

Beyond Government: The Future of Christian Virtue

By Christopher Manion

I'm delighted, as always, to be back at The Heritage Foundation. As most of you know, I have a special devotion to the Third Generation, and have always felt that I was a part of it. I well remember packing my station wagon the day after Ronald Reagan won in 1980 and heading to Washington—so I got here about the same time that the first members of the Third Generation did. And I think my father qualifies as a First Generation member, since he was the first man (and a Democrat at that!) to support Barry Goldwater for President, way back in the fifties. In fact, he published *The Conscience of a Conservative* when no one else would. We corrected the galleys right on our dining room table during my spring vacation from high school.

In those days, my father and other conservatives of the First Generation were very concerned about the liberalism that was rampant in the land—politically and economically—under Lyndon Johnson and the Great Welfare State Society. Today we can see the sad results of that political heyday, with Washington sunk lower than any time in memory, and the woeful economic consequences: Because of federal spending, today the dollar is worth about 25 percent of what it was in those days. Members of the Third Generation might find it hard to believe, but back then the average middle class family could live quite well on a single income.

Conservative concerns back then were political and economic, sure, but moral degeneracy caused by the liberal agenda was already visible on the horizon. The sixties were the liberal's dream—they celebrated sex, drugs, and rock and roll—but their dream has become our nightmare. Just observe what the liberal lies of the sixties have bequeathed to our own time: Free sex has given us both a deadly national epidemic and the elevation of perversion to the level of principle; free drugs (then) have given us a disastrous criminal class which is now in its own "third generation"—and which has just shown once more the impact of its misguided muscle on the streets of Los Angeles. And, of course, when Marlin Fitzwater correctly calls this disaster the direct result of liberal failures, the liberal chorus intones T. S. Eliot's Prufrock: "That's not it at all, that's not what I meant, at all."

Country Music Truths. Rock and roll is more elusive as an issue, but as one who is a rock and roller, not a Holy Roller, I have this observation: American country music, which has been enjoyed consistent popularity for eighty years and more in this country, deals in truth about real human situations. If you cheat on your spouse, it's wrong and you suffer; if you hang out in bars, you're gonna get in trouble; and if you're a drunk, you'll go to jail.

Rock and roll, on the other hand, celebrated the excesses of the passions of the sixties, every political, sexual, and hallucinogenic cause. Note also that rock and roll was made to order for the scenario where the parents, who can't take it any longer, stalk up to Johnny's bedroom and slam the door, shouting, "Why do you have to play that stuff so loud?"

Country music, on the other hand, is usually intergenerational; it is often played by families—the Carter family, the Cash family, the Judds, the Whites. The themes are often spiritual—so much so, in fact, that gospel constitutes an entire genre of country music. So I consider country

Christopher Manion is Assistant Professor in the Departments of Religion and International Relations at Boston University.

He spoke at The Heritage Foundation on May 13, 1992, at a meeting of the Third Generation.

ISSN 0272-1155. ©1992 by The Heritage Foundation.

music to be primarily pro-family. Every bluegrass festival I go to features families singing and playing together. I've never seen that at a rock concert.

Well, these were the concerns of the First Generation, back in the fifties and the sixties; the Second Generation went to work with the remnants of the Goldwater platform and coalition and built the Reagan team; and the Third Generation, including most of you—most of us—arrived here after 1980.

Tonight I want to address specifically our shared experiences of the past twelve years—because I think, in that time, the Third Generation has grown up. I think it's time now to reflect on those years with a view toward what we might offer the next generation—for indeed there will be a Fourth Generation, whether or not a conservative administration ever makes an appearance here in Washington.

For that reason, bearing in mind the possibility that the Fourth Generation might spend its whole life on the outside of politics, I want to address tonight not the realm of the political, or, more properly, the governmental, but the realm of the rest of our lives—what some (most of them politicians) refer to as “the private sector.” I choose to call this the free sector, as opposed to the government sector, because I think this distinction is much more helpful when addressing the problems I want to focus on tonight.

