 26 February 2011, which includes stipulations that require the colonists yield one fifth of the mined gold and silver, and a fifteenth of the mined copper to the Crown. Consequently, it reinforces the perception that Virginia was founded to achieve secular or sensate rather than Christian ends.

99. Slater, *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*, 196.

The lack of Judeo-Christian influence in the establishment of the Virginia colony hindered the colonists' initial endeavors to sustain the colony. According to Slater, one of the problems faced by the Virginia colony was the absence of self-government, which led to anarchy in the colony whenever it lacked strong leadership.¹⁰⁰ Self-government, which is so interconnected with the Judeo-Christian heritage and the Pilgrims of the Plymouth colony, was missing in the Virginia colony.¹⁰¹ Consequently, without a strong form of authority, the colony fell into anarchy and threatened the liberty of all colonists. According to Slater, it was only with the growth of the Christian influence that Virginia secured the rights of Englishmen and established its representative government.¹⁰² Through experience, Virginia realized man derives liberty not as a right of an Englishmen but as a God-given right, inherent to human beings.

The American experience, specifically the experience of the Virginia colony, demonstrates that in the absence of Judeo-Christian influences, society experiences limited protection against the encroaching power of human authority. Furthermore, it reaffirms the value of the Judeo-Christian heritage to the development of self-government and the sustenance of liberty.

Sensate Fractures

Sorokin predicts that a Western civilization dominated by the sensate culture will be unable to sustain itself and that Western civilization will have no choice but to seek

100. Ibid., 191-192.

101. See Ibid., 196-197, which notes how the Plymouth colony had established self-government, evidenced by their strong work ethics and moral character, from their Christian faith. Furthermore, Slater concludes: "The Pilgrims relied on God. They lived as Christians in all their avenues of activity. In their economics they kept their agreements. They invested their labor and industry in order to become self-sustaining and free from debt and the Lord prospered their endeavors" (Ibid., 197).

102. Ibid., 191.

ideational elements of life for its survival.¹⁰³ He identifies various aspects of culture that indicate the problems caused by an extreme form of sensate culture that pervades modern Western civilization. He, however, does not address or develop the fractures the sensate culture has introduced and exacerbated in the pillars of liberty.

Sensate Fractures in Self-Government

Western civilization currently experiences a depletion of self-government. More and more people are sacrificing their liberty for the satisfaction of material well-being. An increasing number of people are willing to live as children under the guidance and protection of the paternal government. Solzhenitsyn identifies the dire situation and criticizes the West for the creation of and reliance on the welfare state.¹⁰⁴ He continues: “Every citizen has been granted the desired freedom and material goods in such quantity and of such quality as to guarantee in theory the achievement of happiness, in the morally inferior sense which has come into being during those same decades.”¹⁰⁵ Without self-government, without taking responsibility for one’s life, man has to merely be satisfied with the freedom to satisfy sensual desires and ends.

Fyodor Dostoevsky through the voice of the Grand Inquisitor in *The Brothers Karamazov* makes a similar sort of lamentation. Drawing inspiration from the narrative of Satan’s temptation of Jesus, Dostoevsky identifies two things—material satisfaction, in

103. See Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, 166-167, which states: “Faced by the catastrophe brought about by his misdeeds, he is once more reminded that liberty is not so much external as internal; that it cannot endure without cogent values and moral norms; and, finally, that it demands self-control and the punctilious fulfillment of one’s obligations. This bitter lesson suggests two alternatives: either to remain enslaved, deprived of all essential rights and liberties; or to seek for inner ideational freedom, as, under similar conditions, Greco-Roman society did. There is hardly any doubt that the second alternative will be chosen.”

104. Solzhenitsyn, “A World Split Apart.”

105. Ibid.

the form of full stomachs, and the relinquishing of responsibility—as the sensual desires of man.¹⁰⁶ It is this inherent fear that drives man to relinquish his self-government.

Similarly, it is the triumph of the sensate culture that has driven Western civilization into choosing material satisfaction over self-responsibility. Addressing the direction of the West, Solzhenitsyn points out: “Even biology knows that habitual extreme safety and well-being are not advantageous for a living organism.”¹⁰⁷

Western civilization, however, also faces an extreme form of self-government: selfishness. Contemporary Western civilization seems to be so steeped in selfishness that it fails to inspire a sense of community and character in the lives of its citizen. Roger Scruton laments in “Forgiveness and Irony,” that Western civilization currently only offers a “culture of repudiation,” a rejection of its historical achievements and identity, so that it fails to provide a sense of community to the Muslim immigrants.¹⁰⁸ Scruton states: “This culture of repudiation has transmitted itself, through the media and the schools, across the spiritual terrain of Western civilization, leaving behind it a sense of emptiness and defeat, a sense that nothing is left to believe in or endorse, save only the freedom to believe.”¹⁰⁹ It is this directionless “freedom to believe” that permeates confusion and prevents people from finding a sense of community in Western civilization.

106. Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1990), 253-254.

107. Solzhenitsyn, “A World Split Apart.”

108. Roger Scruton, “Forgiveness and Irony,” *City Journal* 19, no. 1 (2009), available from http://www.city-journal.org/2009/19_1_the-west.html; Internet; accessed 27 February 2011.

109. Ibid.

Weigel associates the current understanding of freedom with William of Ockham's understanding of freedom—the freedom to impose one's will.¹¹⁰ It is a type of freedom in which the individual is absolutized so that no limits to his liberty, both external and internal, are tolerated. Solzhenitsyn identifies this problem in the legal system of the West. The legalism Solzhenitsyn describes is not legalism in the sense that people are bound and oppressed in the required obedience to law. Instead, it is legalism in the sense that law is detached from the restraints of moral values. Solzhenitsyn states: “If one is right from a legal point of view, nothing more is required, nobody may mention that one could still not be entirely right, and urge self-restraint, a willingness to renounce such legal rights, sacrifice and selfless risk . . .”¹¹¹ The law defines the contours of what is right and wrong. According to the law, the individual has no restraining obligation to act otherwise. The law acts as the parent-like decider of what is permissible for the child-like private individuals. Western civilization has replaced self-government with the allegedly benevolent government that takes all of life's responsibilities.

Sensate Fractures in Private Property

Western civilization no longer views the institution of private property as an inviolable institution. Frederic Bastiat introduces the concept of legal plunder in his seminal work, *The Law*. Similar to the principle embodied in the legalistic life that Solzhenitsyn identifies, Bastiat describes legal plunder as the situation in which the law is used to benefit “one citizen at the expense of another by doing what the citizen himself

110. Weigel, *Against the Grain*, 165-166.

111. Solzhenitsyn, “A World Split Apart.”

cannot do without committing a crime.”¹¹² In other words, individuals or groups can violate the private property of another under the farcical justification provided by the law.

Max Raskin's article, "Jonesin' for a Soda" portrays this concept. In the article, Raskin recounts how Archer Daniel Midland (ADM), a corn producing company, lobbied to pass quotas against sugar importation so that companies that required wished to add sweeteners would be forced to purchase the cheaper High Fructose corn syrup as a substitute.¹¹³ Through the manipulation of the law, ADM was able to force industries such as the soda and candy industries into purchasing its corn. The law deprived sugar producers and importers of property, in the broader sense, in order to divert benefits to the corn producers. In a sensate culture that focuses merely on the material ends of life, nothing restrains the perverse greed of man.

In addition to the violation of external private property, Western civilization also violates and marginalizes the internal aspects of private property: conscience. According to Solzhenitsyn, the West suffers from a "fashion in thinking."¹¹⁴ The media and the intellectual elite divide ideas and views into categories of what is acceptable and unacceptable, thus marginalizing certain forms of thought and even keeping them from publication. Solzhenitsyn states: "This gives birth to strong mass prejudices, blindness, which is most dangerous in our dynamic era."¹¹⁵ For example, in 2001, the *Los Angeles Times* posted an article about Roger DeHart, a high school biology teacher in Burlington,

112. Frederic Bastiat, *The Law* (Irvington, NY: Foundation for Economic Education, 2007), 13.

113. Max Raskin, "Jonesin' for a Soda," *Ludwig von Mises Institute*, 5 September 2007, available from <http://mises.org/story/2678>; Internet; accessed 27 February 2011.

114. Solzhenitsyn, "A World Split Apart."

115. *Ibid.*

Washington. In his class, DeHart introduced the theory of intelligent design, but after receiving a complaint filed by the American Civil Liberties Union, school authorities prohibited him from teaching such theory.¹¹⁶ Thereafter, school authorities even prohibited him from teaching views that questioned the validity of Darwinian assumptions.¹¹⁷ Even today, the “fashion” in thought blinds the eyes of society to create prejudices against idea that questions the sensate view of reality. In a Western civilization dominated by the sensate culture, even man’s conscience, the most sacred form of property, the thoughts and views of the individuals, are beings implicitly directed towards the sensate ends.

