



The Owl of Athena

CONTRATYRANNOS

The Natural Law Theory of Human Progress Website

EXCURSUS 21

One of a series of monographs that expands the discussion of important topics examined in *The Natural State of Medical Practice*.¹

NATURAL LAW, EGALITARIANISM AND COLLECTIVISM

Egalitarianism is a social doctrine imbued with a purposeful and structural resistance to human variation. Egalitarianism is a concept. It is not a corrective for things that are flawed but inherently equal or based on equality. But if there is a desire to make equal those things in the social arena that are inherently or unavoidably unequal, that is true egalitarianism.

Collectivism is a social doctrine that subordinates citizens to the greater society, irrespective of its nature. Collectivism is a process. At its root, however, is covetousness. When something is given willingly, that is a contribution, charity, sharing, generosity, or humaneness. But when something is taken against one's will, that is theft, whatever its final destination. And if that theft is prompted by covetousness of persons in the greater society who are directed, supported, or condoned by authority, that is true collectivism.²

Summary: *The Natural State of Medical Practice* has provided objective evidence from the profession of medicine for the existence and beneficence of natural law, and the Natural Law Theory of Human

¹ Volume, chapter and page number of otherwise unreferenced statements in this monograph refer to the version of the four volumes as published by Liberty Hill Press:

Vol. 1 – *The Natural State of Medical Practice: An Isagorical Theory of Human Progress*

Vol. 2 – *The Natural State of Medical Practice: Hippocratic Evidence*

Vol. 3 – *The Natural State of Medical Practice: Escape from Egalitarianism*

Vol. 4 – *The Natural State of Medical Practice: Implications*

² People act collectively all the time, whether in a traditional kinship, church congregation, etc. Motives for acting collectively can be affection, ancestry, shared tribulation, common interests, etc. These arrangements are freely enjoined. Should there be disagreement, the shared bond can be broken at little or no cost. The distinction herein is that collectivism, however it may be established as government policy, becomes unavoidable, virtually irreversible, and inescapable by those whom it victimizes.

Progress derived from it describes a mechanism for that beneficence. Natural law is embedded in our conscience, and Excursus 4 argues it is the basis for our moral existence. In this excursus it is argued that the morality of natural law is transgressed by the thefts arising from implementation of collectivism in any form, and, by restricting choice for segments of society, it impedes freedom of expression and thereby the progress of society. Thus, the contemporary collaboration of collectivism in the implementation of egalitarianism that is so pervasive in social issues today detracts from any justification for establishing social equity of any kind as a goal of society, imposes what De Tocqueville predicted as “a new form of servitude,” and is an existential threat to our republic.

Introduction

Volume 1 of *The Natural State of Medical Practice* describes how political authoritarianism in great empires over the ages prevented proper maturation of medical practice, and volume 3 describes how the social authoritarianism of the egalitarian kinship prevented its initiation in early societies, thereby delaying the appearance of both modern medicine and an increase in life expectancy of the common citizenry for many centuries. Volume 4 expands the scope of the preceding analyses to encompass human progress in general. The present excursus analyzes the modern face of the authoritarian threat to human progress.

Today’s plight of millions of persons as they seek the beneficence of Western freedom is, in the Epilogue to volume 3, ascribed to the escape from egalitarianism. But this is not just the elementary and unpleasant but sometimes necessary egalitarianism of the kinship. With nationhood, egalitarianism assumed new forms, and it is the exponentially potent collaboration between authoritarian doctrines and egalitarianism that is now poisoning the well of liberty.

The basis for the preceding distinction is the following. There are many popular types of egalitarianism, some limited to equal access to opportunity, some specifying types or conditions of inequality, and others specifying conditions for egalitarian distribution of effort or product of that effort. These categorizations prompt endless disagreement and discussion. But some are procedural issues such as inequality before the law and racial inequality. In these categories the problem is the evil that instituted the inequality. What is needed is not an egalitarian solution but a corrective procedural solution. In contrast, “luck egalitarianism,” in which the unlucky are to be compensated in some way by the lucky, requires redistribution of effort or product to make up for the resulting inequality.

