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Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or what you will drink, or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing? Look at the birds of the air; they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not of more value than they? And can any of you by worrying add a single hour to your span of life? And why do you worry about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they neither toil nor spin, yet I tell you, even Solomon in all his glory was not clothed like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which is alive today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will he not much more clothe you— you of little faith? Therefore do not worry, saying, “What will we eat?” or “What will we drink?” or “What will we wear?” For it is the Gentiles who strive for all these things; and indeed your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. But strive first for the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well. 

\[1\]
Abstract

Modern political activity in the West does not, at first glance, appear to be a hostile entity to the Catholic Church. However, much of its policy is just that, despite the general tone of tolerance. For instance, one can consider the widespread support of abortion and same-sex marriage in more liberal spheres and the attitudes towards economics, war, and immigration in more conservative circles. Indeed, the fact that the Catholic cannot commit himself wholesale to one side or other of the contemporary political spectrum suggests a certain wholesale dissonance with modern political thought.

Indeed, the issue at hand begins at a much deeper level than the current hour, for modern politics rests in the thought that arose in the period directly after the medieval period, that of the Enlightenment within philosophical and scientific fields, and of the Protestant Reformation in the world of theology. In short, the collective European intellect moved away from the Christian gospel, for poor reasons, and developed a defective approach toward politics.

In contrast, true Catholic political thought is rooted in the proper conception of charity. In particular, the Catholic affirms the goodness of God and thus man, His creation, which forms the basis the normative vision for one society (a single Church), with a single head (Christ).

Introduction and Thesis
This work is an attempt to put forward a rudimentary sketch of the normative Christian political state. This attempt is first negative, as errors in opposed thought will be pointed to a broad level, and second, a positive vision will be offered, in the form a frame of the perfect society. So, for example, certain thinkers have posited erroneous anthropological conceptions, holding the human person as a non-charitable being by nature. In other words, Enlightenment thinkers did not believe human beings would be happy by living lives of charity, and designed their political systems around this belief. And yet this is precisely the opposite of what Christian gospel argues. With this in mind, arguments must be made for a state based in Catholic theology, which affirms the centrality of notion of charity. So, to continue the example, the design of such a state should based around individual persons who are each called to become a communion of saints, among other things.

Such a task is speculative rather than apologetic; it does not directly seek to defend the Catholic faith and convince non-believers, but attempts to follow the tenets of the Catholic faith and describe a perfect society in light of such faith. This task depends on the use of Catholic theology and its authorities to critique philosophical thinkers, a legitimate enterprise due to the unity of truth. The light of the faith, even that of revealed truths, has the right to inform all efforts of human knowing, including that of secular philosophy.

Ultimately, a Catholic monarchical theocracy is the offered normative vision of society, a position that intentionally contrasts with and challenges modern political thought, which does not seem to seriously consider such a possibility.

**The Negative Critique**

Enlightenment Problems: An Overview
The reality which political theory describes is the field of communal ethics, and ethics itself dependent on anthropology. To rephrase, the study of the perfection of persons (politics) depends on the study perfection of the individual person (ethics or morality), which rests even further in the study of the person itself (anthropology). More succinctly, the nature of communities and the way in which they ought live ultimately depends upon the nature of the human person. If the Christian position is true, the importance of the field in politics, as it concerns the perfection of all persons, should not be underestimated, nor are its concern non-theological.

Modern governmental and political attitudes are largely rooted in the philosophies which arose in the Age of Enlightenment, and therefore this type of thought will be critiqued (insofar as modern politics must be critiqued). The major errors are threefold: first, Enlightenment thinkers divided the church and state; second, the monarchy was effectively disregarded; third, Catholicism was rejected as the perfective belief for humanity. Indeed, these all seem to truths taken for granted to the ordinary Western adult today, that the church and state should be separated, that a monarchy cannot work, and it is intolerant to seek a fully Christian society. The proposal of universal Catholic theocracy may even appear naïvely senseless and even dangerously irresponsible – and yet, if the Christian theory is true, a religious theocracy is already in place at the cosmic scale (of which the earthly realm composes only a part), and the Kingdom of God will be fully inaugurated at the apocalypse. God is God, and any earthly government should reflect that properly.

In the most pressing of these faults, Enlightenment thinkers by and large viewed people in two ways which clashes with the Christian worldview. They denied, first, that human beings are made for communion, or are relational (perhaps best seen in theological language of love),
and second, that human beings, while fallen, are still intrinsically made for good and thus are fundamentally good.\textsuperscript{7}

The consequence of this first mistake was that relationships were treated (first at a theoretical level, then at a practical one) as contractual and non-natural, and thus were not defended properly. To draw this out, in some sense modern’s society stance on the notion of marriage is a natural outplaying of earlier commitments, as modern scholars like Patrick J. Deneen have pointed out.\textsuperscript{8} Same-sex union is commonly considered to be natural (or at least, not un-natural) to both modern scholars and lay persons, insofar as the human person’s relationships are held to be fully contractual or voluntaristic; i.e. all relationships are legitimate insofar as they are consensual, and all legitimacy can be reduced to this act of will. Again, this lies in sharp contrast to Catholic thought, where one is not only naturally relational vis-à-vis the family, but irrevocably related to God in the creational, covenantal sense. This means, among other things, God loves man and man is unchangeably made to love Him.\textsuperscript{9}

The second problem was that systems were largely designed to counter sin rather than promote virtue. Unfortunately, by accepting sin as unavoidable entity, they took no effort to avoid it, because that would require exhorting the individual person to do good and leaving it in the hands of the masses, denying the possibility of a solitary thinker writing the perfect treatise that could fix the world. Enlightenment thinkers did not think to advocate the communal effort to overcome sin and seek holiness, and as such argued for systems in which sin was already granted a foot in the door; but it is a poor doctor who only seeks to treat the symptom, and not cure the disease. It would be fruitful to contrast the attitude of St. Paul, who frequent exhorts the many disparate churches (i.e. communities) to both individually put sin to death and communally aid
one another in this effort, with Immanuel Kant’s comment that the perfect constitution would work for a city full of demons.

This attitude that systems are more important than persons contrasts with the whole of the ancient tradition, which in general rooted politics in the pursuit of virtue, as especially seen in Aristotelian and Roman political theory. This means, for example, rather than advocate the virtue of chastity, Enlightenment thinkers and their modern children would promote the usage of a technology which would allow immoral behavior without certain more evident consequences. On the other hand, the Catholic teaching is that sin is free act of the will, and as such, it is far from necessary reality; as such, society should be designed to support the individuals in their communal and shared attempt towards beatitude rather than merely beat a retreat and surrender ground to human imperfection. Again, good and evil is an act of free will – no system can replace that; no law, no matter how clever it is, can automatically change one’s heart.

The major dilemma for all these Enlightenment philosophies can be briefly stated: why is there politics? Why do these thinkers not advocate suicide, or to the less extreme, universal isolation? Or most perhaps most precisely, why are they not indifferent to the issue of politics? For it would seem difficult to justify politics if first, human relationships are not natural and purely optional (which means eternal isolation would not be unnatural), and second, that man is inherently bad or corrupt (which should result in the advocation of suicide). Why should man come together? Why should he try to be good? Why do governments work? If they contribute to man’s happiness, then are they not natural? If not, it seems that none of the major early modern philosophers thought radically or consistently enough to suggest the total dissolution of society.

How can societies, political entities, be both non-natural and yet successful? After all, one should not say man is by nature a corrupt apolitical, non-communal, and non-relational
being...therefore he should universally act politically, communally, and have relationships. This is a very basic point which must be stressed. If Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and others all in their own way fundamentally portray man as a being for which communities should not ultimately work, they contradict themselves by still holding a communal vision of man. If man truly is naturally warring (Hobbes), truly non-relational (Locke), and truly noble as a savage (Rousseau), why have a society at all?

It must be admitted this critique is broad and that there may be defenses to this accusation latent within their own work. Perhaps Hobbes holds that man somehow changes his nature by entering into community – but if not, how are warring individuals even capable of coming together to surrender their freedom for mutual toleration and protection? Perhaps Rousseau’s noble savages become even more noble by entering into community – but at the general level, a real defense is demanded by posing this question, and to salvage their theories, it may be that either their view that man is a non-communal being or their hope for political life must be forfeited.

In any case, to defend the non-modern approach, Aristotle appears much more coherent. He first observes how naturally man does come into society to a near absolute degree – true hermits, who simply live alone, are few and far between. Furthermore, always with his biological eye, he understood how humans are naturally created: unlike certain species of living things, the act of reproduction is communal act, requiring a male and female. As such, he describes man as political by nature; this is to say man is made for communal life, a conclusion much closer to the Christian position which holds man is made for eternal communion with God and neighbor.¹²
With this in mind, one can begin to take a deeper look into the trouble spots of the Enlightenment and its political theory. Now, just as the flaws of modern politics rest in the flaws of modern political anthropology, these Enlightenment errors even more remotely rest in a faulty metaphysics (or ontology), at least in part. In other words, these false notions of human societies rest in faulty visions of the human person, which in turn lie in a false notion of being itself. The root of Enlightenment metaphysics can be found in the writings of Rene Descartes, whose work more than any other’s commenced the new tradition of simply breaking from the Classical philosophical tradition. After a broad critique of Descartes, a more in depth attack of Hobbes and Locke can be leveled, who mirrored Descartes’ metaphysical break and broke from the ancient tradition at the political level. Finally, Aristotle is offered as a foil.

Descartes’ Position

Rene Descartes, a French philosopher, set the precedent upon which Enlightenment philosophy, and thus modern politics by extension, is based. He did three things: first, he made an absolute division between body and spirit, between matter and the immaterial. This point is the most technical of three, and in short established the precedent of un-nuanced thinking that would show up at level of politics (where the church became divided absolutely from state, as Descartes divided the person’s body from his soul).13

Second, he attempted to create a non-theological philosophy; third, and most crucially, he was successful in the world’s eye at breaking from Scholastic thought and thus the whole of the ancient tradition.14 His unstated goal, more or less, was to start philosophy from the ground up, in some sense ignoring all past efforts of the entire human race, in a moment that failed in both conception (there was no sound justification for such a drastic approach) and execution (his resultant philosophy was highly related to the same Scholastic thought which professed to find
unsatisfactory, as opposed to say, oriental philosophy).\textsuperscript{15} Thinkers like Locke, Hobbes and the vast majority of post-Cartesian thinkers in general did not highly respect the work of those who come before Descartes. In other words, modern politics works in large part in opposition to or simply ignores the Classical tradition.