Sensate Fractures in Representative Government

Even though in theory Western civilization has the structure of representative government, in practice representative governments no longer represents the values of the people. Through one-side of their mouths, politicians coax the voters with issues that are of deep concern. Through the other-side of their mouths, politicians advocate policies that contradict the values of the voters. It is no surprise that in a 2010 survey report conducted by *The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press*, only 22% report to trust Washington the majority of the time, and only 25% reported that they trust Congress.¹¹⁸

A survey alone does not indicate why people are skeptical of the government, since the

116. Teresa Watanabe, “Enlisting Science to Find the Fingerprints of a Creator,” *Los Angeles Times*, 25 March 2001, available from <http://articles.latimes.com/2001/mar/25/news/mn-42548>; Internet; accessed 3 April 2011.

117. Ibid.

118. “Distrust, Discontent, Anger and Partisan Rancor: The People and Their Government,” *The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press*, 18 April 2010, available from <http://people-press.org/report/606/trust-in-government>; Internet; accessed 27 February 2011; see also Ibid., which reports that the opinion of Washington was the lowest in fifty years while the opinion of Congress was the lowest in twenty-five years.

opinions of people fluctuate with the policies of various administrations and Congresses. It, however, does indicate that the current leaders who the people elected in general do not represent the value of the people.

Furthermore, much of Western civilization experiences a depletion in leaders with character. Solzhenitsyn identifies a lack of courage both in the West and in its leaders. He states: "Political and intellectual bureaucrats show depression, passivity and perplexity in their actions and their statements and even more so in theoretical reflections to explain how realistic, reasonable as well as intellectually and even morally warranted it is to base state policies on weakness and cowardice."¹¹⁹ The depression and passivity he points out is not one of emotion, but one of character—a character amongst society's leaders that lacks passion and direction. This problem is nowhere more prevalent than in the handling of the Vietnam War then, and in the handling of the war in the Middle East, today. A nation, though it may have all the tangible strengths of war, in finances and in military equipment, cannot win a war without courage to stand for her beliefs.

Sensate Fractures in Limited Government

Today, Western civilization experiences the rise of unlimited governments. An increasing number of individuals no longer want to take personal responsibility. They are willing to relinquish their freedom and property for the sake of material satisfaction. No longer does private property remain outside the purview of civil government.

According to Frederich von Hayek, in *The Road to Serfdom*: "If democracy resolves on a task which necessarily involves the use of power which cannot be guided

119. Solzhenitsyn, "A World Split Apart."

by fixed rules, it must become arbitrary power.”¹²⁰ Without fixed rules, without the rule of law, even democratic governments end up being governments without any limits to their jurisdiction. Governments expand their power by bombarding society with laws and regulations. Charlotte A. Twight notes that “a vast web of legal rules now enmeshes Americans in a tangle of law so complex, so contradictory, so uncertain that most of us can no longer either understand or comply with it.”¹²¹ Because, the people do not know, which rules exist, the government in a sensate Western civilization no longer has any accountability. It no longer has limits to its jurisdiction, and individuals are helpless before the whims of the government.

In addition, governments involve themselves not only in the protection of individual rights but also in the ensuring of social and economic justice. Governments have implemented policies of affirmative action to correct the social and economic discrimination of the past because of race and sex.¹²² Governments have implemented policies that seek to reform education according to its vision.¹²³ Governments have

120. Friedrich A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 76.

121. Charlotte A. Twight, *Dependent on D.C.: The Rise of Federal Control over the Lives of Ordinary Americans* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 288.

122. See *University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978), in which Justice Lewis Powell laid the precedent to allowing the use of race as an admissions factor when it was concerned with creating “diversity in the student body;” see also *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003), in which the Supreme Court of the United States reaffirms the *Bakke* decision, which allow the use of race as an admissions factor.

123. See The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 70 (1965), which expands the jurisdiction of the Federal government over the elementary and secondary education of students in America, especially for the purpose of making high-quality education to all children; see also Zachariah Montgomery, *Poison Drops in the Federal Senate: The School Question from a Parental and Non-Sectarian Stand-Point* (Washington, DC: Gibson Bros., Printers and Bookbinders, 1886), 78, which states: “But to our mind, the chief vice of the system lies in its usurpation of parental authority, and in its attempting to do for each child, through political agencies, that which can be properly done by nobody else in the world, except by its own father and mother.” Montgomery points out the increasing jurisdiction of

transferred the property of one individual to another in the name of the greater good.¹²⁴

These are just some of evidences that testify to the growing presence of limitless governments in the West. Governments no longer know their bounds.

