

## Liberal Democracy: A Euphemism for Anarchism in Today's America?

Ntanda NN\*

University of Kinshasa, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo

\*Corresponding author: Ntanda NN, University of Kinshasa, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Tel: +243 993 855 252; E-mail: [nkingi2002@yahoo.fr](mailto:nkingi2002@yahoo.fr)

Received date: March 01, 2017, Accepted date: April 12, 2017, Published date: April 17, 2017

Copyright: © 2017 Ntanda NN. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### Short Communication

As I sojourn in America in this autumn season of 2015 through that of winter 2016, I can't help but feel very concerned about the future of this land I so much love. My fear and frustrations are grounded in what appears to be a real trend in this country today, which is founded on what I would identify as "extreme liberalism" whereby the enjoyment of happiness by some few is becoming a serious threat to the happiness of the many. In the name of liberty America is progressively but surely drifting from a sane, free and responsible society into one that is putting the whole future of the land of the free into a land of the insane, the irresponsible and the lazy. All this drifting stems from the way children, our future, are being brought up in their respective communities, churches and schools. Communities that are allowing their kids to disrespect, insult, and beat up their parents and teachers while crucifying anyone who dares to stand in their way. It's simply a shame, disgusting, and quite revolting to witness such decadence in the most powerful country in the world.

Today in America, it's common to hear responsible adults in positions of authority as parents, teachers, policemen and women, government officials; suggest that teens must not be blamed for their stupid and irresponsible behaviors, however appalling and dangerous they might be; and that it's rather the adult population that needs to understand and adjust to them. That punishment, of any kind, is not allowed and is definitely not the way to go about disciplining our kids, because everything must be resolved through dialogue, discussion, and understanding with teens involved in irrational, rude, impolite, unruly and antisocial behaviors. This skewed approach to bringing up American kids is outright wrong and pretty scary for a country whose ascendance has evolved from disciplined, God fearing, organized and hardworking ways of living. This gives the impression as though everybody has given up on showing to our children that any successful life requires a great deal of discipline, respect for one another, hardworking, fearing and believing in God, living a life that should be seen as descent in any context.

This sad American social reality of today, which is clearly produced by the disciplinary "laissez-faire" attitude of the adults vis-à-vis the youth, is at the heart of the violence that is killing these very kids in endless bloodbaths every day; and one that is making this wonderful country to be identified, from every corner in our planet, as the most violent country in the whole world, with the most unruly children. The line between liberty and libertinage is continuously becoming blur and the words ethics and discipline more and more a taboo. Virtually, it's a non-state situation tantamount to a state of nature in which people generally satisfy their immoral impulses and often act as they please instead of as they ought. Where is America going with this awful social environment? Is this the legacy of the founding-fathers when it comes to the interpretation and enjoyment of liberty? Isn't this outright Anarchism that this country has so much fought against and avoided for so long and which is now being unconsciously entertained?

All things considered, this paper is about looking into different ideas on reshaping societies when necessary. So, my take on this issue is just an approach and proposition amongst many out there; one that may, for that matter, differ from what might be expected by some of you, the readers. It's in this context that this article is also an invitation to wisely and courageously acknowledge what is going wrong with the American youth today and find a way to fix it. The aim is about coming up with a suggestion or suggestions on how to redefine the relationships between individual rights and the State. In that context, this article is just a mere exploration of alternatives to what I consider to be failing America as a State.

That's why the fundamental contention in this paper will consist in acknowledging and postulating that this negative trend must be urgently stopped if America is to remain at the top of the world tomorrow; in terms of leadership, wealth, democracy, mannerism, and overall well-being. Clear conservative clues with respect to faith, social relations, discipline, hard work for the creation and retention of wealth, and overall descent human behaviors must be reconsidered, re-examined, and re-infused in the American social psyche today, in order to prepare and guarantee a better future to all American youth, irrespective of their credo, color, and class.