This is not a strict or even highly philosophical connection, ironically – i.e. nearly no major post-Cartesian thinkers consider themselves strict Cartesians, though they highly respected his work. However, they were perhaps more Cartesian than they realized, as they accepted his diagnosis that ancient philosophy was largely a failed enterprise, and, to a extent, that strong divisions should be made along the lines of body and soul, heaven and earth, and so on. As Martin Luther catalyzed the fracturing of the Christian church through his theology, so too did Descartes set the tone and open the flood gates of a disordered diversity of independent philosophical thinkers, no longer working within a single tradition. However, his schism from ancient thought seems to be based on a faulty philosophy.

The Suggested Critiques of Descartes\textsuperscript{16}

At the root of this general movement of the first modern philosophy of Rene Descartes was his faulty diagnosis that past philosophy was a corrupt enterprise. This is evident from two ways: first, that which he condemned seems viable in its own right, and secondly, his famous replacement method of doubt appears to fail.\textsuperscript{17}

Regarding the first, Descartes, both at largest and smallest of levels, was dissatisfied with ancient and medieval philosophy. As a whole, the enterprise seemed to him as having made no linear progress, with no single school of thought which constantly moved forward, especially when compared to the re-blossoming fields of mathematics and physical science. He attributed this to the very method of philosophy, which is to say he found the very method inadequate, the
very problem-solving approach of philosophers unsuccessful and unmethodical. And so, Descartes put forward his famous attempt to once and for all create the true philosophical method, which would allow the questions of philosophy to be finally answered.

This method was a method of doubt, and its goal was certain knowledge, i.e. clear and distinct ideas. Famously, he sought to doubt everything that could be doubted, and whatever he could not doubt would be left, and thus he would be left with certain knowledge with which to base all future philosophy on. However, this method of Descartes seems to be unworkable for several reasons, and as such his conclusions, mostly metaphysical, are to be doubted.

What are these flaws? First, his doubting seems to be irrational, insofar as he chooses to doubt physical sense impressions on the possibility that his physical senses could be deceived, but he does not doubt his very mind as a whole entity, even though that too could possibly be deceived. After all, one can choose to doubt all things, irrationally; a toxicologist can doubt that drinking pure hydrochloric acid is a bad substitute for water and can act as such – but his actions are not therefore reasonable. And so when Descartes doubts the existence of his body merely because it is possible an evil demon could be deceiving his body, yet denies this possibility absolutely to his very mind, he has already acted inconsistently and thus irrationally. One can certainly choose to randomly reject appearances of reality, but on what basis is that a rational method? If the possibility of deception is the basis of doubt, both the senses of the body and the mind can err or be deceived, and thus both should be doubted – but if Descartes doubts his mind itself, he can never justify a return to certainty, for that which he would argue by would be provided by his mind.

Second, just as his particular mind can be doubted, there is no absolute proof for reason itself. In other words, not only can one be deceived about physical matter, not only one can be
deceived about the immaterial, the spiritual, the truth because of one’s own mind – but what absolute proof is there that any truth at exists, that there is any reason to that which exists?²¹ And Descartes is focused on absolute certainty. If he wishes to doubt all that which can be doubted, should he simply not doubt that reason works at all? Otherwise this method is far from universal and rather unmethodical – it is almost as if he blindly accepts the soundness of reason.

Again, Descartes doubts merely on the possibility that something can be doubted – but then he should doubt reason itself, and thus all things. He should simply remain doubting his own existence, because he has not proved that the existence of his thoughts necessitates his existence. Indeed, should he not doubt his own doubt? Such a proposition may sound absurd, but reason has not been proven as a viable and integral entity, its activity has not be shown to be fundamentally sound.²² To prove reason as a method for finding truth, one would need to make use of reason – but that would be no more than a circular proof. Thus one should come to an end of reason itself: how can one know anything at all is true? One cannot, unless one has accepted reason without the slightest bit of doubt – but then Descartes has corrupted his method. Such an approach, accepting reason merely as axiomatic may sound suspiciously unrigorous, but it is the approach of Aristotle and Aquinas and many others, as seen in their treatment of the law of non-contradiction. At an even broader level, even mathematics, a model of science for Descartes, makes use of axioms.

To finish the general, bird’s eye, and abbreviated critique, it appears Descartes has unjustifiably selected doubt as the foundation of his method, and has followed that up by unjustifiably moving from doubt to back knowledge, for the sake of escaping total skepticism and even nihilism. His diagnosis that ancient philosophy was in dire need of regeneration, his first response to doubt all knowledge, and his final move, from this doubt to certainty (for he
does claim to prove absolutely the existence of the soul and God), all appear illegitimate and inconsistent.\textsuperscript{23}

His reductive method has had long lasting effects; while indeed $2+2=4$ may appear to have enviable clarity, a method designed for a specifically simple object cannot universally apply to more complex fields. Philosophers after him tended to move away from a full-bodied study of classical tradition, instead each trying their hands at their more private enterprise. Again, most philosophers after him also started from scratch, and so agreed with his diagnosis, but disagreed with his cure.\textsuperscript{24}

It can be speculated as to why there was such a consensus to move from the tradition; perhaps the ancient corpus had become too intimidating.\textsuperscript{25} In contrast, the physical sciences of the times made incredible breakthroughs, which would only intensify in the centuries after Descartes, further giving testimony to the simplicity of the scientific method and its application to philosophical inquiry.\textsuperscript{26} In any case, with the basis of Enlightenment philosophy critiqued, one can now look to how these errors played out. To summarize briefly, Descartes broke from the tradition of Christian thought, seeking to divide philosophy from theology, setting a misguided precedent.

**Turn Towards Enlightenment Politics**

With the suggested critique of Descartes in place, a similar outline to the weak points of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke can be put forward. Their importance lies in the fact that not only are they two of the earliest modern political philosophers, but their works have had long-lasting, popular effects, and as such they are perhaps more than any other are fathers of modern government, insofar as modern liberalism is very much based in their thought. Their similarity lies mainly in erroneous anthropology, which leads to poor visions of human communities. The
former portrays man as fallen, while the latter views man as relational only by means of contract. Naturally, both conflict with Christian politics, in similar ways.

Hobbes argued that all power should be funneled to one absolute ruler to prevent human society from tearing apart, but this raises a question: why does funneling destructive power to one person make a peaceful society? It would seem again, either humans are naturally communal (the only way a community would last), or they are naturally at war, in which case war would be much more common. Hobbes’ problem is that not only can he not explain peace, but he cannot even explain how rare war is. If peace is truly unnatural, it should not exist at all, ever (or perhaps only as an anomaly), if man is fundamentally at war. The Catholic position, on the other hand, can explain war (i.e. violence) and peace. War is the abuse of peace.

Locke too has a similar problem: he holds man is a contractual being, but human beings appear to be naturally communal. Not only is man almost universally found in communities, but his origin lies in the biological family. In other words, man is both fundamentally and ultimately communal: to be and to be happy, man lives together.

Extended Critique of Enlightenment Politics

Hobbes famously portrayed man as fallen (though not in those words). As such, he believes all power should be funneled to one absolute king to prevent this outplaying of natural human barbarism. In other words, people surrender their freedom to a king, who enforces the law to protect everyone. However, the main objection to this is funneling the destructive power of individuals to one person does not seem to make for a peaceful society. If humans are individually bad, why do individuals coming together to not simply compound the problem? Or is not this king a human being, and therefore will he not also be at war with all, and so will he not naturally abuse the power given to him? Most pressingly, if man is truly fundamentally at
war, laws enforcing peace will always be unnatural, extrinsic, and thus doomed to fail. It would seem again, either humans are naturally communal (the only way a community would last), or they are naturally at war, in which case war should either be sought, or is ultimately unavoidable.

Hobbes’ problem is that he can he explain war, but he cannot explain peace; from the scientific viewpoint, however, it is the latter that is the principle, and the former that is the exception. After all, the desire for peace is incredibly present in human life, much more present than the desire for violence. Not only is most of human time filled with peace (even the worst wars are violent, staccato bursts, and traditionally only a small portion (the bold or the forced) of a small portion (young males) of the society participates fully), but the wars themselves are waged are for the sake of peace. No state, not even ancient Sparta nor Nazi Germany, has ever sought perpetual war – yet if the individual man is a war-making animal, then his actions would more fully reflect that. While it is indeed true, Hobbes speaks of war in more of individual manner, even in that sphere most humans are rather content to live along side another, only rarely stealing or murdering – indeed the world’s evil can be much more hidden and imperceptible than crude war.29 If man is truly and fundamentally at war, peace would be an anomaly or abnormality.

John Locke, while not taking such an immediately dark view of man, views relationships as contractual.30 This too seems to be a deathblow to any communal theory. As Hobbes was a reactionary to the Wars of Religion and the English Civil War, seeking to unite parliamentarian and monarchical approaches to government, Locke was in large part a reactionary to religious persecution occurring during the Reformation.31 In order to restore basic respect for human dignity, he took a more relaxed view of relationship that can be best seen in his essay, “A Letter
Concerning Toleration.” However, his call for a societal ceasefire of religious persecution was based on a philosophy that sacrificed any real notion of communal charity, for the sake of this tolerance: “Secondly, that seeing one man does not violate the right of another by his erroneous opinions and undue manner of worship, nor is his perdition any prejudice to another man’s affairs, therefore, *the care of each man’s salvation belongs only to himself*.\textsuperscript{32}

This seems to be a full betrayal of Christianity (the faith of which Locke professed to be a member of), where man’s salvation is not his own concern but God’s, and his neighbor’s too.\textsuperscript{33} After all, if Cain questions whether he is his brother’s keeper, the cross and mission of Jesus Christ to redeem the entire world, and his invitation to all to follow him in doing so, answers definitely, yes, neighbors are indeed their brother’s keeper.\textsuperscript{34} While Locke’s motivation appears noble in part, to speak out against religious violence and the use of torture, it does not justify a philosophy which attacks society, the family, and the very personhood of man.

These dangers are not overstated. After all, a purely contractual approach begins the slide into a wholly voluntaristic conception of morality, commonly referred as subjectivism or relativism, insofar as all relationship is based in choice, not nature. Again, if man is only related by choice, a parent owes nothing to his or her child if he or she so chooses. This is a grave issue in modern society. For example, Professors Alberto Giubilini and Francesca Minerva argued along these lines in their essay “After-Birth Abortion: Why Should The Baby Live?” They hold that after-birth abortion would be legitimate, insofar as infants are not real persons because of their lack of rational ability, and can only achieve personhood if someone chooses to invest value in them. Indeed, they go so far as to suggest a mother could abort one twin for the sake of the other, if she so chose.\textsuperscript{35} At an even deeper level, this contractual approach to human relationship also affirms a culture of divorce, among the deepest Western family issues, in which marriages
are terminated once one of the persons involves wills it to be so – for again, the relationship was always just a contract chosen to enter into.