One might conclude there are two general categories of egalitarianism: procedural and circumstantial. But the former is not based on an “inequality,” for, whatever opportunistic proponents may say, humans are of the same species, and imposed restrictions based on presumed racial, physical or intellectual distinction are evil and to be rooted out. Defeating racism is not about establishing equality, for equality as a member of the human species already exists; it is about defeating imposed inequality. Similarly, any inequality imposed by a legal system is obviously evil. What was intrinsically intended to be fair is used to punish unequally. The solution is to correct the legal system. Thus, a procedural basis for correcting such inequality is an issue distinct from egalitarianism.³

³ Placed in the context of racism, the Civil War, abolition of slavery and the formal outlawing of racism of any kind in subsequent years solved the issue of racism. These were not egalitarianism correctives; they corrected a crime. To the extent it raises its ugly head from time to time, there is legal recourse and law will prevail. This is separate from

For purposes of this excursus, therefore, a definition consistent with true, or circumstantial, egalitarianism is used, one applicable to modern Western society. It encompasses such issues as luck, gender (a form of “luck” egalitarianism), and economic egalitarianism. Circumstantial egalitarianism intends to establish equality where equality does not *ab initio* exist and always requires some form of redistribution of effort or effort’s product to attain its goal. This is true egalitarianism, and a general definition is: *Egalitarianism is a social doctrine with a purposeful and structural resistance to normal human variation.*⁴

This does not deny that injustice can pose issues of inequality, but normal human and environmental variation in a society makes decisions difficult. As pointed out by Dr. Murray Rothbard, in egalitarian societies leadership will determine the appropriate access to opportunity, distributive effort and product for the greater good of society. Because arguments for the greater good will be considered by some citizenry as inadequate justification for such a unity of purpose, there will be resistance in society to redistributive efforts. Leadership must then coercively impose them on society for its own good. *Collectivism*, which subordinates society to the state irrespective of the nature of the society or its governance, provides the method for its implementation. This excursus examines the contemporary collaboration between egalitarianism and collectivism for its morality.

Background

The kinship of ancient cultures prior to urbanization centered around the family, tribe and clan, its positive and negative features being discussed in *The Natural State of Medical Practice*, volume 3, chapter 11. With the evolution of cities, kinships weakened their hold on members, who began transferring allegiances to commercial ventures and then, inevitably, to the coattails of authoritarian governance. Traditional assigned duties, obligations and loyalties of the kinship could be found, sometimes even being the basis for dynasties, but its effectiveness in the political realm generally decreased.

In recent times, however, the concept of kinship has been actively revived in the West, although this time the makeup of the kinship usually has no basis in familial relatedness. A traditional definition of kinship is “A universal form of social organization based on real or alleged culturally defined family ties and rules of behavior.” Instead, in an attempt to arrogate the kind and gentle reputation of the familial kinship, alternative designations such as the “fictive kinship” are proposed in which individuals share an intimate association with a specific concept,

egalitarian claims for retribution and compensation for prior racism. These are examples of circumstantial, or social, egalitarianism.

⁴ Social issues are clouded by definitions, and “egalitarian” invites controversy by its very name. The etymology is simple: Latin *aequalitas* (equality) to French *egalitaire* (egalitarian) to English. It can be relevant to conditions, processes, and goals. It is no wonder why Dr. Murray Rothbard’s excellent book on egalitarianism provides no definition of the term, instead associating it with the absurdity of all social issues that resist or ignore the inherent inequality within the human species. My definition is merely an adaptation of his published sentiments. See his *Egalitarianism as a Revolt Against Nature*, Auburn (AL), 2000, second edition, especially its first chapter. In a sense, this excursus is a corollary to Rothbard’s title of that book in which the biological revolt he describes *is also a revolt against natural law*. But this excursus also describes the mechanism for destruction of Western civilization that he forewarns: it will not be caused by egalitarianism *per se* but by the immorality of its collectivist implementors.