### Introduction

The drop that led to the spillover from the glass, as far as I am concerned, can be traced to a Monday, October 26th, 2015 in a classroom at Spring Valley High School in Columbia, South Carolina; where Officer Ben Fields, a Richland County sheriff's deputy, was seen on a footage world widely circulated, talking to and later manhandling an unruly and rude black female student from her seat. The officer had been summoned by the school because the student had refused to stop using her cell phone while the class was going on, and had been warned by her teacher and by a school administrator for interfering with the normal learning ambiance in that classroom. With the exception of the students from this very high school who had organized a march to protest the firing of the officer and reclaim his reinstatement in his job from which he was dismissed only two days after the event; all the local authorities, including the leaders in Richland County, the mayor of Columbia and the governor of South Carolina; had come out to demonize and accuse the officer of having acted in an unprofessional manner. Not only that but the Legal Defense Fund of the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, was planning to file a lawsuit against the school and the officer for violating the civil rights of the undisciplined and impolite student. Isn't this "le monde à l'envers?" as the French saying goes? That is, Isn't this the world upside down?

While it would be very naïve and truly an illusion for any responsible mind living in America today to deny the existence of widespread institutional racism within the police and in America in

general, and even more so in the South; this still remains a déjà vu kind of a case that clearly illustrates what I am referring to as an American youth going berserk versus an American adult population giving up on its future. Instead of focusing on the “why” of the alleged aggression being displayed by the American law enforcement officers during the endless arrests of the unruly and the drifters in this land of the plenty; the American society is constantly putting its blame in the wrong place. The focus in America is constantly on the effects of many troubling situations like the one being referred to than on their causes. Of course, with such an approach, it will always be difficult to identify what is wrong and correct it.

But as one observes this society more strictly and genuinely; as I tried to do, it doesn't take long to realize that the key reason for this collective “unconscious” deviation can be found in what I consider to be a twisted interpretation and enjoyment of individual rights in America today. One that is supported by a liberal and libertarian democratic mindset that is failing to protect the individual's present and future by allowing him to do as he pleases in the name of liberty. One that is, unconsciously or not, reinforcing anarchist fundamentals as it encourages citizens to ignore one another and the State; take the law in their hands and do as they please. In other words, one that, in fact, is tacitly inviting the people to govern themselves in disregard of the appointed and the elected authorities. This can only be a recipe for a weak, irresponsible, poor, unruly and doomed America of tomorrow. An America that will lose its grip on inventiveness, development, good values, the creation and retention of wealth; and which will end up betraying the legacy and fantastic heritage from the founding-fathers of the most powerful country in the face of the earth. An America that can only be saved from such anarchist trends by bringing back and in force many of the values and virtues constantly an unfairly labeled as conservative, as though there is nothing positive with Conservatism today in America [1-5].

## On Anarchism

Here is a word whose mere sound or pronouncement would, rightly so most of the time, make most people feel uncomfortable, scared, confused and edgy. This is precisely so when one knows that etymologically, Anarchism stems from the word Anarchy which entails disorder, chaos, lawlessness, rebellion, and all that is negative and undermining for the stability and wellbeing of society as we have come to know it. Also, as one digs deep into the literature on this ideology of Anarchism, its fundamental proposition is that, we the people living in society would be better off if we were to live without a State or its authority. Because for anarchists, any State necessarily violates people's moral rights and that's why any State becomes intrinsically immoral. This explains why questioning the existence of a State is central to the anarchist discourse. For according to anarchists, the State is based on ‘fundamental coercive power’, which is the power that does not rest

upon any consent of the people to whom it is applied; and that unfortunately this is the only arena of the only legitimate power of state or regal activity<sup>1</sup>.

