



INDIVISIBLE

Social and Economic Foundations of American Liberty

Leading Conservatives
Exchange Policy Perspectives

INDIVISIBLE

Social and Economic Foundations of American Liberty

Leading Conservatives
Exchange Policy Perspectives

INTRODUCTION BY JAY W. RICHARDS

CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
Jennifer A. Marshall and J.D. Foster, Ph.D.	
INTRODUCTION	5
Jay W. Richards, Ph.D.	
CIVIL SOCIETY	12
MORAL ARGUMENTS FOR LIMITING GOVERNMENT	
Joseph G. Lehman	
RULE OF LAW	17
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY REQUIRES THE RULE OF LAW	
J. Kenneth Blackwell	
LIFE	21
THE CAUSE OF LIFE CAN'T BE SEVERED FROM THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM	
Representative Paul Ryan	
FREE EXCHANGE	25
MORALITY AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM	
Jim Daly with Glenn T. Stanton	
MARRIAGE	31
THE LIMITED-GOVERNMENT CASE FOR MARRIAGE	
Jennifer Roback Morse, Ph.D.	
PROFIT	37
PROPHETS AND PROFIT	
Marvin Olasky, Ph.D.	
FAMILY	42
WASHINGTON'S WAR ON THE FAMILY AND FREE ENTERPRISE	
Stephen Moore	
WAGES	47
THE VALUE OF WAGES	
Bishop Harry R. Jackson, Jr.	
RELIGION	52
WHY FAITH IS A GOOD INVESTMENT	
Arthur Brooks, Ph.D., and Robin Currie	
INTERNATIONAL TRADE	56
WHY TRADE WORKS FOR FAMILY, COMMUNITY, AND SOVEREIGNTY	
Ramesh Ponnuru	
CULTURE	60
A CULTURE OF RESPONSIBILITY	
Edwin J. Feulner, Ph.D.	

PROPERTY	66
PROPERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS	
Representative Michele Bachmann	
ENVIRONMENT	70
CONSERVING CREATION	
Tony Perkins	
EDUCATION	77
A UNIFIED VISION FOR EDUCATION CHOICE	
Randy Hicks	
CONTRIBUTOR BIOGRAPHIES	82

CIVIL SOCIETY

Moral Arguments for Limiting Government

BY JOSEPH G. LEHMAN



Joseph G. Lehman

MORAL IMPERATIVES USUALLY TRUMP ECONOMIC arguments. The charitable impulse to help the needy arises from a moral imperative. Those two facts help explain why it's extremely difficult to fix, scale back, or replace government social programs even when they are indisputably inefficient, unaffordable, or even downright harmful to those they are intended to help. This endlessly frustrates fiscal conservatives who want to solve these budget-busting problems. But, unlike their social conservative brethren, fiscal conservatives are more accustomed to making economic arguments than moral arguments. Instead, we should be making the moral case for downsizing the welfare state and letting civil society have some room to breathe. Welfare is not just a fiscal issue. It is a decidedly moral one as well.

Fiscal and social conservatives alike generally agree on three broad goals for programs intended to help people beset by poverty, addiction, homelessness, and other special hardships. Those goals are to improve the programs' success rates, reduce their cost, and make their recipients less dependent on government. Let's look at the moral case for such reforms.

MOVEMENT FROM PERSONAL OUTREACH TO GOVERNMENT SERVICES

To get some perspective, we first have to look at the history of aid in America. The contemporary term "social services" helps tell the story because the term was not used in the Colonial and Founding eras. In those days, the closest analogue would have been "charity." Virtually all charity was funded and administered privately, apart from government.⁹ It was typical for charities to operate with explicit religious motivations and goals. Religious and non-religious charities tended to extend aid coupled with close monitoring, accountability, and relationships between recipients and givers. Providing charity was a virtuous act that could be individual or corporate. Helping the needy *per se* was not considered a public service of