Locke’s problem, therefore, is similar to Hobbes. Man seems naturally relational, both fundamentally and ultimately; that is to say, he is designed as such that he is always in a state of relationship (one can consider the state of hell as the attempted rejection of one’s relationship to God), and second, he comes to his perfection insofar as he accepts his relatedness (i.e. the blessed in heaven). Or, at more basic level, as a specifically contingent being, man comes into being only by the act of another, whether that be God (it always is, in part), parents, or even a scientist. Perhaps most evidently, once alive, humans choose near universally to live with another, which supports the thesis that they are naturally communal, rather than arbitrarily.

Again, the very basis of this notion, that humans are not naturally related, is strange. Man is a physical being who is like his neighbors physically, existing in the same material world and thus capable of acting on his neighbor in a material way. Second, as spiritual beings, it seems clear that man is made for communion. Otherwise, a man alone forever in a large jail cell, with all his material needs provided for magically could be perfectly happy. After all, he should never be lonely if he entered into relationship out of absolute freedom. And at an even broader level, a city (a large, growing community) is necessary for fine or excellent life. That which is commonly called culture, perhaps the finest point of man’s vocational participation in God’s creation, is only possible within such a state. It seems clear man is a relational being, which is why isolation is cruel, and the life of hermit only entered into for the sake of penance. Indeed, humans are intensely social, for not only do they spend time with of each other, but they spend most of their time with others. 37
Of course, such a traditional philosophical view could be much more easily found in Aristotle. First, with his eye of the biologist, he noticed man even when compared to other animals is a social being, for the sake of survival. As a mammal, human offspring need comparatively much longer time with their parents before they are full grown, as when compared to amphibians like frogs (who never see their parents and live largely alone). Second, with his eye of the philosopher, he perceived that for man to live well live, he had to live with others.

The cell or desert is perfectly natural for the contractual being; the city is natural for the communal being. And it should be of note that man has developed more cities than cells.

Both of the political Enlightenment philosophers critiqued have a root contradiction to their thought: they claim that man is not charitable by nature (i.e. good via love of other, that is willing the best for non-self), yet seek, in some limited sense, for him to live charitably. Hobbes denies the goodness of man, and Locke the goodness of man via natural communion. At same time, they do not follow this thought to its conclusion: man should not live (if he is truly a warring animal), much less in community (if he is not intrinsically communal and related). Of course, that seems absurd, to call into question the very goodness of society, but it is what they should have done if they wished for their conclusions to be fully consistent with their dramatic premises.38

In general, the notion of a charitable nature should lead one to a more optimistic and noble view of society and thus government. But, as these philosophers have not taken charity as their foundation of thought, modern political thought tends to make no reference to the virtue of love. After all, Hobbes denied the reality of virtue, that citizens can be truly good, thus denying the possibility of a community being good, and Locke denied the reality of love as the key to man’s being.39 This can be considered in stark contrast to Catholic thinkers like St. Pope John
Paul II, who writes: “man cannot live without love. He remains a being that is incomprehensible for himself, his life is senseless, if love is not revealed to him, if he does not encounter love, if he does not experience it and make it his own, if he does not participate intimately in it. This, as has already been said, is why Christ the Redeemer ‘fully reveals man to himself.’”  

The strong contrast Aristotle offers can be found perhaps most easily two quotes, who also notably ties ethics (which he calls political science in his *Nicomachean Ethics*) to political science (which he treats in *The Politics*). After all, it is the perfection of the person leads to perfection of persons. First, he writes: “[A] city is excellent, at any rate, by its citizens - those sharing in the regime – being excellent; and in our case all the citizens share in the regime.” In this quote, not only does he affirm the notion of objective excellence of a city (the fullest natural unit of society, according to him), something which contrasts to a more modern approach valuing subjectivism and tolerance, but he does so even to the point that he identifies the objective excellence of a city through the objective excellence of persons. 

This appears to a position is strikingly harmonic with the Catholic position. First, certain persons are objectively better (such as persons of Godhead being worthy of worship, and Mary, the Mother of God, worthy of hyperdulia); or, one can consider the objectively better states in life such as consecrated life, or even the most basic objective distinction between the blessed and the damned. Indeed, it is this last comparison that extends this line of thought further, for while all are born with immutable human dignity, actions also matter. The whole Christian tradition of being judged based on one’s works testifies to this. This not to deny that man is saved by grace through faith. Rather, such teachings are not in contradiction with and must be taken in mutual light of Scripture passage such as these: “For the Son of Man is going to come in his Father's glory with his angels, and then he will reward each person according to what they have
Indeed, Cardinal Ratzinger hits on this point in his work *Introduction to Christianity*. In any case, what is a stake is the notion of objective goodness, i.e. sin and holiness (sanctification), good and bad deeds, and indeed, right and wrong itself.

The second quote is thus: “The end of politics is the best of ends; and the main concern of politics is to engender a certain character in the citizens and to make them good and disposed to perform noble actions.” Again, this quote affirms politics as a kind of universal ethics: persons are the most important entities in existence (especially in light of the doctrine of the triune personal God), and that can be seen, in some broad sense, in the science of politics, the science of the Church. Finally, certain acts are simply better and more perfect than others: there is a right and wrong.

Indeed, even beyond these two brief writings, Aristotle provides among the best viable alternative in the classical tradition of wisdom (philosophy and theology) to modern thought. The most prominent notion that must be affirmed, if a political theory is to be truly Catholic, is that goodness of persons leads to the goodness of the community (as opposed to the badness of person somehow giving rise to goodness of the community). Enlightenment thought begins the slide into the denial of any right and wrong, in the attempt to achieve a version of toleration to stop the religious persecutions and wars of the time.

Any political system is rooted in the person; Enlightenment thinkers tried the hopeless task of creating a system that would work without referencing the type of person that belong to it, which is a slight but critical move from designing a system that works for all persons. The latter recognizes the nature of the person as universal (within humanity) and tries to build from there; the former tries to build a universal politic without any reference to human nature and thus ignores the person. In their hasty ceiling-first attempt to build a house, a church, the political
systems of Enlightenment suffered from their poor anthropologies. Rather, saints come before the system, for no system will produce saints; not even the best laws can turn the wicked into saints, or God would have done that long ago. The externals of law cannot replace or determine automatically the internal state of man’s heart.

Conclusion of the Critique Enlightenment Philosophy

As such, a preliminary critique of the political Enlightenment philosophy has been offered. More specifically, Thomas Hobbes asserted a bad view of man and John Locke asserted an implicitly bad view of man (freedom contra relationality). In short, this mistaken anthropology led to ultimately to a flawed conception of society, and it is not a coincidence that Hobbes, Locke, and many others wished to divide the church from the state. For example, Hobbes held the state was more effective at wielding punishment than the church (for kings can execute the unruly, but popes can only threaten with damnation), and Locke held the question of salvation to be wholly divided from matters of the earth. The latter’s approach especially can be seen as mainly rooted in Cartesian philosophy, even if the link is merely an informal similarity of thought; that is to say, just as Descartes approached the human person as divided wholly between body and soul, and argued his philosophy was not related to matters of theology, Locke viewed earthly affairs as not concerned with theology and religion as largely irrelevant.\(^5\)

With this negative critique in mind, it is now time for positive vision of Catholic politics. Again, there are three central positions: first, that a monarchy is objectively best government, second, there should be no division between church and state; and third, the state should be explicitly Catholic. In all of this, what will be kept in mind is that the politics of the Church is theory of Kingdom of God. In other word, the true normative society is not only possible, but it is at hand, insofar as God (and his saints and angels) at work bringing it about, even now. It is
only after the resurrection of the dead that true Church will come into full being, as the earthy seed grows into the heavenly tree.\textsuperscript{52}

\textbf{The Threefold Positive Construction}

\textbf{The First Construction: One Society}

The first of the resultant arguments is that there ought be one society, with no division between church and state. First, a historical context is given to form the basis of such a position. Second, and centrally, man’s relationship to God and neighbor affirms the Church’s existence as the true state. Finally, Holy Scripture does not attack but support this position.

To the modern eye, the separation of church and state may seem to be a given, but from a historical perspective, the issue is not so one-sided. Indeed, the Medieval Church was preoccupied by this question.\textsuperscript{53} While the debate ultimately resulted in the division of church and state due in part to issues of corruption in the Church, it does not seem like such a division has been beneficial to European and other societies. Furthermore, St. Augustine, the great doctor of the Latin Church, in his \textit{magnum opus}, \textit{The City of God}, divided society not between the church and state, but between two intermingled societies.\textsuperscript{54}

Secondly, it is not as if the Church has simply been or ever will be an innocent part of society; it makes claims which has led to its persecution from its foundation. Shortly after Pentecost, Stephen, the first martyr, was killed; Peter, the first pope, was martyred; Paul, who wrote the first documents of the New Testament, was martyred. Even more fundamentally, it is the very through the very persecution of Jesus that the world is saved.\textsuperscript{55} The point of this litany is to draw attention to the foundational mission of the Church: opposition to this world for the sake of the world’s salvation, to be a narrow gate through which all can find rest.
Indeed, this is the first root problem for the division between church and state: the Church is complete for man’s perfection. Love of God, obedience to the first great command, completes man absolutely.\(^{56}\) If man successfully loves God, he is not incomplete in anyway; another way of saying this is that man’s salvation (and eternal life) rests in God, not in any other being. For this reason, the Church is its own society, insofar as it is full and complete unto itself, which needs no reference to any other society.

To further this point, the reason why there ought be one society, one church-state is that all mankind has one external good which orders all lesser goods: God.\(^{57}\) The fact that all creation has one destination means only one ship is needed, even if this ship (or ark) need be very big, even if one house needs many rooms.\(^{58}\) The unity of goods, of one heaven, one goal, one God and one end, causes this unity if organization, causes there to be only one society, in the normative sense. Again, all people have one most fundamental end to achieve by nature: communion with God. As such, all are ordered to communion to God, and as such all ought be in full communion with the Church, i.e. with each other. In other words, because are all made to love God (as God loves them), they are necessarily made to love each other, for how can one love God and hate what He loves?