According to Murray Bookchin, an eco-anarchist; Anarchism opens to what he calls Polisnomos or the management of the polis (city) by a body politic of free citizens<sup>2</sup>. The ideal, in this case and as it has been suggested by Anarchists like Dimitrios Loussopoulos, is about achieving decentralized, stateless and collectively managed communities that are rooted in nonhierarchical ethics, a unity of diversity, self-management, complementarities and mutual aid<sup>3</sup>. This, most Anarchists would contend, is possible because, not only naturally mankind contains within him all the attributes that make him capable of living in freedom and social concord; but he is naturally social!<sup>4</sup> Therefore, rulers and their rules, economic, cultural, sexist and any other form of domination are unnecessary<sup>5</sup>. This, all together, is a call for a society that organizes itself without any authority or any political order.

Anarchists argue that the State is immoral by trying to protect the individual against his will and that is why it loses its moral legitimacy. It is this state of affairs that dictates the need to revisit the structure of the State and redefine it by moving away from what it is today; they contend. It is also the ground for the fundamental question of political philosophy on how the State should be organized; and also the key question in this paper. Quoting P.J. Proudhon, Robert Nozick, a US National Book Award winner, writes that the State's domestic ‘inconveniences’ when it comes to the governing of the people, consist of having them ‘watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued, censured, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the virtue to do so.’ He goes on to say that to be governed ‘is to be at every operation, at every transaction noted, registered, counted, taxed, stamped, measured, numbered, assessed, licensed, authorized, admonished, prevented, forbidden, reformed, corrected, punished. It is, under the pretext of public utility, and in the name of the general interest, to be placed under contribution, drilled, fleeced, exploited, monopolized, extorted from, squeezed, hoaxed, robbed; then, at the slightest resistance, the first word of complaint, to be repressed, fined, vilified, harassed, hunted down, abused, clubbed, disarmed, bound, choked, judged, condemned, imprisoned, shot, deported, sacrificed, sold, betrayed; and to crown it all, mocked, ridiculed, derided, outraged, dishonored. That is government; that is its justice; that is its morality’<sup>6</sup> As I look at the behavior of the American youth today I bet, without any exaggeration, that this anarchist definition of the State would pretty much fit in their psyche should they be asked about the kind of social environment they would like to live into. For this is, as far as I am concerned, their unstated but displayed attitude vis-à-vis the State and the overall civilized world in which normal and responsible people live into today; and which is totally resented by these kids.

<sup>1</sup> ROBERT N, ‘Anarchy, State, and Utopia.’ Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, New York, New York: USA. 1974. Also, see JOHN RAWLS, ‘A Theory of Justice.’ Cambridge, Massachusetts: USA. The Harvard University Press. 1971

<sup>2</sup> MURRAY B, « Theses on Libertarian Municipalism ». In Dimitrios Roussopoulos, Editor, The Anarchist Papers. New York : New York. Black Rose Books. 2002. pp: 9-22.

<sup>3</sup> DIMITRIOS R, Editor, The Anarchist Papers. New York : New York. Black Rose Books. 2002

<sup>4</sup> GEORGE W, “Paul Goodman: The Anarchist as Conservator”. In Dimitrios Roussopoulos, Editor, The Anarchist Papers. New York: New York. Black Rose Books. 2002. pp: 55-73

<sup>5</sup> FRANK JH, « Culture and Coercion ». In Dimitrios Roussopoulos, Editor, The Anarchist Papers. New York : New York. Black Rose Books. 2002. Pp37-54

<sup>6</sup> Ibidem. p: 11

Having eliminated and suppressed the State, Anarchists have contended that the later could be replaced by groups of individuals who will have formed their own 'mutual-protection associations' that will always answer the call of any member for defense or for the enforcement of his or her rights<sup>7</sup>. For in union, they submit, there will always be strength. To me, this seems to be the very modus operandi of the gangs as we have come to know them in America today; and which, unfortunately, are quite an omnipresent attraction for many American kids. Talk about going nuts! It can't get worse than this. As the American youth; black, Hispanic, white and what have you, access guns as they wish, carry weapons in school to kill one another, beat up their teachers, challenge law enforcement agents in the name of their civil rights, do drugs and drop out; this is 'America digging its own grave' as a civilization. This is Anarchism.