such as gender, employment, minority status, or other organizational bond distinct from the traditional consanguineal and affinal one, positions sometimes considered “leftist.”⁵ Apart from modifications of the traditional kinship such as god-parentage and matters of adoption that are recognized by sociologists and anthropologists as not new and varying across cultures, modern “fictive” kinships have been devised that have a separate claim on the loyalty and industry of members beyond that of simple camaraderie.⁶

Fictive kinships would have been disruptive and unwelcome in societies with traditional kinships and in early civilizations, for divisive behavior was to be avoided. There is a marked distinction between traits that govern traditional kinships and those that govern the newer kinships; the former are permanent, demarcated in domain, cohesive and resistant to intrusion, whereas the latter are contemporaneous, broad-based, expansive, and are adaptable to the moment. The modern looseness of the definition of kinship is paralleled by the looseness of its structure and the tenuous connections among its adherents. Nevertheless, this can change if its leadership is politically capable of unifying its message on its adherents.⁷ If this can be done, it will be difficult to reverse the process because indoctrination, propaganda, disciplining, and canonization of the issue will, to varying degrees, have been internally instituted.

Historically, as Western populations increased and asserted their natural rights in recent centuries, a myriad of autonomous associations have appeared. Their purpose has been to further specific personal interests, usually matters of self-betterment, for their members, and people with similar interests rather than similar ancestries became a power unto themselves. In general, this was a wonderful thing. Freedom was put to work, and much of the flowering of Western culture and its autonomous associations in the medical, social, legal and technological fields of the 19th C would benefit national and global populations. But some concepts emerged that, rather than fostering self-betterment, furthered parochial interests such as fictive kinships that attempt to change the structure of the society that had permitted them to emerge in the first place.

How did this new phenomenon in American associations, the latter so favorably reviewed by Alexis de Tocqueville (see Excursus 15), come about? Briefly, the political trend to individualism followed on the 16th C Reformation challenge to European authoritarian political hierarchies and the pan-European “super-kinship” of the Church. The concept that all of mankind were equal before God entered political dialogue involving the relation of individuals to

⁵ “Leftist,” in politics as defined by Britannica, is that “portion of the political spectrum associated in general with egalitarianism and popular or state control of the major institutions of political and economic life.”

⁶ A tribe is a larger kinship unit, and modern kinships under discussion are tribal in nature. Like a traditional tribe, competing organizations are a threat. Outsiders who disagree are an enemy. They also cannot tolerate internal dissent, just like a traditional tribe, and the dissenter will be disowned. Kinship is viewed popularly as a more gentle association than tribe, but for present purposes the terms are equivalent.

⁷ Equating such associations with characteristics associated with a nuclear human family and its extensions seem disingenuous. Kinships based on kin have been central to all human societies for obvious reasons. They have their benefits, drawbacks and inconsistencies, depending on circumstance, but opinion of the kinship is generally favorable. It almost seems that the focused and politically active fictive kinship desires the appellation of “kinship” for purposes of public relations. The kindness, caring and child-friendliness commonly attributed to the family-oriented kinship sends the message that the fictive kinship is likewise kind, caring and child-friendly. While this might even be true for some, it can also be deceptive, for coercion is in its plan. Negative aspects of kinship include an antipathy to other kinships, subordination of individual preferences to the demands of the kinship, resistance to change, inability to progress, and an authoritarian approach to decision-making and implementation. Fictive kinships add the following: cultural relativism that invites negative interactions with other cultures, instability of the association because of its impermanence and individual voluntary nature, its focus is narrow even though implementation is broad, it restricts opinion rather than seeking concord, and it requires a personal involvement (rather than family) that can be isolating.

the state. Democratic process followed, and natural rights were recognized and, in the West, became constitutionally protected to varying degrees. Just as it took about two-and-a-half centuries after the onset of the Reformation for freedoms of association and expression to begin to reap the beneficence of the natural state of medical practice, the moral abolition of slavery (see Excursus 18), the suffragist movement, and other laudable goals, the same length of time saw the emergence of some associations not so compatible with democratic social structures. The problem, of course, was not the emergence of the ideas spawned by association, for that is what our species was born to do. The problem was also not the permissive regulatory environment that allowed them to grow in influence. The problem for the West was, and is, the inability to effectively win the popularity contest with some social structures being proposed.