*Welfare is not just a fiscal issue.
It is a decidedly moral one as well.*

9 Alexis de Tocqueville was one of the most insightful observers of this phenomenon. See de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Henry Reeve (Cambridge, Mass.: Welch, Bigelow, and Company, 1835), pp. 129–130.

government, but rather the job of voluntary institutions in what we would now call “civil society.”¹⁰

Two things occurred in the evolution from “charity” to “social services.” First, the nature of some charities changed in response to ideological and societal trends in the second half of the 1800s. Charities arose that dispensed aid while de-emphasizing spiritual matters and religious motivations. Many made few demands of recipients or required little follow-up with them.¹¹ Recipients naturally gravitated to charities that offered the most aid with the least strings attached. This paved the way for the second change.

Government’s involvement in aid programs was legitimized, in part, by the trend to separate material aid from spiritual aid and accountability. Government had to remain officially non-sectarian. Government grew to assume more and more of what had once been the near-exclusive province of churches, families, and religious and non-religious aid societies. Aid became part of the public policy and political agendas, and eventually became divorced from the private moral and religious contexts that had nurtured it.

But this didn’t happen immediately. By 1919, the term “social service” had begun to take hold¹² as a non-religious umbrella term covering different kinds of private charity as well as government’s growing role. Still, the term didn’t so much redefine “charity” as re-contextualize it. Charity was still private, but it was now merely one way to help needy people. Government added “social services” to its growing list of functions. This didn’t necessarily expand society’s capacity for charitable work, however, since private charities began to understand their role, at least in part, by what the government was not doing.

COUNTERPRODUCTIVE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Government social programs multiplied and spending grew dramatically with great popular and political support, particularly in the 1930s and 1960s. The new aid philosophy, dominated by government, tended to crowd out charities that connected aid to spiritual matters, accountability, and personal relationships.

But persistent poverty and a growing underclass invited skepticism. In his 1984 book *Losing Ground*, Charles Murray persuasively demonstrated the perverse incentives of government welfare programs. They hurt many people who needed

10 Marvin Olasky contributed enormously to contemporary understanding of historical changes in American charity in his book *The Tragedy of American Compassion* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway Publishing, 1992).

11 Olasky’s *Tragedy of American Compassion* resurrected the provocative term “promiscuous charity” to describe this kind of assistance. The term had been used as early as 1849. See James Hill Burton, *Political and Social Economy* (Edinburgh: W. and R. Chambers, 1849), p. 326.

12 W. N. Hutchins, “The Psychological Approach to Social Service,” *Religious Education: The Journal of the Religious Education Association* Vol. 14, Issue 6 (1919), pp. 365–368.

help the most.¹³ Marvin Olasky, in 1992, chronicled two centuries of poverty fighting in his book *The Tragedy of American Compassion*. He concluded that government programs could not match the success of private programs that employ spiritual and relational components.¹⁴ In 1995, Robert Rector and William Lauber estimated the cumulative cost of the three-decade “War on Poverty” at \$5.4 trillion,¹⁵ which was more than the U.S. spent fighting World War II.

In 1996, Congress and President Clinton seemed to respond to Murray’s (and others’) findings by placing work requirements and time limits on welfare recipients.¹⁶ This victory was a step in the right direction, but only a step.

The positive shift in welfare policy showed the power of moral arguments. We can further harness moral arguments to shift welfare policy even closer to the ideal where private charity, greatly expanded, reduces poverty so much that little justification remains for government social programs.

It’s a tall order, but not an unknown ideal. As Olasky documented, it’s an ideal to which we were once much closer. To move toward it, conservatives must consider moral arguments anew.

This means fiscal conservatives, especially, must embrace the legitimacy of moral arguments and use them. Moral arguments, not merely economic ones, have produced the major changes in social service policies. The moral argument for welfare reform does not focus so much on how much is spent, how much is saved, or how efficient a policy is. Rather, it seeks to answer this question: What policy will, in the long run, best help those in need?