In essence, this is the scientific understanding of Anarchism as an ideology that I felt was necessary to succinctly explicate at this juncture in order to understand why we are linking this youth's behavior to it. This is also necessary to know in order to appreciate and take for what it really is the rationale behind any reservation vis-à-vis this ideology. Because the belief in this paper is that the authority of the State is a must; for too much liberty to the people often ends up hurting the very people who were yearning for it. To me, this is exactly what is happening to the American youth as a result of too much freedom and very little, if at all, control. And since it was already suggested that the effort in this paper is to address the causes; those that explain the ugly state of affairs as it appears today with the American youth are profoundly rooted in the liberal-libertarian mindset that seems to have plunged most of the American mothers, fathers and overall adults in some collective amnesia as it pertains to educating, disciplining and caring for our children [6,7].

## On Liberalism

In very simple terms Liberalism as an ideology came about in the name of Individualism as a reaction to a society that was becoming richer at the wake of the Industrial Revolution and in which class structures that started to develop clearly had the potential to jeopardize the rights and freedoms of the many, and mainly of the weak and the weakest. The idea was to fight for and preserve a more open, relatively egalitarian and tolerant society where every individual is free to pursue their own ideas and interests with as little interference of anybody as possible, but above all that of the State. Whether one reads Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Alexis de Tocqueville or John Stuart Mill to only name a few of the key traditional thinkers of Liberalism; this is the bottom-line when it comes to Liberalism as interpreted by the latter. They all focus on individual rights with respect to life, liberty, and property in the overall pursuit of individual happiness.

On the one hand, this is what I identify as Political Liberalism which primarily focuses on preventing from any form of State intrusion in our lives. That is, when it comes to deciding whether my children deserve or not a corporal punishment; or how do I sexually behave in my own privacy; or whom do I love; or who do I associate with; or how do I worship my god; or how do I plan the births of my children; to only name some of the many domains of individual decision in a lifetime; Liberals are basically contending that no one, including and above all the State, should interfere with the individual decisions as it

pertains to any of these areas of life. Donald Allen, a libertarian thinker, goes even further when rejecting the role of the State in people's lives and speaks of a "paternalistic democracy" that allows such intrusion not to be needed anymore in America<sup>8</sup>. So, clearly, while most Liberals, and unlike Anarchists, do recognize the existence of and the need for government; they however advocate one that must be limited from any interference in the individual life. In fact, John Locke went even further and has submitted that any government that violates the people's rights releases them from any obligation to obey it and entitles them to overthrow it and replace it with a new one<sup>9</sup>. Without a doubt, this is tantamount to the anarchist stand or rationale already discussed.

Whereas Economic Liberalism, on the other hand, simply repeats the same stand still precluding the State from any interference but this time in the market or with the individuals who are competing in the market. This is the idea that meets the underlying principles of economic philosophers like John Maynard Keynes, John Stuart Mill, Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Friedrich von Hayek, or Milton Friedman who, in very different terms and sometimes with some critical philosophical nuances and disagreements, speak of the very limited role of the State in the market, or of its exclusion all together from it and where only the "invisible hand" or the forces of Supply and Demand must prevail. This is also the idea that had been embraced by modern Conservatives like Margaret Thatcher, Yasuhiro Nakasone, Paul Mulrone or Ronald Reagan in the eighties as a ground for their respective economic recovery and growth. In other words, this means that even if some very limited roles would still be allowed to the State, say about securing or protecting the markets; the fundamental idea still is that in any free and fair market the role of the State must be limited. Regulations must not exist to the extent of obstructing businesses. Thus, either way, that is politically or economically, the exclusion of the State as a common denominator remains a recipe with the potential for anarchy, as far as this paper stands. And this is what brings the Liberals and Libertarians closer to Anarchists: the weakening of the State via that of the government.