Again, naturally, this love of God flows into the second great commandment: love of neighbor. A Doctor of the Church, St. Francis DeSales, explains this very well in his *Treatise on the Love of God*:

> “As God created man to his own image and likeness, so did he appoint for man a love after the image and resemblance of the love which is due to his own divinity. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind. This is the greatest, and the first commandment. And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Why do we love God, Theotimus? “The cause for which we love God,” says S. Bernard, “is God Himself;” as though he had said: we love God because he is the most sovereign and infinite goodness. And why do we love ourselves in charity? Surely because we are the image and likeness of God; and whereas all men are endowed with the same dignity, we love them also as ourselves, that is, as being holy and living images of the divinity. For it is on that account that we belong to God by so strict an alliance and so sweet a dependence of love, that he makes no difficulty to call himself our father, and to call us his children; it is on that account that we are
DeSales’ point here is that insofar as man is like God, the love of God is due is to man as well, in a fitting and proportional way. And the central relationship between God and man causes all other interpersonal relationships with neighbor to fall under the domain of a politic of charity. In other words, it is right to be charitable to another (to will the best i.e. want what is best), and therefore the Church, the means of establishing this love of neighbor, constitutes the fullness of society. In short, the same union with God that provides the church completeness is the same love which fills the world with love of neighbor, completing all social relationships, driving out what has been traditionally left to politics or the state, leaving no room whatsoever for a “secular society,” whatever that may mean.60

This elucidates the issue from the negative side: what is the purpose of the division between church and state? There seems to be none. Politics is again a matter of relationships, a matter of community. Religion (in the modern usage of the term) is a matter of relationships, and ultimately, all relationships can be summed up by the two great commands: love of God and love of neighbor. Regarding what is traditionally referred to as politics, the latter has greater visibility, insofar as neighborly love, i.e. interpersonal relationships between humans. Just as the first command establishes the Church’s complete perfection (insofar as anyone fully united to God is fully perfected), it flows into the second command, and reveals the domain traditionally claimed by the state is rightfully the land of the Church alone. The love of neighbor, as rooted in the love of God, is central to the true religion, and constitutes the fullness of political action.
This point will be made all the more obvious from a more inductive approach. Which political issue is not religious? What aspect of government does not rest in morality, morality resting in the nature of God? If one were to run alphabetically through issues from abortion to the last of all issues, all would be a matter of how to treat others (including non-human entities, such as the environment). There is no issue on which the faith has no claim, for the faith is the fullness of truth, and political debate (in the normative sense) is merely the pursuit of certain type of truth. Taxation and economics is clearly a matter of poverty; the environment is to be stewed; sexual ethics is clearly a matter of chastity; immigration a matter of how to treat the alien; wars ought to be just; and this continues *ad infinitum*.\(^{61}\) All being, matter and spirit (more abundant matter), is under the domain of God; if it is real, if it exists, it exists through God’s will and grace, and is under his dominion.

Now, perhaps one may argue that these issues have different degrees of approach; for example, it is one thing to say, our taxes should provide for the poor, but it is another thing how to bring that about. However, even the details of policy can be moral issues; after all, if a politician is facing the decision to cut the education budget in order to increase welfare, he has to consider the persons involved; and insofar as the concerned with persons, it is a matter of charity (*the law of relationships at an ontological level*) and thus religion. And, most importantly, if they are not moral issues, is it not merely a matter administration – and this is not basis to construct and independent and separate state, but would again, seem like another arm of the church, just as the workman in his workshop is too a part of the Church, but in a less visible way than a priest in his garments.

As such, those functions which are today associated with state may still exist in the normative society, but at no point is the Church itself to be considered a lesser, subservient sub-
Again, to suggest the state is either an equal partner to or anything more than a
temporary (and false) lord above the Church is to imply the Church is some how limited in
scope, its mission some how incomplete, its people in need of another good, which only the state
can provide.

To summarize, not only does the Church in her most visible arm proclaim clear stances
on many issues traditionally claimed to be the realm of politics (such as economics, sexual
ethics, and so on), but more importantly, each issue that exists has an objective right and wrong,
determined by the nature of God, and therefore a matter of the morals, and thus Church.

First Objection to One Society

One of the major responses traditionally leveled in defense of the division of church and
state is that Jesus Christ himself supported such a division. Indeed, there seems to be some
evident for this: “My kingdom is not of this world. If it were, my servants would fight to prevent
my arrest by the Jewish leaders. But now my kingdom is from another place.” And in general,
Christians never seemed traditionally political – in its early stages, Christians did not seek top-
down reform of the Roman Empire, but built from the ground up, simply by living a certain
lifestyle.

Indeed, a fuller analysis of scripture (including traditional Church interpretation) would
be needed to completely respond to this. Still, in light of the arguments just made, such an
approach to Christian politics seems to be a reductive attempt at best. Indeed, if the Christian is
concerned with the salvation of the world, the eternal welfare of others, how can his concern be
anything other than the fullness of politics?

As such, the temporary rejection of temporal power ought be to understood in light of the
cosmic scale; while he avoids the crowd wanting to crown him king, He also accepts the
universal crown bestowed on Him by His Father.\textsuperscript{64} While certain forms of political action are rejected, like raising a Hebrew army against Rome, this is only because it is not the true form of politics. To explain exactly why Christ’s passion brings about His reign, and not more superficial political action (like that of perhaps Mohammed or even more pertinently, King David, who foreshadowed Christ’s office), one would need a deep understanding of the nature of the Paschal mystery. Perhaps only an act of love can work at a universal level.

At the very least, though, the basic points stands: Jesus is not rejecting politics or authority or power, but first, a certain type of power, and second, a certain wielding of that power. In other words, he is rejecting the wrong ends, namely power which would not fully bring about salvation, and the wrong means, power wielded for selfish gains. After all, much of the drama within the Gospels center’s around Jesus’ dramatic claim (even if proclaimed only quietly at first) to be the very Son of God; this climaxes when He makes such a claim directly before the Sanhedrin, in the fullness of time, a claim that leads to his execution.\textsuperscript{65}

A suggestion can be made as to why Christ’s political action takes the form it does. Christ’s message should be seen as a paradoxical call to conquer through submission, which is at the heart of His Passion. Put to death by his enemies, he offers them salvation. The absolute realization of God’s relationship to man must come in its mature and final form.

In other words, the end goal is not here and now, but the heavenly kingdom, which is being established now, as this age is passing away. It should be kept in mind that Christ’s treatment of the current age (i.e. not wanting want \textit{crude and ineffective} war now) is the treatment of passing age. Again, if Christ is advocating radical submission to rulers (through Paul for example), it is not because they are lawful or normative, but rather because submission
to them is precisely how they are overthrown. In short, Christ is not dividing church against state, but placing his Church to conquer the world; it is war of state against state.

**Second Objection to One Society**

Another possible and common objection is thus: power corrupts, and therefore, it would best to keep it out of the hands of the Church, for the sake of her own purity. However, this line of thought fails. While some may argue absolute power corrupts absolutely, the only absolutely powerful being is God. God, however, is not also all-corrupt, but all-good. Power may intensify the manifestation of one’s corruption, and even be the occasion of sin, but power in and of itself is a perfection, not an evil. It is right for that which is good (which the Church ought be) to be powerful. Furthermore, this is not merely applicable to God, for Jesus, who was fully God and thus all-powerful, was also fully man; thus power does not necessarily corrupt man. Nor does it seem wise to say that Jesus is an exception because he was incorruptible; Mary, who could have sinned, did not, and is now crowned as queen of the universe, as Catholic tradition teaches. Furthermore, in Mariology there is the growing trend to argue God gives her power second only to her son, in some intercessory way. Finally, there is witness of the rest of the saints, who held positions of power, and were not necessarily corrupted by it.

Again, one must keep in mind that sin is a non-necessary entity, for otherwise it would not be freely chosen. As such, the question of what the goal ought be in the realm of politics and what danger lies in trying to achieve those goals are different matters. The general root of this irrational movement of thought is concluding that because a failed version of something is bad, it is inherently bad. Just because one is bitten by a rabid dog, does not mean it is rational to fear or try to destroy all dogs, for the evil which the dog carried out was not inherent to its nature. Just because past churchmen sinned with power does not mean it is wrong for the Church to possess
such power (no more than it is wrong for God to endow men and angels with freedom, though it may be abused). Furthermore, the issue of whether or not a couple should have child is a separate issue is of how to raise one – just as the issue of whether or not the Church should have power is different issue of how she should be given and wield such power. Just because there are risks in attempting to be perfect and good, does not mean it is wrong to attempt; the human person aims at the true perfection, the best end, not the most immediate. The end, the destination must be clear if progress toward is to be made; for the kingdom to be built, there first must be blueprints.

**Summary of One Society**

In itself, the Church is complete, and this completeness consists of in part the sphere traditionally surrendered to the modern state. This is not to assert that Church ought to invade the state in some crude sense, but rather to say that which the state claims dominion over is already sacred, at least in some most basic sense. After all, all neighborly relations are rooted in the love of God. What the precise role of the Church looks like in its absolute fullness, both in this earthly vale now and heavenly realm forever, is yet to be determined. A clearer vision, however, will shortly be provided.

**The Second Construction: The Monarchy**

"I have other sheep that do not belong to this fold. I must bring them also, and they will listen to my voice. So there will be one flock, one shepherd."

Scriptural Discussion

Today, it would seem ludicrous for a serious political movement to attempt to bring about a fully active monarchy in the United States, or any other modern developed nation. And indeed,
if such an event happened in an undeveloped country, it would likely be ignored or even condemned – perhaps with good reason. However, it should be pointed out in a simple fashion that the majority of societies, historically speaking, have lived under some form of monarchical rule. With this in mind, at the very least, modernity should consider the monarchy its parent.

This raises two points: first, a monarchy is not a fantasy, but rather a relevant government type. Second, while flawed societies in the past have had a flawed king, so too have good societies had good kings. To say that a monarchy is categorically bad is to say that there have been no flourishing societies historically speaking, or that a monarch unequivocally damages a good society. But yet, golden ages have happened under golden rulers, so to speak; while no age within this current passing age is perfect, it be would ludicrous to assert that there have not been fluctuations in the quality of societal life throughout human history. For every Emperor Nero there was a King Cyrus, for every King Henry VIII, a St. Louis IX, and for every King Solomon, a King David. These last two rulers in particular serve the entry point of a theological discussion of Kingship.