HOW BEST TO HELP THOSE IN NEED

When people believed more money was the key to helping people more, the policy they supported was to involve government and its vast funding apparatus. Decades later, when Murray and others showed that the resulting programs were harming those they were supposed to help, the programs were modified by adding some of what Murray said was missing. Economic arguments were made for all these changes, but those only augmented the moral imperative of how best to help needy people.

The lesson is that moral arguments ultimately matter more than economic

13 Charles Murray, *Losing Ground*, 2nd edition (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

14 Olasky, *The Tragedy of American Compassion*.

15 Robert Rector and William F. Lauber, *America’s Failed \$5.4 Trillion War on Poverty* (Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation, 1995). New calculations in the fall of 2009 by Robert Rector put the total at \$15.9 trillion on means-tested welfare since the beginning of the War on Poverty (in inflation-adjusted 2008 dollars). See “Obama to Spend \$10.3 Trillion on Welfare: Uncovering the Full Cost of Means-Tested Welfare or Aid to the Poor,” The Heritage Foundation, September 2009.

16 See U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, HHS Fact Sheet, “The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996,” at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/new/prwora.htm> (accessed August 13, 2009).

ones, at least in public policy debates. Durable policy changes don't appear out of nowhere. Most of the time they arise from political changes that, in turn, flow from social movements. Social movements in America have been driven mainly by moral ideas framed in terms of how to help people, not merely by cold logic, hard economic data, and the bottom line. It was principally moral convictions and arguments that drove the social movements behind abolition, civil rights, women's suffrage, prohibition, labor unions, and environmental activism. These social movements all produced major changes in public policy.

What policy will, in the long run, best help those in need?

The contemporary political Left may be more successful at framing its policy goals in terms of how to help people, but the political Right has its own successes to build on. School choice probably would not have progressed in the last two decades without compelling moral arguments for permitting parents to choose the safest and best schools for their children. Economic analyses were necessary, but they would not have been sufficient.

GOVERNMENT'S PROPER DOMAIN

Another moral issue concerns the nature of government itself and the morality of using government to accomplish certain ends, such as reducing poverty. The sanctioned use of force is what distinguishes government from all other institutions. For some functions, force, whether direct or indirect, may be necessary, even morally imperative. But the issue is complicated in liberal democracies where the use of force is rarely overt. As a result, it's easy to opt for the coercive power of the state without quite realizing it. Whether or not we intend it, however, every tax, expenditure, regulation, police action, and mandate is ultimately backed by the legal use of force. When people do not comply, they are either forced to comply or met with the threat of force. And the use of force always has moral implications.

Charity is an exercise of private virtue. And virtue requires freedom.

Different societies extend aid to needy people in different ways. The driving force behind aid in a society can locate that society on a spectrum that runs between two poles, compulsion and voluntarism. Near the compulsion pole lie societies in which the state compels citizens to help others through taxes and other means. Near the voluntary pole lie societies characterized by citizens who help one another without being forced.

Societies near the compulsion pole require expansive governments powerful enough to force people to do what they might otherwise not do. Societies near the voluntary pole have more limited governments. Put another way, in some societies the government constrains its people. In others, the people constrain their government.

All governments employ force, but at one end of the spectrum the force primarily restrains people from unjustly harming others. At the other end, the

force routinely compels people to do what might be virtuous if it were voluntary. Somewhere along the spectrum, a government ceases to be limited.

The distinction is not merely academic. It has practical consequences. As we've seen in the case of welfare, for instance, when certain forms of "help" are taken over by government, they become less helpful. They can even become harmful. The problem is rooted in using the state to deliver charity in the first place. Charity is an exercise of private virtue. And virtue requires freedom.

Therefore it's impossible to force someone to be charitable.

If something can be accomplished voluntarily rather than coercively, surely we ought to prefer voluntarism. And with regard to "social services," we have every reason to argue that these not only can be performed, but performed *better* by voluntary charities. The moral burden of proof should lie squarely on those who seek to replace voluntarism with redistributive coercion.

Of course, moral arguments are grounded in some moral vision, some notion of ultimate truth; but not everyone agrees on the source of ultimate truth. Some do not believe in God and others conceive of God differently. One brief essay is not the place to settle ultimate questions, but perhaps we can affirm principles upon which all can stand.