Collectivism⁸

In the elementary kinship of the past it was survival of the kinship that was sought, whereas in kinships of modern Western society it is usually claimed that “fairness” is sought. It is but natural to expect that ancient and primitive kinship members would voluntarily agree to the authoritarianism and attempts at homogeneity of the kinship despite its unpleasant or unfair demands. Survival was at stake, and there was no satisfactory alternative. But with modern “fictive” kinships the issue is not survival. The issue is how to implement one’s perspective of fairness on society.

How can the new kinships convince the entirety of a Western society of the need for correctives to their perceived unfairness? The answer is, they cannot. This requires coercion because the need for and implementation of fairness will be contentious, and humanity is not homogenous. To demand homogeneity in thought and/or action in our species is to attempt the impossible. Numerous voluntary egalitarian or utopian communities have existed in America, mostly in the 19th C, but they remained circumscribed, and none were viable beyond two or three generations. To succeed society-wide, implementation of a desired monolithic social change must be imposed on citizenry.

This calls for collectivism, which demands, rather than seeks, a degree of homogeneity in thought and action throughout a society to implement programs of society’s leaders that are proposed as benefitting society as a whole. Those leaders can be elected and, in a democracy, the majority of society may agree with the demand. This can lead to tyranny of the majority, against which America has its buttresses. It is, however, the authoritarian procedural and propaganda components of collectivism that have been implemented in communism, socialism, Nazism, and common expressions of other forms of tyranny.

But the target for this excursus is not the popularity or utility of collectivism, instead being its morality. As discussed in Excursus 4, the basis for morality is natural law. Herein the focus is on transgressions of natural law as they may or may not apply to the implementation of egalitarian goals by collectivism, a doctrine that views the citizen as a serf of society.

⁸ The Oxford English Dictionary definition includes the following: Collectivism is often used to refer to any doctrine which argues for the priority of some version of the public good over individual interests. In particular, collectivism is associated with the goal of equality among citizens.

Natural law

The ancient concepts of natural law and its equivalence with the Ten Commandments, especially the five ethical Commandments, and the Golden (and Silver) Rule was described in Excursus 6. It, by definition, is a body of unchanging moral principles innate in all people in all times and places and is regarded as a basis for all human conduct (derived from its definition in the Oxford English Dictionary). It is to be distinguished from the laws of nature as posed in philosophies of science. Thomas Aquinas considered the Commandments and natural law to be equivalents, as did Martin Luther. There also has been serious contemplation on the existence and nature of natural law in many societies as a moral guide, ancient and modern, progressive and primitive. Margaret Mead, who characterized natural law as a “species-specific capacity to ethicalize,” was sufficiently convinced of natural law as a proven phenomenon to affirm that, based on her experience, its presence was felt in every primitive society.⁹ Components of the Ten Commandments are included in Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and other philosophies and theologies.¹⁰ Some scholars acknowledge it exists irrespective of religious association, and others deny any religious association altogether. As a standard of morality in the West, it has been pointed out that natural law, especially as expressed in the Ten Commandments, has replaced the “seven deadly sins” of medieval times. The interpretation and proposed proof of natural law by *The Natural State of Medical Practice* is that *the essence of natural law is to not transgress the natural rights of others*, a dictum that is argued to apply to government as well as to the individual. Its critical role in the foundational writings of America as a protection of natural rights is no longer debatable, although specificities of the definition and origin of natural law can be contentious. This historical interpretation and the prominence of America that has developed since its founding add to the evidence that natural law is an unequivocal statement on the goodness of human liberty.