This free sector, however, includes much more than the private sector that we all know so well. Much of what we today consider the public sector concerns our neighborhoods, our schools, our work place—but should not concern the government. Yet the government has, over the years, come to occupy much of the territory and the activity that was once performed by free, non-governmental institutions that were nonetheless public in the best sense of the word. After all, public should not be synonymous with government.

Clearly, the government has taken much of the ground in this formerly free sector, and one of my arguments tonight is simple: We should take back this public ground from the government and make it free again.

Christian Model. In addressing this point tonight, you will hear me speaking specifically of the plight of the Christian in politics. Don't let that mislead you: This reflection is not only for Christians; rather, this is an analysis, not a homily, and anyone whose religious principles propel them to political activity will find that it addresses their experience as well as mine. And I aim to use a framework that is equally intelligible to the believer and the doubter. I choose to investigate the Christian model because it has been the most interesting dimension of politics since 1980, and because it has been the focus of my analytical work as well as of my personal experience.

In that spirit, then, permit me a brief reflection on the past twelve years. Since the end of the Reagan Administration, many Christians who had become active in the “New Right” have been pondering anew the relationship between religion and politics that had emerged since 1980. Many of those who had formed the “Christian right” during that decade became disillusioned, some more quickly than others; most noticeably, several groups, which had been formed to manifest the Christian political presence in national politics, actually dissolved. But many individuals had their heartaches, too.

During the 1980s many of these individuals had invested their political activities with a great deal of faith, energy, and enthusiasm. The disillusionment they have now experienced merits at least a brief analysis, which asks two questions: First, what went wrong? And second, what is to be done?

The religious right's political program prevailing in the 1980s encouraged Christians to capture political power and to persuade politicians to follow Christian principles by adopting specific programs or legislation. But politics in those days was a liberal game (in fact, it still is). In order to qualify, we had to play by the liberal rules: we had to find secular goals, secular means, and secular language with which to articulate these programs. If our proposals reflected a Christian character, either in substance or in language, they were called offensive, unwelcome, and, all too often, illegal. If we look at the elements of this experience with an analytical eye, we can find a good deal of the explanation for the failure of so much of our high hopes. Let's look at some of those experiences.

Throughout the Reagan years, many Christians properly resisted a politicization of their beliefs, especially when they realized they were conceding something by adopting secular logic and language in the process. That is, many people who had in the past had little faith in politics had a healthy skepticism about changing their minds just because of an election. As the 1980s went on, in fact, an increasing sense of discomfort emerged among Christians who had supported political programs aiming at all sorts of social goals; the trouble was, all of these goals had to be dressed up in secular labels. A few of these programs were praiseworthy—I have in mind the adolescent chastity programs adopted in HHS run by Nabers Cabaniss and then Wrenn Archer—but these programs were accepted begrudgingly by the government sector and have to compete in an almost asphyxiating atmosphere of condom distribution programs and the celebration of “alternative sexual lifestyles” which almost defeats their purpose.

Frustration with Government. An interesting aspect of this uneasiness might be explained in terms of two concepts which reflect the Christian's approach to politics. Anyone coming from a Christian natural law tradition would be much more comfortable appealing to language that Christians and others had in common; and those Christians whose sense of history recognized the importance, even the necessity of politics, and the impossibility of gathering the City of God and protecting it in some political way from the City of Man, would have an easier time accepting roles in programs where the results might have been less than perfect. But many Christians came from traditions where results, like salvation, were expected to be achieved almost instantly; thus, frustration set in much more quickly among them. I have noticed, however, that many from the first category found themselves slowly drifting over into the second, even though their traditions spoke loudly of the dangers of such an approach. Thus, Christians of all stripes are now burdened by frustration with the gridlock in government.