Let it be observed though that the problem that often arises has to do with the fact that even if there is agreement as to the limited role of the State in our lives or in the market, say by regulating here and there; who decides where the State stops? Ask the Liberals. Is there any consensus pertaining to the rights to be or not curtailed? Who decides which right to curtail? Of course, often the Constitution of the land provides the avenues on how to go about it. Specifically that would happen through constitutional amendments. Although the liberal and libertarian trends in America today seem to disagree even with such attempts and rather re-emphasize the inalienability of any individual rights as the way to go. Whether it is about the ownership and/or access to guns, or about sexual orientation with respect to the LGBT (Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, Transsexuals) statuses, freedom of speech and association; Liberals through Liberal Democracy overall submit that individuals should be left alone and that no regulation from the State should be allowed here as in many other similar circumstances in the pursuit of people's happiness however crazy it might be or appear to be [8,9].

Although the irony here still is that, while the State is being denied any right of interference in both the market and the individual life; it is

<sup>7</sup> Ibidem. p: 12

<sup>8</sup> TERENCE B & RICHARD D, Ideals and Ideologies. A Reader. New York, New York : Longman.1999. pp: 122-125.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. pp: 75-89.

still the same State that is being called upon to protect the enjoyment of the very rights from which it is being curtailed or blocked from any interference. For instance, the very LGBT who do not want the State to regulate their sexual lives still need the protection of the same State to enjoy the very rights they don't want the State to interfere with. This seems to be a pretty complex paradox to grasp. But that is the irony that nevertheless reaffirms the magnitude of the State via the government as a vital tool for a better organized society; as it shall be argued in this paper.

## On Conservatism

To put it in very simple and clear terms, Conservatism, as an ideology, refers to the desire to conserve or keep something, usually values, a way of life, traditions as it pertains to a specific society, institutions and systems. According to Michael Oakeshott, a British philosopher of the early 20th century, to be a Conservative is to be disposed to think and behave in certain manners; it is to prefer certain kinds of conduct and certain conditions of human circumstances to others; it is to be disposed to make certain kinds of choices<sup>10</sup>. But since this can be said about any ideology, he goes on to be more specific and suggests that to be Conservative is to enjoy what is available rather than to wish for or to look for something that isn't there. It is to delight in what is present rather than what was or what may be. It is to be aware of something to lose and that we may have cared for a great deal. To be a Conservative, he goes on to say, it is to prefer the familiar to the unknown, the tried to the untried, the fact to mystery, the actual to the possible, the present laughter to utopian bliss. It is to be equal to one's own fortune, to live at the level of one's own means<sup>11</sup>.

What transpires from the foregoing development seems to suggest that change must be quite challenging to Conservatives such that they will be often predisposed to oppose innovation and progress. Fortunately that is not the case at all, as would suggest Edmund Burke, an Irish philosopher who is seen by many as the real father of Conservatism<sup>12</sup>. According to Burke, Conservatives favor and advocate a piecemeal or gradual approach to change. While they do accept it as part of life, they have often argued that it should never be brutal, radical or a rapid overture to new and alien elements or values, because that may lead to chaos within society. Once identified, all the requisites must first be put in place before any change that reinforces society can be integrated.

While abstract theory and human reason do play a major role in shaping society, Conservatives would rather advocate the passing over of traditions from generation to generation so that the new society may evolve and be sustained from such a tradition. Of course, the idea of traditions being passed over does not entail going back to the ways of living of the past, because after all, civilizations are meant to evolve. That is rather what being a Reactionary would be all about but not a Conservative. As suggested by Michael Oakeshott, "it's rather about having the disposition of a guardian of what from time to time is considered not yet ripe for destruction often perceived as the amenities of life"<sup>13</sup>. And this is what is being passed over until it becomes obvious that it has reached its obsolescence and could be discarded. Until that

time comes up without any doubt, it has to be protected by being passed down from generation to generation. That's why it can be cogently suggested that Conservatism has never been and will never be about wanting a static society or about swimming against the tide [10,11].