Indeed, Holy Scripture ought be one of the biggest challenges to modern Western thought. It is almost too hard to summarize how central a concept kingship plays within these ancient Semitic/Middle-Eastern and Greek writings. The king, after all, is the head of all persons, and is more less the person responsible for universal welfare of mankind. This culminates with Jesus, who is referred to as “The Christ,” the title of the Messiah, which is to say the true hero-king who saves all. As such, this means one finds the one true God in the true eternal King – one finds that Jesus Christ, who is the long awaited for King of the Hebrews, is also God. And this seems greatly fitting, insofar as, again, God is in relationship to all as the ultimate ruler. Finally, it should be noted how insistently Christ speaks of the Kingdom of
God, the Kingdom of Heaven, and His Kingdom – indeed he is identified upon his cross as the King of the Jews, the charge by which the Jewish priests convince Pontius Pilate to execute him.

Indeed, the word “king” in its common usage perhaps ought be applied to the Vicar of God or the Son of God. After all, at the risk of being redundant, God is the title of God; but there is a likeness between earthly rulers and the one ruler. Traditionally, king has been applied primarily to earthly rulers and only secondly to God (as God is also called Rock, or Father, or Shepherd), and earthly rulers have only been treated as divine in a largely secondarily way. In other words, though Egyptian, Roman, Persian and other ancient rulers have taken titles such as “Son of God,” they were always more fundamentally treated as earthly, ruling figure. Perhaps, for non-Hebrews (and even for the Chosen people), because there was no true God for them to worship, it provided a temptation to view the tangible king as a virtual God. Such was the abomination of Hebrew subjugation, before forced to honor one like King Nebuchadnezzar, or not being able to worship their God while in Egypt.

The Old Testament can be understood as the story of establishing God as God. It begins with God’s rightful dominion over all, through His creation (i.e. gift of being), and then details the ups and downs of humanity’s not wholly rebellious relationship. It is hard to exaggerate how much emphasis is placed on God’s identity as rightful ruler (though this is far from the whole picture). Indeed, Lord is among his most common titles (along with “King,” whereas the more intimate “Father” does not play a large role until the New Testament). Furthermore, two of the greatest struggles the people of God face are first, to not fall into idolatry, and second, to obey God’s law (the latter especially emphasizes God’s political claim upon man). Lastly, the first commandment of all is to give God right relationship, a sentiment which is echoed almost identically five times throughout the Old Testament, and finally once in the last book of the
This establishment of right relationship (which ultimately culminates in the love as shown by the Son) comes to the forefront especially once Israel is freed from Egypt and finally established in the Promised Land. For short while, Israel possess judges, temporary rulers appointed by God who only appear or act in times of crises. Before long, however, they seek a king. Most interestingly, in essence, their sin was the same as that of Adam and Eve and the prodigal son; all were too impatient, desiring what they would be given to soon. The parents of the human race desired “to be like Gods,” which is in itself is not wrong, for after all, God offers us divinization through His Son.73 The prodigal son also demands his rightful inheritance, but before the appropriate time.74

In other words, the people of Israel desired a king, a right desire insofar as they were human (just as it is natural for a son to desire his father and mother), but could not wait for the fullness of God’s kingship, a kingship described perhaps most explicitly in the Book of Revelation, which tells of, among other things, the conclusion of salvation history. Indeed, God will fully be the leader of the human race one day, insofar as the Catholic teaching is that Christ has been crowned king and will come again to first, judge the living and the dead, and second, rule in eternal peace. Simply because the Day of the Lord, when Christ is king and His enemies made subject, is does not mean it is not coming. In any case, just as the prodigal son, who demands his inheritance early and goes onto squander it, so too did Israel squander its inheritance.75 Again, they had just possessed the Promised Land when they immaturely demand the fullness of their inheritance:

“When Samuel became old, he made his sons judges over Israel...Yet his sons did not follow in his ways, but turned aside after gain; they took bribes and perverted justice. Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah, and said to him, ‘You are old and your sons do not
follow in your ways; appoint for us, then, a king to govern us, like other nations.’ But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, ‘Give us a king to govern us.’ Samuel prayed to the Lord, and the Lord said to Samuel, ‘Listen to the voice of the people in all that they say to you: for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being king over them.’” 76

To summarize a long story, Israel indeed receives an earthly king, chosen by God through his prophet Samuel. While it is easy to regard the narrative of the Hebrew Kingdom as just another part of the Bible, it should be understood as the center point of the Old Testament, insofar as the kingship of Solomon constitutes the high point of the story of the Jews, the greatest extent and glory of the kingdom, before his corruption leads to the division, fall, and occupation of the Promised Land. Indeed, to summarize briefly, after a short, dramatic reign of King Saul, King David claims the throne, whose heroic deeds and saintly life richly yet also imperfectly provides for the rise of the kingdom and thus the people. This ultimately culminates in his son, who at long last builds the temple in Jerusalem – the very house of God, a symbol of ultimate harmony with the divine, a house of God residing peacefully and gloriously in their capital city. It was a singular entity, the doorway to God, serving as the only true place of sacrifice (a ritual means of purification allowing them to maintain God’s presence in their life). The temple functioned as the sign of Israel’s greatest success, a sign of wisdom, of peace, beauty, and above all, the glory of God. 77

The very builder, once chosen (as even more suitable than David to rule in peace) and blessed by God, however, is responsible for its downfall. King Solomon, under whom Israel collectively reached its greatest heights (not only in material but also spiritual wealth), falls into sin, and shortly, so does the whole kingdom, as one monarch after another falls into sin, most prominently idolatry, which leads to a disregard for the rest God’s law, for why respect God’s word if one does not respect the Lord God? Until Christ Jesus, it is a struggle for the Jews simply
not be occupied by a foreign power, much less have a united kingdom, posses a temple, and finally, have a devout and good people—the ultimate goal.

Thus, the Old Testament can be seen as centered around this moment of kingship. It is the importance of this kingship (as the kingship represents the people) that gives Jesus one of his most common public titles: son of David, the Christ (anointed as was David), the Messiah, whom David’s son was meant to be. Insofar as Solomon failed, Christ is the new and true Solomon (as he is the new and true Adam), not merely wise but the very wisdom of God, to whom the crowds cry out.

This discussion of kingship within the Old Testament and its fulfillment in the person of Jesus Christ (who is king of not only the Jews, but the entire universe) attempts to show the monarchy is not a flawed governmental system, but rather, it is man’s destiny and man’s truest government. The radicalness of the Christian Gospel is that Jesus is not only the true King, whom the Jews awaited, but God as well. He is the King and Temple in one person.

Again, a host of well-marshaled scholarly scriptural study would be needed to entirely prove this point, beyond the mere point of how often Jesus himself is speaking of the Kingdom, which is more or less the focus for the Synoptic Gospels (whereas the Father is the focus of the Johannine one). For lack of that, it is Psalm 110 that most clearly asserts the kingly office of the Son. In it, David refers his two lords; one lord is giving his power over to other, in the line: “The Lord says to my lord, ‘sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.’” In other words, the Father is handing over all power and dominion to his Son. Indeed, this is the same psalm which traditionally affirms Christ’s priestly office, as it says “You are a priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek,” and is the same psalm by which Jesus affirms his own vocation as higher than even David:
“Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them this question: ‘what do you think of the Messiah? Whose son is he?’ They said to him, ‘The son of David.’ He said to them, ‘How is it then that David by the Spirit calls him Lord, saying, ‘The Lord said to my Lord, ’Sit at my right hand, Until I put your enemies under your feet’”? If David thus calls him [the messiah] Lord, how can he [the messiah] be his [David’s] son?’ No one was able to give him an answer, nor from that day did anyone dare to ask him any more questions.”

In other words, the theologian-lawyers (it would be good to notice the union of state and church, of religion and politics, for the Law was a religious entity) of the day are asked by Jesus in one of their public dialogues what they think of the Messiah, the publically awaited figure who will restore the kingdom (and thus the integrity of the lives of all Hebrew persons). They naturally answer that the Messiah is the heir to David, insofar as that is the scriptural promise made by God to David, that his son would be king forever. Jesus points out that He, the Messiah, will be greater than David because unlike David’s kingship, his Kingdom will never fail and extend beyond the spatial-temporal limits of Israel to include all of existence, as is testified to even by David’s own words.

**Argument in the Abstract**

With a plethora of material presented to show how legitimately embedded the notion of kingship is in salvation history, abstract philosophical argumentation for the monarchy can now take the stage. In order to describe the perfect government, one must first discern what government is. Now, normative earthly governments respond to what is right and wrong (i.e. they are not the basis of it – a government proclaiming slavery to be right does not make it so), and in turn seek to order society and how members are to interact. For example, the government do not tell the craftsman how to make a good shoe, but does tell him how is allowed to acquire materials, sell his good, how he should treat his employees, his customers and so on. Second, they enforce this law, this articulation of inter-personal right and wrong; they respond to the
people’s response, rewarding those who obey and punishing those who do not. In terms of their relationship to those they rule, they are first teacher (or rabbi), and second, judge.

Indeed this is not a small job, making sure all parties work together so society forms a cohesive entity, a body, with all members working towards one end and the true good (God). The need for government at the earthly level is rooted in the complexity of societies as they grow. Law is a matter of inter-relations, of guidance, of the whole working together. That is why the two great laws are about relationship: loving God and loving neighbor. Even the Decalogue has been traditionally treated this way, insofar as the first three commandments are instructions or articulations of how to treat God, and last seven how to treat one’s fellow human. This appears to be sum of earthly governments ought do: they create laws and enforce them.

Now it becomes clearer why only one ruler is needed. After all, the task of a ruler is to discern what is right and wrong, declare this right way of conduct to the people, and finally treat them in accord with their action. To give an example, a ruler must decide to declare murder wrong, to which the people will respond by either obeying or disobeying, to which he will respond with reward and punishment, according to deed. In other words, nothing that cannot be carried about by a single person, for a perfect mind should be able to know the truth carry out the right course of action with all power.

Here, a Chalcedonian understanding of the human person is made use of, insofar as God assumed every part of humanity, including the human intellect, and was still able not only to know the truth, but be the truth. In other words, not only is Jesus Christ the perfect King, in a pre-eminent way, but other persons too may aspire to a certain likeness with him.

To make an analogy, one may consider a trip to a doctor’s office. Only one doctor is needed to make the diagnosis, because the mind (in some sense) is complete and can discern the
truth. This may seem obvious but it is an interesting point; when it comes to reproduction, after all, one human person is naturally insufficient. For the role of king, this is not so, for it is a matter of intellect and will, of knowing the truth and acting well, which again, can be found within a single person.\textsuperscript{82}

If two perfect doctors are present, the latter one is redundant; so too if there are two perfect captains on the same ship who both know what they ought do and do so, or if there were two fathers in a single family. Now, there does not appear any problem in sharing office of doctor, of captain, or king. Indeed, Scripture promises Christ’s followers a share in Christ’s eternal rule.\textsuperscript{83} However, it must be kept in mind that all ruler-ship flows first through Him (and before Him, His Father), and as such, He is always still king in some way, no matter how many regents He has, no matter how often He lets other doctors’ makes the diagnosis, because they are only able to make such perfect diagnosis through Him, with Him, and in Him.