What about those folks we supported in getting high government positions, bearing in mind that “personnel is policy”? Well, sometimes it seemed that the more Christians “succeeded” in getting various positions in government, the less Christian the result seemed to be. It wasn't just a co-opting of good men and women, although there was undoubtedly some of that; it was the nature of the political experience itself. Many Christians felt muzzled in their new political positions because they thought they had actually to repress their Christian vocabulary and logic and replace it with one that could be understood and accepted in the secular sphere. I do not refer here to the need to express realities in philosophical terms, perhaps those of the natural law, instead of terms of religious belief. It goes a lot further: it refers to the fact that one could not say anything that offended the secular sphere either. And the adoption of this guideline in practice made the Christian government leader or employee indistinguishable, except for some “personal convictions,” from any other. This is the tough problem I want to focus on tonight, elusive as it might appear.

Now this imposed silence under which the Christian must operate in government—you might call it the spiritual gag rule—leads to another consequence: Programs conducted by government at any level—federal, state, or local—have been so affected by the mythical wall of separation

between Church and State that no Christian, working anywhere in government, can perform his duty with Christian love in an open fashion without (at least technically) breaking the law. That is to say, all government welfare or education or health programs, for instance, have been hermetically sealed from the Christian virtues of those charged with carrying them out. The results are as unavoidable in fact as they are in logic. And they are disastrous.

How does this happen? Well, it's simple—at least to those of the ACLU (often referred to as the "Anti-Christian Liberal Union"): Like faith and hope, Christians understand charity to be a theological virtue. A Christian, of course, is motivated by this charity (a word taken from the Latin *caritas*, meaning love—the love of Christ). Well, the Christian is motivated by this love when he serves his fellow man, in all sorts of ways that we today label as charitable.

The liberal community, of course, takes note of the existence of these virtues, just as the founders of our republic did. However, the founders took note of them in order to assure the voters of the state of New York (in the *Federalist Papers*, especially numbers 49 through 55 or so) that our government would be limited, and they took for granted the fact that the source of American virtue was outside the government (as de Tocqueville observed, it is in our churches). The founders also observed that governmental power, if anything, would continually tempt the politician to abandon these virtues—something which goes down very badly with contemporary politicians.

As an aside, this is why Mother Theresa, for instance, insists that her Sisters of Charity are not "social workers": far from it! She knows the difference between a bureaucrat making a living and a Sister of Charity giving her life for Christ.

Charity Freely Given and Received. But there is more to it even than that. Consider the individual acts of charity which make up our daily lives. In the Christian view of charity, both the donor and the recipient must act freely: The donor, recognizing his duty to God as witnessed by countless accounts throughout both the Old and the New Testaments, gives freely, of his own accord; the recipient, with equal charity, accepts his plight, thanks God for this brother who has shared with him, and thanks the donor as well, even as the donor gives thanks to the recipient and to God for giving him the opportunity to be needed, to be helpful.

Note that there is no hostility, no "class struggle," to divide the giver of charity and the recipient. Christian charity unites them. The recipient, knowing that he has no right to charity (for charity is different from justice), knows too that he must avoid the sins of envy and resentment—which are just as dangerous as the greed we hear so much about today—and instead be thankful for God's blessings. Thus to the Christian the poor offer a constant invitation to exercise charity, one person at a time, in a spirit of freedom common to the donor and to the recipient.

(By the way, there is a tangent here: Christians don't abort babies, even if they are retarded, physically handicapped, or if they are going to grow up poor or unwanted, because we recognize our solidarity with them in Christ and their creation in the image of God. Imagine a world where everybody had everything he needed. Who would need the love of Christ, as expressed in charity? For that matter, who would think they needed redemption? We should count our blessings; but remember, even in such a world, the liberal would find some reason for expanding government programs.)

Now contrast this Christian view of charity exercised in freedom with government programs that claim to have the same nominal goals. In the case of programs for the needy—of any stripe—we are confronted with the liberal notion of entitlement: Thus the recipient has a right that he can assert, free of any gratitude (and thus free of a spirit of charity), and the taxpayer is deprived of the opportunity to give freely of his own earned income in a spirit of charity—at least insofar as government programs are concerned. Instead, the taxpayer must give under the threat of force. How "good" would the Samaritan have been if he'd been forced by Roman soldiers to fish that