But it is also from its stand vis-à-vis values and traditions, together with their passing over from generation to generation that stems the dubious position most Conservatives have taken towards Liberal Democracy. For many of them, Liberal Democracy is a threat to the wellbeing of society. The emphasis that this ideology has given to individual rights and interests to the detriment of the many obviously threatens the fabric of society. Because for Conservatives, it's the joining together of all members of society, in the most equitable manner, and not individualism advocated by Liberal Democracy that should be emphasized and effortlessly defended. They strongly believe, and contrary to Liberal Democracy, that human beings are too shortsighted to take measures that will restrain their passions and desires. It has been seen over and over even when it comes to court decisions, radical public policies, or just mere facts of our mundane lives. People will often give precedence to their own feelings, passions and desires than to the law, all in the name of the enjoyment of their rights as advocated by Liberal Democracy. In this context, Liberal Democracy is indeed a threat to social order as would contend most Conservatives.

Seen from today's political landscape and particularly in America, Conservatism has become blur and thus very difficult to identify and define. It comes in so many brands that it is even identified with values that only yesterday were very central to Liberalism. The protection of life, for example, yesterday an ideological cornerstone of Liberals has become the credo of the Conservatism of Evangelical Protestants who represents what is referred to today in America as the Christian or Religious Right. This is why one has to be very careful today in identifying the criteria that objectively would corroborate the labeling of an individual or a public policy of being conservative or not. Issues of morality as it pertains to the LGBT movement, abortion rights, the place of religion but specifically Judeo-Christianism in the American society, the issues of national security, the Supreme Court nominations, the place of discipline in schools and universities, the issues of race and gender; to only name a few, have all been central to the overall conservative discourse. One which has aimed at strengthening the representative State as it tackles all these issues with the understanding that the people should never be given any right to what is not reasonable, and to what is not for their benefit<sup>14</sup>. Often, the representative State that is virtually immune from the individuals' natural weaknesses as reflected through their biased passions and desires seems to be the right and legitimate arbitrator to decide about this.

## Conclusion

The key contention in the hypotheses argued in this piece has been that due to an excessive enjoyment of individual rights as professed by Liberal Democracy today in America, especially as it pertains to the

<sup>10</sup> MICHAEL OAKESHOTT, *On Being Conservative*. From *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. New York: New York. Harper Collins Publishers, Inc. 1962

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem. TERENCE BALL & RICHARD DAGGER. (1999). p: 162.

<sup>12</sup> Ibidem. pp: 141-142

<sup>13</sup> Ibidem. p: 166

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem. p: 145

American youth; there is a possibility, if left to itself, for this Youth to go astray and thereby jeopardize the future of this wonderful land whose traditions have been about hardworking, sound discipline in all aspects of life, the creation and retention of wealth in the pursuit of happiness, the valorization and elevation of faith and social relations, and overall descent human behaviors in every single interaction with mankind. These, coincidentally, have also been conservative values and basically, they are the ones that need to and must be reconsidered, re-examined, and re-infused in the American social psyche today.