Conclusion

The pillars of liberty—self-government, private property, representative government, and limited government—contribute to the sustenance of liberty, which uplifts the value of the individual while at the same time restraining the individual under a set of moral values. These pillars owe much of their conceptual growth and development to the contributions made by the Judeo-Christian heritage, such that liberty itself is dependent upon the sustaining influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage.

Western civilization, however, has been experiencing a spiritual crisis. Scholars such as Solzhenitsyn and Benedict XVI have delineated the crisis from the Judeo-Christian perspective, and have reached similar conclusions—that the crisis in Western civilization is the crisis of man rejecting God, the denial and rejection of the Judeo-Christian heritage of the West. Nevertheless, the crisis continues and the influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage continues to wane in Western civilization.

The decline has created fractures in the pillars of liberty. Sorokin's cultural stages—ideational, sensate, and idealistic cultures—serve as a useful framework to understanding the fractures in the pillars of liberty. Whilst the history of liberty in both

the Federal government that has even overlapped the traditional jurisdiction of parents in the education of their children.

124. See *Kelo v. City of New London*, 545 U.S. 469 (2005), in which the Supreme Court of the United States sanctioned the government's use of eminent domain to transfer the property of one private individual to another. According to the majority opinion presented by Justice John P. Stevens, "promoting economic development is a traditional and long accepted function of the government. . . . Clearly, there is no basis for exempting economic development from our traditionally broad understanding of public purpose" (Ibid., 484-485).

Europe and America demonstrates the changes in the social relationships, it also anticipates the exacerbated fractures in the pillars of liberty.

These fractures give evidence of man becoming subservient to the promises of the State, blind to the violations of the sanctity of private property, tolerant of the leaders that no longer relate to the people, and indifferent to the growing interference of civil government. Through the establishment of the pillars of liberty and the fractures of the pillars introduced and exacerbated by the growing sensate culture of Western civilization, this study offers a unique portrayal of the struggle liberty faces in a Western civilization that rejects its Judeo-Christian heritage, and consequently it supports the centrality of the Judeo-Christian heritage as the nursing father and sustainer of liberty.

Bibliography

- Bastiat, Frederic. *The Law*. Irvington, NY: Foundation for Economic Education, 2007.
- Blackstone, William. *Blackstone's Commentaries: With Notes of Reference to the Constitution and Laws, of the Federal Government of the United States; and of the Commonwealth of Virginia*, vol. 1. Edited by George Tucker. Union, New Jersey: The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd., 1996.
- Brague, Rémi. "Liberty and the Judaeo-Christian Inheritance." In *Liberty and Civilization: The Western Heritage*. Edited by Roger Scruton. New York: Encounter Books, 2010.
- Brander, B. G. *Staring into Chaos: Explorations in the Decline of Western Civilization*. Dallas, TX: Spence Publishing Company, 1998.
- Brown, Harold O. J. *The Sensate Culture: Western Civilization Between Chaos and Transformation*. Dallas, TX: Word Publishing, 1996.
- Chambers, Whittaker. *Witness*. Chicago, IL: Regnery Books, 1985.
- Colson, Charles W. and Harold Fickett. *The Faith: What Christians Believe, Why They Believe it, and Why it Matters*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.
- Dalberg-Acton, John Emerich Edward. "The History of Freedom in Antiquity." In *Essays on Freedom and Power*. 2nd ed. Grenco, IL: The Free Press, 1949.
- . "The History of Freedom in Christianity." In *Essays on Freedom and Power*. 2nd ed. Grenco, IL: The Free Press, 1949.
- "Distrust, Discontent, Anger and Partisan Rancor: The People and Their Government." *The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press*, 18 April 2010, available

from <http://people-press.org/report/606/trust-in-government> (accessed February 27, 2011).

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1990.

Eidsmoe, John. *God and Caesar: Christian Faith and Political Action*. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1989.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 70 (1965).

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "Self-Reliance." In *Essays and English Traits, The Harvard Classics*, vol. 5. Edited by Charles W. Eliot. New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909-1914, available from <http://www.bartleby.com/br/00501.html> (accessed April 1, 2011).

Evans, M. Stanton. *The Theme is Freedom: Religion, Politics, and American Tradition*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, 1994.

Ewell, Marshall D. *A Review of Blackstone's Commentaries*. In Rosalie J. Slater. *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*. American Revolution Bicentennial ed. San Francisco, CA: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1980.