Social movements draw their power from moral conviction. Fiscal conservatives must not leave it to social conservatives alone to advance moral arguments. Those who sought abolition and civil rights for political or economic reasons were successful because they worked in league with those who advocated those goals on moral and often explicitly religious grounds.

Effecting durable change in public policy by means of economic analysis alone is like bringing a knife to a gun fight. Uniting with a new focus on moral suasion and a better articulation of the moral implications of government force is what will win the day.

Joseph G. Lehman is president of the Mackinac Center for Public Policy.

Contributor Biographies

MICHELE BACHMANN represents the 6th District of Minnesota in the U.S. House of Representatives. She serves on the Financial Services Committee and has been a leading advocate for bipartisan earmark reform and tax relief as well as a staunch opponent of wasteful government spending.

J. KENNETH BLACKWELL is a senior fellow for family empowerment at the Family Research Council and a senior fellow at the American Civil Rights Union. He is a former Secretary of State for Ohio. He serves on the board of directors of the Club for Growth and the National Taxpayers Union and is a columnist for *The New York Sun*. Blackwell is the co-author (with Jerome Corsi) of *Rebuilding America: A Prescription for Creating Strong Families, Building the Wealth of Working People, and Ending Welfare*.

ARTHUR BROOKS, PH.D., is president of the American Enterprise Institute. His writings explore the interrelationships between culture, politics, and economic life and include three books: *Who Really Cares?* (an analysis of charitable giving in America); *Social Entrepreneurship: A Modern Approach to Social Value Creation*; and *Gross National Happiness: Why Happiness Matters for America—and How We Can Get More of It*.

ROBIN CURRIE is a senior writer and editor at the American Enterprise Institute. He is a former editor at Time Life Books, where he worked for 11 years. Among his books there were *What Life Was Like Amid Splendor and Intrigue: Byzantine Empire A.D. 330–1453* and *The American Story: War Between Brothers*. He is the author of the forthcoming National Geographic book *The Letter and the Scroll: What Archaeology Tells Us About the Bible*.

JIM DALY is president and CEO of Focus on the Family, where he has served in various capacities for 20 years. His first book, *Finding Home: An Imperfect Path to Faith and Family*, tracks his pathway to success from a disadvantaged childhood and the loss of his parents. Daly's second book, *Stronger* (forthcoming), explores ways in which family tragedy can hold new direction and purpose in life.

EDWIN J. FEULNER, PH.D., is president and a founding trustee of The Heritage Foundation. He is former president and current treasurer of the Mont Pelerin Society and has served as a trustee and chairman of the board of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute. In 1989, he was awarded the Presidential Citizens Medal by President Reagan as "a leader of the conservative movement." Feulner has authored seven books, including *Getting America Right*, *Leadership for America*, *Intellectual Pilgrims*, and *The March of Freedom*.

J.D. FOSTER, PH.D., is the Norman B. Ture senior fellow in the economics of fiscal policy at The Heritage Foundation, specializing in long-term reform in tax policy and entitlements. Previously, Foster served as associate director for economic policy at the White House Office of Management and Budget and senior advisor in economics at the Treasury Department's Office of Tax Policy.

RANDY HICKS is president of Georgia Family Council, a nonprofit organization whose mission is to foster the conditions in which individuals, families, and communities thrive. He also serves on the Georgia Supreme Court's Commission on Children, Marriage, and Family Law. He has led Georgia Family Council since 1997, working to alleviate the suffering caused by family breakdown and promoting family- and community-based collaboration while seeking to raise awareness of the connection between human flourishing, culture, and public policy.

HARRY R. JACKSON, JR., serves as senior pastor of Hope Christian Church in the Washington, D.C., area and is founder and chairman of the High Impact Leadership Coalition. Jackson's daily radio commentary, *The Truth in Black and White*, reaches audiences of more than 400 stations, and he is a frequent guest commentator in a variety of print and aired media. His books include: *The Truth in Black and White*; *High Impact African-American Churches* (with George Barna); *Personal Faith, Public Policy* (with Tony Perkins); and *In-Laws, Outlaws, and the Functional Family*.