As should be clear, it is Christ who is this one monarch in the fullness of the office (insofar as he given it by his Father). Thus it becomes clearer why He is the true king: He truly knows what is right, the basis of the first act of a governor, explaining to persons of society what their role is, so that shoe-maker or doctor does not need to consider the matter of politics. In other words, this is the role of His first coming, where, as the perfect image of the Father’s true love, He issues His commands, His new law of love. Second, He knows how to respond to his subjects and will do so rightly, which is the role carried out in his second coming, in which he enforces his law with perfect mercy and justice, as the true teacher, judge, and thus king of mankind.\textsuperscript{84}

To expand, Jesus Christ occupies the office of offices, the role of roles – he, as the head, integrates the many unique roles of others into one cohesive body.\textsuperscript{85} He does this by loving all
perfectly, thus showing all how to treat others. This law of charity functions at a universal level, and encompasses all interpersonal relations at the broadest of levels (indeed, for God is both Being and Charity). Thus, we see the true end of politics: rather than debate about the specifics of tax policies, He commands love. He articulates (and perhaps even determines, insofar as he is God) what is right and wrong. He describes how all should function as a whole, in the interrelations of all parties. In other words, he tells us to love God, out of which love of neighbor flows, for who come to one’s Father, hating his children?

Christ’s kingly office of articulating love can perhaps be best seen in his moment of crucifixion, which is the ultimate image of love. His suffering functions salvifically, and thus is the moment in which he earns the title of Messiah, of King. Paul emphasizes this throughout the Scriptures: it is his completed mission of obedience, obedience to death upon Christ that earns Him eternal glory and endless dominion at the right hand of the Father. Supporting this cross, one must also keep in mind his many words, none of which will pass away, including to love another as He has love mankind. He is the true Law and Temple, the source of true politics and religion. He is, indeed, the perfect image of the Father, His very Word of Love.86

**Argument against Anarchy**

A tempting objection may appear at this point: if this society is normative, and its individual person perfect, why is a leader a needed at all? However, this simply ignores the nature of creation. There are degrees and diversity of goodness that have nothing to do with sin, so its removal would not remove the hierarchy. To make the clearest analogy, there are different roles within a family, which is of course not inherently sinful. In other words, in a perfect family, it does not mean all people are adults – children, who hold less power, still remain.
Indeed, within creation at large, there is a general hierarchy, for example, with man taking a higher role than animals. So too, within society, there may be higher or lowers roles. These examples can be multiplied: one does not need to say there cannot be a perfect pen because it would not be as good as a perfect person. Or within a perfect car, though the wheels are lesser than the car as a whole, this does not mean the wheels are imperfect.

Again, the point is there can be higher or lower roles within a perfect entity. In society, there are manual laborers, craftsmen, athletes, farmers, artists, doctors, lawyers, educators, administrators, and so on. Diversity is not an evil. The governor is merely the one who spends his time articulating how these parts are to act as a whole. As such, Christ role is the role of roles, as he articulates the relationship of the pieces and thus facilitating the integration and harmony of all. In other words, teaches us to love another. He is the Logos, the Word, the ordering principle of unity.

The First and Re-Occurring Objection: Politics of Despair

Just as the most common objection to union of church and state is historical evidence that it is dangerous when corrupted, such similar arguments are often leveled against the monarchy. But, as before, this is no argument when discerning the normative vision of society: a child can turn into the worst sort of criminal, but that should not universally dissuade parents from having children. In other words, merely because something can go bad, it is a non sequitur to conclude it is inherently wrong. To multiply the examples, it is possible to die in a horrific car crash; does that mean it is rational to never drive? Thus, the philosophical argument holds no weight: no matter how bad a corrupt version of a thing may be, it does not mean it is inherently bad. No matter how dark an angel may be if it chooses to abuse the gift of life, it is not wrong to create them.
In short, those who wish for a limitation and division of power are ultimately wishing for the division of a good, for after all, power is a perfection of God. There is no contradiction between being all-good and all-powerful, just as there is no contradiction between being God and man, however strange it may seem. In more ordinary terms, not only is power when used for good is better than power when used for bad, but it is better than no power at all; therefore, one should seek to give power to the good (i.e. give power to a just king). To extend this, a saint is not only better than a wicked person, but also a non-person. Therefore, one should not seek to be dead merely because it is better than being wicked, but understand that the normative person is a holy, living one – just as the normative state is one of absolute monarchical power wielded by pure hands.

The modern thought of a weakened and crippled political system that prevents people from abusing power by denying them power is, again, essentially espousing a gospel of despair and sin. It holds that man must and will necessarily become corrupt, that it is unrealistic to trust human lords, and therefore humans ought agree to commit governmental suicide and limit powers. This is as brutal as a man believing he will sin and cutting off his arms preemptively. It is almost as if Enlightenment philosophy declares it is better to be animal than human, because an animal cannot commit an injustice – but that is only because animal cannot reach the level of perfection of love. But indeed, a society that proclaims that virtue is an impossibility will breed sin much more quickly than which identifies the right and pursues it.

Finally, at the philosophical level, in a strangely satisfactory way, it may be argued that finding the worst entity is the easiest way to find the best. In other words, the worst corrupted and abused good is a sign of the highest good when perfected, and that is the concern of one who seeks the normative, perfect state. If the militant Islamic theocracy seems to be the worst form of
government in the world it is only proof that the pure theocracy is best; a brilliant mind turned to evil is more dangerous than a untrained one, but that does not mean intellectual prowess is bad.

In some sense, this is acknowledged by St. Thomas Aquinas, who holds rule by one, when abused, i.e. a tyranny, is the worst form of government: “however, if the government should turn away from justice, it is more expedient that it be a government by many, so that it may be weaker and the many may mutually hinder one another. Among unjust governments, therefore, democracy is the most tolerable, but the worst is tyranny.”

It is important to note that it is precisely what the post-classical thinker seeks: a tolerable, unjust government, for holiness and charity is naïve ideal. Furthermore, Aristotle thinks along the similar lines, continuing the analogy person to state:

“For man, when perfected, is the best of animals, but, when separated from law and justice, he is the worst of all; since armed injustice is the more dangerous, and he is equipped at birth with arms, meant to be used by intelligence and virtue, which he may use for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue, he is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony. But justice is the bond of men in states, for the administration of justice, which is the determination of what is just, is the principle of order in political society.”

Indeed, this ought be agreed with: an abused theocracy is worst form, one where the religion is wrong and forced down throats. But what if Christ was reigning? What if John Paul II was the governor of a town, or Mother Theresa the local judge, so to speak? Indeed it should be noted that in religious orders, and indeed, the Church itself, is based in monarchical structure, perhaps precisely because it affirms the reality of human perfection through love by the grace of God.

Thus, the question seems clear: does one take the Enlightenment, un-Catholic approach and say sin man must sin, therefore, how shall a government be designed? Or does one take the approach of the gospel, where man is called to the perfection of the Father, to the beatitude of the son?

The Third Construction: Christian Society
Finally, this perfect society ought be explicitly Christian. After all, Christianity constitutes the fullness of life, and as such, in heaven, Christianity will be openly accepted by all, beyond all doubt. Indeed, this will be case in final kingdom, which earthly state should seek to work towards. Especially in light of the documents promulgated at the Second Vatican Council, this attitude of conversion must in some way related to tolerance. Indeed, it would seem the visible Church is in some way the extraordinary Church. After all, indeed great blessing to be born into Church, an unmerited gift (along with life itself). At the same time, God wills all be saved, and by his omnipotence, it therefore follows that all are offered salvation. If all salvation is through Christ, and salvation is offered to all, Christ is offered to all.

Clearly however, the visible Church has not been offered to all (including those who lived before Christ, preached to in hell; but also miscarried infants, and isolated natives, etc.). The point here is to maintain objective excellence of the visible Church, and that it ought be extended to all, while also maintaining salvation is not limited to the visible Church. Just because God is not limited by his sacraments, does not mean it is not more blessed for all to receive the sacraments explicitly. Finally, in consideration of the perfect society, all persons will be perfect, i.e. saints. All saints will commonly and openly accepted Christ. What all this means is that man must know work to bring the Church to all.

Conclusion

Enlightenment philosophy is misguided in its foundation, as Descartes unjustifiably broke from the Western tradition of philosophy and theology. Such errors were compounded in the uncharitable anthropologies of Hobbes and Locke. In the light of these errors, it becomes clearer why a unified Catholic theocracy would be the truly normative vision of society. After all, the Incarnation bears witness to the potential perfection of man and his world. This unity of
society is based in the unity of God’s love, which includes and demands a like love neighbors, and leaves no room for a divided society. Finally, the unity of ruler-ship is based in the unity of the person, including the human person, when it comes to two fold act of governing, i.e. teaching and judging rightly (including the enforcement of such judgment). Finally, if Christianity is the true religion, it would appear that this society ought be fully and explicitly Catholic.93

The starkness of such a position when compared to the modern approach to politics is evident, but modern politics is not God’s politics. If Rome fell to brutal barbarian conquests just a century of so being painfully conquered and converted by the sacrifice of the martyrs, so too can the West fall. In light of such drastic statements, two things must be kept in mind. First, the reason for striving to correct envisioning the perfect community of man is because man must have the right end to make any real progress. To move toward the kingdom, (to change oneself through the grace of God), to move toward God, one must treat God and his neighbor correctly. In particular, one must resist the world’s resistance to charity. He must remain resolutely naïve and entrenched in his innocence and purity, even beyond the point of crucifixion.

Second, to bring the kingdom down to earth, to change the world through the grace of God, one must know what change to bring about. In other words, in some sense, the Catholic is not merely waiting for heaven, is not merely waiting for God, but is waiting by trying to change others. Indeed, it should be the goal of the Church to participate in Christ’s mission to convert and save the world. This rebellion, of course, does not take a crude nature, of swords or guns. Rather, it ought take the most universal tact: it must seek to win on a cosmic scale, in the realm of spirit, not flesh, just as Christ engaged in cosmic warfare to conquer for his Church.