That's why the methodology in this piece was about identifying three of the many ideologies that are often relied on as sources of the theoretical foundations for setting up, strengthening or innovating social and overall communal life. Whether it's about Anarchism, Liberal Democracy/Liberalism, or Conservatism; this methodology made it easy to succinctly provide the essence of each one of these three ideologies and thereby understand what they really are all about and how they do relate to the issue under scrutiny. Having identified and illustrated the very problematic conduct of the majority of young Americans today; and having also spelled out the key tenets of these ideologies; it's clear to me that this very problematic conduct goes, fundamentally, hand in hand with the teachings and beliefs of both Anarchism and Liberal Democracy. It is in this sense that both Liberal Democracy and Libertarianism simply become euphemisms for Anarchism. It is just a kind of the "far left of the two lefts" so to speak. Even though today, the distinction between the three has continued to be hazy and distorted. But as one looks closely into the statement and implementation of their main precepts, we are basically dealing with the same stuff. Even if Liberals, and unlike Anarchists, do acknowledge the existence of the State, they still stand for a very weak one; one that is ready to easily capitulate over the protection of individual rights and privileges, however crazy they may be or appear to be. This is where lies the problem of Liberal Democracy as a source of reference for theoretical orientations in dealing with issues of discipline in American schools and universities, issues relating to social equality in terms of class structures, overall issues pertaining to the gender biases, specific issues of the LGBT movement, immigration and overall problems of national security and foreign policy.

As one considers all these challenging issues beyond but including the one that triggered our attention and led to the writing of this article, it's crystal-clear that it's mainly through the Conservative precepts as above mentioned and as generally known that lasting solutions can be found to our many problems, but specifically to the youth going berserk. What being a Conservative is all about and as explained earlier provides a series of behavioral guidelines that can serve as key references is bringing up our children in today's America. Intelligence, wealth, creativity and happiness without morality are but a danger to society. Similarly, a deliberately weakened State is but useless and a danger to society. For, a society led by a weak State is but doomed. This is why Conservatism is right in advocating the strengthening of both the State and a Moral Citizenry. That is a Citizenry that entails nationalism or true love for country, values social relationships, very fears God, fears sin, values ancestry, and overall respects life and mankind.

It is also clear that this piece is as well an invitation to humbly but honestly acknowledge that there is, indeed, something wrong with the American youth today and that needs to be fixed. There are plenty of solutions out there to be considered in addressing the issue of the

youngsters losing their way. This paper is just another way among many others of addressing this problem. But the first step, as said earlier, is to recognize that the problem does exist. Unfortunately, the liberal beliefs that kids as individuals have to be who they are and do as they wish for that's what the youth is all about, once again push the psyche of our youth in the wrong direction. They are thus unable to even realize they have a big problem. Liberal Democracy as a euphemism for Anarchism is the source of the rationale that is, consciously or not, used by the unruly kids to explain and justify their irresponsible behaviors. Yet, quoting Edmund Burke, it was already argued in this paper that there will not and should not be any right for any individual doing or wanting what is obviously not reasonable. When the student's want in an ongoing class is loudly using her phone and disturbing the whole ambiance of the learning process; this is simply not reasonable as a behavior on her part. It is simply a wrong want; that is a negative freedom as has suggested the neoclassical Liberal Thomas Hill Green<sup>15</sup>. In other words, there is no reason whatsoever for such a conduct in such an environment. As a consequence she cannot dare pretend that that is her right to speak on the phone wherever and whenever she wishes to. That is simply nonsensical and fundamentally that is the main claim in this paper. By behaving like she did she automatically lost her right and became liable for a behavior deserving a punishment. Thomas Hill Green captures this best as he speaks of positive and negative freedoms whose juggling by mankind day-in, day-out, requires the State as the main watchdog against any derailment in the pursuit of happiness.

As human beings we are born with what has been identified as our Ontological Dignity. That is the dignity or respect and honor given to every mankind by God because of our quality as human beings in the image of God himself. It is our right to have that dignity as long as we haven't been transformed into extra-terrestrial beings, if at all that would be possible. That is a statement simply about emphasizing the idea that this dignity it fundamentally tied to our nature as human beings. But once we enter society, we are involved in very many interactions and are confronted with very many challenges of life. As we deal with these interactions and challenges, their accomplishment and outcome require that we accordingly adopt specific attitudes, conducts, and temperaments at different times since all these encounters do not happen at the same time and are not of the same nature. In life, we may have to deal with a teacher, a school principle, a policeman or woman, a law or authority enforcement agent, a priest or a pastor, a fellow student or employee, a foreigner or an immigrant, or just a brother or a sister. Similarly, we may have to take part in an amorous relationship, a funeral, a wedding, a job interview, or just a social event like a birthday. In each one of these circumstances, most of the time our attitude and behavior cannot be the same but will rather vary and be deliberately adjusted depending on the context. The honor and respect with which we present ourselves in public as we handle all these challenges of life represent what is known as our Postural Dignity. That is the dignity that results from the posture that we display in the front of anybody else.