"The First Charter of Virginia." *The Avalon Project*, 10 April 1606, available from, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/va01.asp (accessed February 26, 2011).

Goh Keng Swee. "Speech by Dr Goh Keng Swee Minister of Defence at the Opening Ceremony & Dinner of the General Conference of the Methodist Church in Malaysia and Singapore." Speech, Singapore Conference Hall Restaurant, Singapore, 13 November 1972, *National Archives of Singapore*, available from

<http://stars.nhb.gov.sg/stars/public/viewPDF.jsp?pdfno=PressR19721113b.pdf>
(accessed February 11, 2011).

Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).

Fukuyama, Francis. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. First Free Press Paperback ed. New York: Free Press Paperback, 1996.

Hayek, Friedrich A. *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Kelo v. City of New London, 545 U.S. 469 (2005).

Kipling, Rudyard. "The Gods of the Copybook." *The Kipling Society*, 1919, available from http://www.kipling.org.uk/poems_copybook.htm (accessed April 4, 2011).

Kurth, James. "The Protestant Deformation and American Foreign Policy." 22 April 2001, available from <http://www.phillysoc.org/Kurth%20Speech.htm> (accessed February 6, 2011).

Landes, David S. *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some are So Rich and Some So Poor*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.

"Letters Patent to Sir Humfrey Gylberte." *The Avalon Project*, 11 June 1578, available from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/16th_century/humfrey.asp (accessed February 26, 2011).

Lieber, Francis. "Anglican and Gallican Liberty." In *New Individualist Review*, ed. Ralph Raico. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1981, available from http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=2136&chapter=195437&layout=html&Itemid=27 (accessed February 27, 2011).

- Madison, James. "On Property." 29 March 1792. *The Founders' Constitution*, available from <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch16s23.html> (accessed February 6, 2011).
- "Magna Carta." 1297, Translated by Nicholas Vincent. *National Archives and Records Administration*, 2007, available from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured_documents/magna_carta/translation.html (accessed February 20, 2011).
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: The Communist Manifesto and Other Writings*. Edited by Julian Borchardt. New York: Carlton House, 1932.
- Minogue, Kenneth. *Politics: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Montgomery, Zachariah. *Poison Drops in the Federal Senate: The School Question from a Parental and Non-Sectarian Stand-Point*. Washington, DC: Gibson Bros., Printers and Bookbinders, 1886.
- Rahe, Paul A. "The Constitution of Liberty within Christendom." *The Intercollegiate Review* 33, no. 1 (Fall 1997): 30-36.
- Raskin, Max. "Jonesin' for a Soda." *Ludwig von Mises Institute*, 5 September 2007, available from <http://mises.org/story/2678> (accessed February 27, 2011).
- Ratzinger, Joseph Alois. "Faith, Reason and the University: Memories and Reflections." *The Holy See*, 12 September 2006, available from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060912_university-regensburg_en.html (accessed February 6, 2011).

- Scruton, Roger. "Forgiveness and Irony." *City Journal* 19, no. 1 (2009), available from http://www.city-journal.org/2009/19_1_the-west.html (accessed February 27, 2011).
- Silving, Helen. "The Origins of the Magnae Cartae." *Harvard Journal on Legislation* 3, no. 117 (1965): 117-131.
- Slater, Rosalie J. *Teaching and Learning America's Christian History*. American Revolution Bicentennial ed. San Francisco, CA: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1980.
- Solzhenitsyn, Alexander. "A World Split Apart." 8 June 1978, available from <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/augustine/arch/solzhenitsyn/harvard1978.html> (accessed February 6, 2011).
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. *The Crisis of Our Age*. 2nd rev. ed. Oxford, England: Oneworld Publications Ltd, 1992.
- Twight, Charlotte A. *Dependent on D.C.: The Rise of Federal Control over the Lives of Ordinary Americans*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).
- Watanbe, Teresa. "Enlisting Science to Find the Fingerprints of a Creator." *Los Angeles Times*, 25 March 2001, available from <http://articles.latimes.com/2001/mar/25/news/mn-42548> (accessed April 3, 2011).
- Weigel, George. *Against the Grain: Christianity and Democracy, War and Peace*. New York: Crossroad Book, 2008.

Zhao Xiao. "Extended Interview: Zhao Xiao." Interview by Evan Osnos, n.d., *Public Broadcasting Service*, n.d., available from http://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/china_705/interview/xiao.html (accessed February 11, 2011).