The current age is the age of the vicar – humankind has witnessed the triumph of Easter, and awaits the Apocalypse. This notion of continuity and place-holding should apply not only to
the Pope, but to the whole people, in a different but like way. As such, two comments must be made as to the model of this earthly state, which is ordained to bring about heavenly kingdom.94

Finally, perhaps most importantly, this age is defined more than anything else, persecution.95 The Christian is called to battle, to revolution in some sense – but again, through the cross. Jesus did not come to bring peace, but sword and fire. No words any page can be substituted for truly bringing this about through charity; it is not, therefore, however, hopeless to preach. But the preaching of the self can never be substituted for the conversion of others. The Christian must perform a rebellion within the rebels’ ranks, for sin itself, which now holds dominion of this world, was a wrongful rebellion. But this rebellion must be through submission. Nothing will bring about the kingdom so quickly as innocently suffering for it. It is how Christ conquered in the first place; it is how martyrs conquered Rome; it is how it will happen again.96 The battle can only be won as it always been won.

Christ, the Lamb of God, tells us clearly: suffer innocently. 97
NOTES


2 Crucially, it should be understood as an overview and general outline of the arguments that could be expanded for the sake of a full vision of the Christian notion of “The Kingdom of God.”

3 Or, at least the most viable rational defense of the Christian belief system would seem to rest in a rejection of voluntarism, which holds that God can impose moral law’s regardless of His (or man’s) nature. On the contrary, it appears traditional to view the moral law as an articulation of wisdom and instruction on to how to be truly happy.

4 Despite what some might say about theologians minding their own business, it appears that if the Christian position is true, ethics is morality roughly speaking (for it too is based in God, whether or not it references Him), and politics is merely communal morality.

5 The basic point is that if Christianity is right for the individual (as the Catholic Church holds) it of necessity holds for all individuals, and thus society.

6 Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2nd ed., 680-82.

7 Ibid., 380-384.


9 CCC, 44-49.


11 Except perhaps Friedrich Nietzsche or Jean-Paul Sartre.

12 Pecknold, Christianity and Politics. 1-15.

13 It should be noted, even at the level of metaphysics, Descartes’ division created the infamous problem of interaction (not unlike Plato’s problem of absolutely dividing form and matter). After all, if two entities are wholly unrelated, how could they interact? Indeed, it seems impossible for there to be two wholly unrelated entities, for they would share existence, which is a likeness. Furthermore, if the interaction of two entities within a single reality is observed, is not their interaction and likeness a more basic point than their difference? And finally, while Descartes’ approach has led more quickly to materialist philosophy, it seems difficult to conceive of the truth as a material entity, thus negating the possibility of reason.

14 “I have always thought that two issues—namely, God and the soul—are chief among those that ought be demonstrated with the aid of philosophy rather than theology.” Rene Descartes, Meditations on First Philosophy in which the Existence of God and the Distinction of the Soul from the Body are Demonstrated, trns. Donald A. Cross. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing
Descartes goes onto make a sharp division between matters of faith and matters of reason.

15 This is especially evident from his terminology, such as “soul” and “matter,” which are highly technical words rooted in Platonism and Aristotelian thought, which Scholastics like St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and Bl. Duns Scotus based themselves in, a point made by historical scholars such as Fr. Fredrick Copleston, SJ.

16 Of course, of greater value than any critique of Descartes’ would be a proof of Christianity.

17 Indeed, one must ignore the fact that philosophy had made progress if one holds to the Christian classical narrative, from the Pre-Socrates materialists, to Plato’s idealism, to Aristotle realism, to the Scholastic synthesis, (with other schools on the fringes).

18 Descartes, 18.

19 Descartes, 2. “And finally, I was strongly urged to do this by some people who knew that I had developed a method for solving all sorts of problems in the sciences—not a new one, mind you, since nothing is more ancient than the truth, but one they had seen me use with some success in other areas.”

20 Descartes, 13-24.


22 While it could be (and has been) argued that a defense for such a position is to be found in Descartes’ epistemology, in which some truth is intuitively known, this appears unsatisfying for two reasons. First, his very psychology does not appear to bring clear and sound arguments for intuitive knowledge in and of itself, and second, if certain truths are simply known intuitively, they ought be the starting point of philosophy, not a method of doubt. Copleston, Volume IV, 90-115.

23 Descartes, 8-10.

24 Still, because the large differences between their resulting philosophy, Descartes’ successors’ agreement with him only went so far. Indeed, his particular dualist metaphysics and his subject-to-object empiricism are rather unique to him, meaning it is largely rejected by those who follow him. Still, the practical effects are obvious. Indeed, even philosophers are human beings, and Descartes’ battering ram of a philosophical move gave them room to think. Indeed, despite the timelessness they strive for in their writings, thinkers are often very affect by the times. The horrible wars of religion provoked Hobbes and Locke, the debates of the Reformation provoked thinkers like David Hume and Baruch Spinoza; even Blaise Pascal, Soren Kierkegaard, and Georg Hegel experienced inner turmoil about their lives. Despite all their speculative enterprises, philosophers are still very much flesh and blood.
Indeed, St. Thomas Aquinas was trained from an early childhood in a Benedictine monastery; furthermore, many Enlightenment thinkers confessed to being frustrated by their early education, which was largely Scholastic. Finally, since Aquinas, there has been no greater Scholastic thinker, a potentially distressing sign about the lack of growth in the classical Christian tradition.

For whatever reason, Aristotle’s science, while a great leap forward for its time, stalled in some sense, before breakthroughs were had by hostile parties, who tended to blame the great philosopher (or at least his school) for the state of material sciences had found themselves, which historically speaking does not seem to have much truth to it (for medieval science was notable both in itself, and in preparing the stage for such breakthroughs). Indeed, like the model teacher, the model school itself should be charitable: any work of human hands should be ready to lay down its life for a better version of itself. A good teacher, just like a good father, should wish to see those under him surpass him.

This can be seen as analogous to good and evil, insofar as good does not necessitate evil, but evil cannot exist without the good, for evil only exists as a corruption of the good.

Thomas Hobbes, The Leviathan, ed. Charles W. Eliot. (New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909–14), XIII.1-10. “During the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that conditions called war; and such a war, as if of every man, against every man…To this war of every man against every man, this also in consequent; that nothing can be unjust. The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice have there no place. Where there is no common power, there is no law, where no law, no injustice. Force, and fraud, are in war the cardinal virtues…No arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death: and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.”

Considerations such as these become clearer when considering raising a child in this world.

Deneen: “Even marriage, Locke holds, is finally to be understood as a contract whose conditions are temporary and subject to revision…”

Pecknold, 69-83,114-118.

John Locke, A Letter Concerning Toleration. (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 2002), 141. Emphasis added. While shortly after, he writes man can debate about right and wrong but cannot use force to settle such a debate (a much more legitimate claim), the quoted statement is taken as paradigmatic of more underlying attitude found in Locke. He called for matters of religion to be declared largely prevalent in the public sphere, so as to purify the government from theological strife. As such, any notion that man is fundamentally communal being is destroyed, for such a truth is based in God, and therefore, theology.

Romans 5:8. “But God proves his love for us in that while we still were sinners Christ died for us.” James 5:19-20 “My brothers and sisters, if anyone among you wanders from the truth and is brought back by another, you should know that whoever brings back a sinner from wandering will save the sinner’s soul from death and will cover a multitude of sins.” Ezekiel 3:18-21 “If I say to the wicked, ‘You shall surely die’, and you give them no warning, and do not speak to warn the wicked from their wicked way, in order to save their life, those wicked persons shall die for their iniquity; but their blood I will require at your hand. But if you warn the wicked, and
they do not turn from their wickedness, or from their wicked way, they shall die for their iniquity; but you will have saved your life. Again, if the righteous turn from their righteousness and commit iniquity, and I lay a stumbling-block before them, they shall die; because you have not warned them, they shall die for their sin, and their righteous deeds that they have done shall not be remembered; but their blood I will require at your hand. If, however, you warn the righteous not to sin, and they do not sin, they shall surely live, because they took warning; and you will have saved your life.” Clearly, the Christian is called to be concerned with another’s salvation.

34 Genesis 4:9. “Then the Lord said to Cain, ‘Where is your brother Abel?’ He said, ‘I do not know; am I my brother’s keeper?’”


36 Indeed, the images of beatitude are often social, such as the heavenly city Jerusalem or the wedding feast. Indeed, the Catholic notion of God is itself of an eternal, communal being; and the God of hosts, not only extends such a communal nature to all in creation, but even assumes matter to restore communion.

37 The basic principle at work is that tendency reveals nature, Aristotelian approach. Things are known by that which they most often do. Thus, acorns tend to turn into trees, they fore they are oriented naturally to become trees. In other words, the majority determines the rule, not the minority; thus man is usually at peace and with others and acts well (which is why murder occur only within a small portion of the population, and only accounts for a small part of their life, temporally speaking).

38 Indeed, Jean-Jacques Rousseau began to near this rejection of society itself (along with Nietzsche and Sartre much latter), with his notion of the noble savage, yet, very notably, ultimately still concluded man should live societally. None of the Enlightenment philosophers advocated isolation and the eremitic life, which they should have, unless man is naturally made for communion and intercourse.

39 The fundamental irony of Hobbes becomes clearer: he suggests that warring citizens should freely surrender their freedom (a good act) and give it to a king (another warring human), who must discipline these citizens (a good act), who are somehow in both need of external discipline yet capable of surrendering their freedom freely.


41 Or at an even more traditional level, it is has been Catholic teaching that man was made to know, serve, and love God, in this life and the next.

Further, citizenship extends universally, as Paul explains both in Galatians 3:28 and Colossians 3:11.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* Ila-IIae, q. 184, art. 1, (Blackfriars edition, 1973). “Anything is said to be perfect so far as it attains its proper end, which is ultimate perfection. But it is charity that unites us to God, who is the ultimate end of the human soul, since, as St John says, ‘He that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him (1Jn 4:16).’ Therefore the perfection of the Christian life consists principally in charity.”

In other words, all human persons have irrevocable dignity, such that any person is loved (and ought be loved), even those in hell with their internal perversion of hating love, if it is chosen by their own hand.

I.e., salvation comes by the free gift of God, which is accepted through faith in or belief in God, which the gospel of John is so emphasizes.

Matthew 16:27. Indeed, even Paul, whose writings Luther’s infamous “sola fides” teaching was based on affirms this, insofar as he distinguishes different degrees of good works in 1 Corinthians 3:10-15 in order to explain the reality of Purgatory, necessary for only some: “According to the grace of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation, and someone else is building on it. Each builder must choose with care how to build on it. For no one can lay any foundation other than the one that has been laid; that foundation is Jesus Christ. Now if anyone builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw—the work of each builder will become visible, for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each has done. If what has been built on the foundation survives, the builder will receive a reward. If the work is burned, the builder will suffer loss; the builder will be saved, but only as through fire.” Emphasis added.