Thus, our integrity as human beings will be the result of our ability to steadily juggle both the Ontological and the Postural Dignities in such a manner that the Ontological Dignity is always fed and strengthened but never weakened by the Postural Dignity; and that the Ontological Dignity becomes inspirational for the Postural Dignity for it stems from the mercy and the love of our creator. In simple terms, when we behave badly or very badly, in terms of posture that is; we are

<sup>15</sup> Nettleship RL (ed.) *The Works of Thomas Hill Green*, Vol. 3. London: UK. Longmans, Green & Co. 1964.

making ourselves less deserving of that natural respect and honor bestowed upon us by God himself as human beings. In other words, our posture will make us more or less deserving of the Ontological Dignity. In this sense, a murderer, a thief, a public fornicator, a drunkard, or a terrorist engage, at different levels, in postural settings that negatively impact the public appreciation of their Ontological Dignity. For example, society may decide to ignore the Ontological Dignity of a serial killer and hang him as a result of his posture of a certified serial killer. The same society may recognize a benefactor with a medal of honor to gift his good deeds to society. In the latter case, the Postural Dignity of the benefactor reinforces the appreciation of him as a good human being; that is, one that deserves even more of his Ontological Dignity.

It is the same rationale as it regards the enjoyment of our rights. Our own behavior may curtail the full enjoyment of our rights; as it may also facilitate and make it easy for us to fully take pleasure in them. All is up to us as we decide, define and redefine on how we shall relate to the State. What clearly transpires from the preceding development is an apparent need for the American youth to reinforce both their Ontological and Postural Dignities via the Conservative teachings and beliefs. Especially their Postural Dignity that seems to be the source of all their attitudinal and behavioral problems. The drugs, the senseless killings, the unruly and rude manners, the faithless lives, the lack of ambitions for education and overall spirit of hardworking, sacrifice and super achievement are all the result of an environment that has lost its fear of God; one that is imbued in individualism and does not have any respect for collective life and for other mankind. This is exactly the opposite of the Conservative values all of which could not be presented

in this short article. But the sampling of these ideological guidelines, obviously demonstrates that the cure for the scourges that have beset the American Youth and which were denounced and condoned in this paper lies within Conservatism. It's just a matter of honestly figuring it out even further and applying it to save and guarantee a better future for the Youth of this fantastic and unique country in the face of the earth.

## References

1. Ball T, Richard D, O'Neill DI (1999) Ideals and Ideologies. A Reader. New York, New York: Longman.
2. Bookchin M (2002) Theses on Libertarian Municipalism.
3. Harrison JF (2002) Culture and Coercion.
4. <http://www.psupress.org/books/titles/978-0-271-02975-7.html>
5. Mill SJ (1910) The Subjection of Women.
6. Nettleship RL (1964) The Works of Thomas Hill Green. 3: London: UK. Longmans, Green & Co.
7. Nozick R, Anarchy S, Utopia (1974) New York: New York. Basic Books Inc. Publishers.
8. Oakshott M (1962) On being Conservative. New York: New York. Harper Collins Publishers Inc.
9. Reeve H (1845) Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America. 1. New York: New York. Henry G. Langley.
10. Roussopoulos D (2002) The Anarchist Papers. New York: New York. Black Rose Books.
11. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41879237>