JOSEPH G. LEHMAN is president of the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, a Michigan-based research and educational institute, and serves as the director of the Chicago-based Sam Adams Alliance, which promotes the use of new-media vehicles to advance economic freedom and individual liberty. Lehman has written extensively on free-market principles and policies.

JENNIFER A. MARSHALL is director of domestic policy studies and the Richard and Helen DeVos Center for Religion and Civil Society at The Heritage Foundation. Previously, she worked on cultural policy issues at Empower America and served as director of family studies at the Family Research Council. Marshall is the author of *Now and Not Yet: Making Sense of Single Life in the Twenty-First Century*.

STEPHEN MOORE is senior economics writer for the editorial board of *The Wall Street Journal*. Prior to joining the *Journal*, Moore served as founder and president of the Free Enterprise Fund, a free-market nonprofit advocacy group. He is the author of five books, including *It's Getting Better All the Time: The 100 Greatest Trends of the Last Century*; *Bullish on Bush: How the Ownership Society Will Make America Stronger*; and *The End of Prosperity: How Higher Taxes Will Doom the Economy—If We Let It Happen* (co-authored with Arthur Laffer and Peter Tanous).

JENNIFER ROBACK MORSE, PH.D., is founder and president of the Ruth Institute, a project of the National Organization for Marriage that promotes marriage as a bond of love between “one man and one woman for life.” She has been a research fellow at the Acton Institute since its founding in 1990. Morse is the author of three books, including *Smart Sex: Finding Life-Long Love in a Hook-Up World* and *Love and Economics: It Takes a Family to Raise a Village*.

MARVIN OLASKY, PH.D., is provost of The King’s College in New York, editor-in-chief of the national news magazine *WORLD*, and a senior fellow at the Acton Institute. Olasky previously served as professor of journalism at the University of Texas at Austin. He has published more than 2,000 magazine and newspaper articles and has written 20 books, including *The Tragedy of American Compassion*, *The American Leadership Tradition*, and *The Religions Next Door*.

TONY PERKINS is president of Family Research Council. He previously served in the Louisiana legislature for eight years. Perkins hosts a regular national radio program, *Washington Watch Weekly*, with commentaries broadcast on 300 stations. He appears frequently on national broadcast and cable news programs and issues daily pro-family e-mail updates to tens of thousands of grassroots activists. In 2008, he co-authored (with Bishop Harry R. Jackson, Jr.) *Personal Faith, Public Policy*.

RAMESH PONNURU is a senior editor of *National Review* and a columnist for *Time*. He has published numerous articles in national newspapers and policy magazines and appears frequently on major news commentary television programs. He is the author of *The Party of Death: The Democrats, the Media, the Courts, and the Disregard for Human Life*.

JAY W. RICHARDS, PH.D., is a visiting fellow in The Heritage Foundation’s Richard and Helen DeVos Center for Religion and Civil Society. He has written four books, including *The Privileged Planet* (co-authored with astronomer Guillermo Gonzalez), and, most recently, *Money, Greed, and God: Why Capitalism is the Solution and Not the Problem*. Richards is also the executive producer of two documentaries from the Acton Institute: *The Call of the Entrepreneur* and *The Birth of Freedom*.

PAUL RYAN represents the 1st District of Wisconsin in the U.S. House of Representatives and is currently serving his sixth term. He is the ranking member of the House Budget Committee and a senior member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

GLENN T. STANTON serves as director of global family formation studies at Focus on the Family and directs a research project on international family formation trends at the Institute of Marriage and Family in Ottawa. Stanton has authored three books: *Why Marriage Matters: Reasons to Believe in Marriage in Postmodern Society*, *My Crazy, Imperfect Christian Family*; and *Marriage on Trial: The Case Against Same-Sex Marriage and Parenting*.



214 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

heritage.org