With perhaps the exception of Thomas Aquinas and the whole of the scholastic tradition – an admittedly gaping exception.

This general approach of dividing earth from heaven is often traced to late Scholastic thought. And indeed, it may appear a much more tempting conclusion, that matters of liturgy more or less nonsense, when people are drawn, quartered, and hung from London Bridge over the matter (the point here that such grave mistakes can be occasioned by grave situations and pressures).

Luke 13:18-19. “He said therefore, ‘What is the kingdom of God like? And to what should I compare it? It is like a mustard seed that someone took and sowed in the garden; it grew and became a tree, and the birds of the air made nests in its branches.” Emphasis added. Indeed, after the resurrection of the dead, the true church will come into full being. All that is now earthly is some sense passing, which is why Paul, the Evangelists, and Christ himself exhort man to
prepare himself. It is under this context that it should be noted that even in light of the apocalypse, the continuity between heaven and earth is affirmed.

53 Pecknold 51-68.

54 Ibid, 30-50. And indeed, what is here being considered is the normative state, i.e. one in which sin has been conquered. In other words, it is important to understand simply what the city of God ought look like, both now and forever. Indeed, it would seem ludicrous to say the Church needs a state separate from itself.

55 CCC 619-623. From Christ earning his crown during his crucifixion to the earlier flight of Holy Family to Egypt to escape the Massacre of Innocents, to even before that, the Church has been persecuted. Mary, who had just conceived Jesus, was under threat of being stoned; and indeed, even from man’s time in the Garden of Eden has there been those who seek his ill. The paradox of Christian rebellion to such war is a rebellion through submission: be crucified to conquer, return evil for good. CITE coals?

56 The Church is the means of loving of God, His Love being the basis of man’s action.

57 What is a society, a state, a church, or an assembly (the last of these being the original meaning of the word “church” in Greek)? It is a community or group of people; it is multiple persons. Now, all people have one end: God. From this, it is clear there ought be only one community, (or at most two, if one considers the damned a separate state, though this does not seem Cleary to be so—i.e., even hell is under God’s dominion). Within this Church-society, there are of course divisions of higher and lower goods (such as food, a basic material good, or art, or contemplation, a spiritual good). Still, all these lower goods are organized under one heading, and therefore there is only one society for there is only one true Good, one God, one end, and one telos, something that is only to be finally established after the resurrection of the dead. The matter of how the crew is organized will come later for the ship determines how the crew should act.

58 John 14:1-4; “Do not let your hearts be troubled. Believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father’s house there are many dwelling-places. If it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, so that where I am, there you may be also. And you know the way to the place where I am going.” Emphasis added.


60 Regarding what is traditionally considered the role of the state, it appears there are issues of ends (morals) and issues of means (how to bring about these ends); the former is a matter of theology and philosophy, the latter is a matter of administration.

61 See Exodus 21-32.

62 CCC, 890-892.

63 John 18:36.
64 John 6:15 “When Jesus realized that they were about to come and take him by force to make him king, he withdrew again to the mountain by himself.”

65 Matthew 26:63–68:

“But Jesus was silent. Then the high priest said to him, ‘I put you under oath before the living God, tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God.’ Jesus said to him, ‘You have said so. But I tell you, “From now on you will see the Son of Man/seat at the right hand of Power/and coming on the clouds of heaven.”’ Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, ‘He has blasphemed! Why do we still need witnesses? You have now heard his blasphemy. What is your verdict?’ They answered, ‘He deserves death.’ Then they spat in his face and struck him, and some slapped him, saying, ‘Prophesy to us, you Messiah! Who is it that struck you?’

Furthermore, the question of Jesus’s divine and thus regal identity is at the heart of Mark’s Gospel, historically perhaps the first gospel written. It establishes the Incarnation in itself, as Jesus divinity is the reoccurring theme – the Father twice speaks from heaven naming Him Son, demons cry out at his presence identifying His divine nature, Roman centurion and High Priest guess identity. The disciples struggle to understand, and keep secret afterwards; Peter is praised and given papacy by means of being first to recognize (yet even here, Christ says still has to suffer and fulfill). At the very the beginning of the Gospel of Mark, Jesus rejects the temptation to deny his identity as the Son of the God.

66 Insofar as it rooted in the grace of God – indeed the Church is best seen her living image, Mary, who is Mother in the order of Grace. Indeed, in light of recent Mariology, it seems reasonable to draw a constant analogy between Mary and the Kingdom of God.

67 In short, the role of the state at some level is sacred, just as the image of the Good Shepherd is a sacred image. In particular, the God-King ought tell people what is right in wrong and every day matters, which is precisely the way one lives a life of faith. How is faith alive? By works of charity, as the letter of James explains. This is what the king ought do: provide the universal law of action, i.e. tell man how to live an everyday life of charity. He teaches humankind how to be earthly human beings that humankind might one day inherent eternal life. The conception of the state as it is held today, as non-sacred, ought be eliminated.

68 The exact definition and forms of monarchy is a diverse topic; however, it is here understood as a government in which one person has the authority to create and enforce laws; as such, this person may be the final authority for all people in any matter.

69 John 10:16

70 After all, God is personal relationship to all (insofar as He is God), and is also the root of personal relations, on a cosmic level.

71 Furthermore, among the traditionally titles given to Mary in the Latin Church is Mary, Mother of God, Queen of Heaven and Earth. Furthermore, Paul writes in his epistles about the continuity of earthly power to the heavenly, which is why earthly power is to be respected, obeyed, and submitted to in large part.
Ratzinger, 196-243.


For their true inheritance is God, i.e. the gift of the Holy Spirit who is the love between the Father and the Son, i.e. Charity. See Lamentations 3:24; Psalms 16:5.

1 Samuel 8:1-7. Emphasis added.

Very notably, Jesus likens his very body to the temple in the Gospels; Paul says a Christian's body is the temple of Holy Spirit; finally, the Book of Revelations says there will be no temple in the Heavenly Jerusalem, for it will be replaced by that which it signified: God’s intimate presence within His people.

Matthew 22:41-46

2 Samuel 7:12-14 “When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me.”

Matthew 22:34-40 “When the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together, and one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question to test him. ‘Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?’ He said to him, ‘“You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.” This is the greatest and first commandment. And a second is like it: “You shall love your neighbour as yourself.” On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.’

John 14:6 “Jesus said to him, “I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.”

CCC, 1705, 1711.

2 Timothy 2:11-13 “The saying is sure: If we have died with him, we will also live with him if we endure, we will also reign with him if we deny him, he will also deny us if we are faithless, he remains faithful—for he cannot deny himself.”

In a sense, His third act is perhaps the most quiet (yet most radiant), for it is the governing of people perfect, a reign during peace, a sharing of His rule with his peoples.

CCC, 813-816.

Hebrews 1:3. “He is the reflection of God’s glory and the exact imprint of God’s very being, and he sustains all things by his powerful word.”

Again, the family is not necessarily imperfect just because there is a hierarchy of roles. Just because father or mother has a governing role of a child does not mean the child is imperfect; one can consider, for instance, the Holy Family. Or at a broader level, in some sense an animal is less than a person, but that does not mean animals sin. Finally, Mary is glorified more than
any other wholly created being, is still not glorified to the level of God, and yet remains utterly sinless. In other words, government is not just existent for the sake of curtailing sin. A body is not sinful because the head governs the body.

88 DeSales, X.I: “Man is the perfection of the universe; the spirit is the perfection of man; love, that of the spirit; and charity, that of love. Wherefore the love of God is the end, the perfection and the excellence of the universe.”


91 The perfect society will be explicitly Christian. Again, the validity of Christianity is not argued here, but if it is true, the heavenly kingdom best vision of society. Whatever final form it will take, it would seem likely it will be explicitly Christian. Therefore, earthly society still ought work for an explicitly Christian state.

92 Hebrews 12:13-16. “Therefore Jesus also suffered outside the city gate in order to sanctify the people by his own blood. Let us then go to him outside the camp and bear the abuse he endured. For here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for the city that is to come. Through him, then, let us continually offer a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that confess his name. Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God.”

93 Speaking of the Kingdom of God is speaking of the Unity and Goodness of God. A kingdom is united whole. So too in does the Nicene Creed profess one whole Catholic and Apostolic church – one body. To understand the good of this unity rests in much deeper contemplation of God and His unity. But in any case, it will suffice to make a brief point: Enlightenment philosophy seems to have concretely moved away to the Christian gospel. This is not the fault of philosophy or reason itself, but certain men, for the very lifeblood of the early Church was the baptism of (pagan) Greek philosophy, something that was awaiting baptism.

94 1 Corinthians 15:42-44 “So it is with the resurrection of the dead. What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body.”

95 This is nothing new: this world is not our home. At this point in time governments are not only implicitly misaligned from the gospel, but are explicitly so, and at a growing rate. While officials of developed (i.e. rich) nations may proclaim neutrality on matters of religion, and may even in some sense believe it, their words do not make it so.

96 It seems this can be done in two ways: first, if one is guilty, one should accept and receive the suffering innocently, without grumbling and complaining, and be made pure (this is the state of purgation, which is completed after death, if necessary); second, if one is innocent, and receives suffering disproportionate to one’s crime, one can share in Christ’s extraordinary mission to accept the suffering of others, and offer salvation through forgiveness to the whole world.
Revelation 5.

“There I saw in the right hand of the one seated on the throne a scroll written on the inside and on the back, sealed with seven seals; and I saw a mighty angel proclaiming with a loud voice, ‘Who is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals?’ And no one in heaven or on earth or under the earth was able to open the scroll or to look into it. And I began to weep bitterly because no one was found worthy to open the scroll or to look into it. Then one of the elders said to me, ‘Do not weep. See, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals.’

Then I saw between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders a Lamb standing as if it had been slaughtered, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth. He went and took the scroll from the right hand of the one who was seated on the throne. When he had taken the scroll, the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders fell before the Lamb, each holding a harp and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints. They sing a new song:

‘You are worthy to take the scroll and to open its seals, for you were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed for God saints from every tribe and language and people and nation; you have made them to be a kingdom and priests serving our God, and they will reign on earth.’

Then I looked, and I heard the voice of many angels surrounding the throne and the living creatures and the elders; they numbered myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands, singing with full voice,

‘Worthy is the Lamb that was slaughtered to receive power and wealth and wisdom and might and honour and glory and blessing!’

Then I heard every creature in heaven and on earth and under the earth and in the sea, and all that is in them, singing,

‘To the one seated on the throne and to the Lamb be blessing and honour and glory and might for ever and ever!’
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