Thus, restricting the natural rights of another person, for convenience defined as life, liberty (includes expression, assembly) and estate, is immoral. An action consistent with natural law is moral; one that is inconsistent is immoral. As discussed in *The Natural State of Medical Practice*, volume 3, p. 258ff, egalitarianism of the primitive kinship is inherently authoritarian, but environmental threats required coherent communal responses for survival, and agreement on its necessity and on the lack of options rather than coercion was the basis for its persistence. But for modern fictive kinship and its equivalents it is proposed that use of collectivist procedures is a scheme for implementing contentious social issues such as egalitarian ones and is immoral. Communism is the most familiar example of collectivism.

⁹ Margaret Mead, *Some Anthropological Considerations Concerning Natural Law*, in *Natural Law Forum*, 1961, paper 59, pp. 51-64; http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/nd_naturallaw_forum/59.

¹⁰ For example, relevant verses in the Quran include Sura 6:151, 5:38, 25:72, 17:32, 4:32, 17:23-24. In Hinduism the source is considered the divinely inspired Vedas but their clearest expression is in the Yamas of Yoga Sutra (aphorisms). In Zoroastrianism it is in the Yasna that are recited the moral implications of Asha, a universal presence guiding desirable conduct of mankind. In Buddhism there are the five precepts from the Eightfold Path, and in Taoism are found the five precepts of Laotsu. These all exhibit a variable and fragmented similarity to the Ten Commandments, but their importance herein is their ancient provenance, universal application and spiritual doctrines of right and wrong governing all mankind rather than necessary laws based on human experience (“positive” laws).

The example of communism

Communism is an early example of a theory to be perpetrated on humanity for its own good. The alleged purpose was, ultimately, to liberate the individual from the inequities of an economic class system, not to impose equity or fairness. Karl Marx realized the futility of social equity given the inherent inequality of an infinity of human and environmental variables. But his social restructuring, which involved collective ownership of production, required the subordination of one's personal and collaborative efforts to needs of the greater society. While not typically egalitarian in that wealth was not to be equally distributed, it was collectivist in that everyone was enlisted in achieving and maintaining a communist society that placed benefit to society above that of the individual. Ultimately, after elimination of economic class, everyone in the final stage of Marxism was to have equal opportunity for self-fulfillment. The logic goes something like this: Expression of human freedom and variation was to be collectively restricted or eradicated so that human freedom and variation could flourish.

Despite the generally negative contemporary opinion of communism, the intellectual attraction to the work of Karl Marx remains strong, its monstrous history of implementation notwithstanding. As a social process rather than an economic theory, it is now being used to redefine modern Western society, this time along ethnic lines rather than its failed economic class lines, the goal being egalitarianist, sometimes with an element of retribution. Although Marx centered his theories around contemporary class struggles rather than a classless society, modern invocations seek society-wide structural changes that are now thought to exceed economic factors in importance. The more successful the changes, the greater will be the homogeneity of society, an authoritarian's dream.

This process of collectivism, as advanced by some fictive kinships, is appropriately viewed as a divisive threat to cohesive Western governance. It is favored by those who fear diversity of opinion and doubt the average citizen can make decisions appropriate for society. For the same reasons, many seek globalization, not of the mechanism by which Western freedoms have brought about economic and scientific successes that have improved the lives of billions, but of centralization of political power that would allow collectivism to compass the entirety of nations themselves. In contrast, *The Natural State of Medical Practice*, based on the history of medicine over the ages, repeatedly warns of the danger of centralized power.

Why is centralized power such a threat to societies? This has been discussed in other excursus, and the great threat is this: it facilitates transgression of the natural rights of its citizens. A strong central government can more efficiently arrogate decisions that are infringements of natural rights of individuals, whereas multifocal distribution of components of governance will resist unanimity and enforcement. Matters are even worse if that centralized power resides in the hands of one or a few individuals, rather than a congress or parliament.

Religious belief was widespread around the globe in 1843-44 when Marx made the passing comment that religion was the opium of the people. He viewed the popularity of religion as illusory happiness, one that would pass once a superior social environment removed from the mass of the population the necessity of a search for happiness that helped them bear the misery into which they had been born. Religion was not a problem, but it was symbolic of a problem. As Marx was an atheist, any divine assistance or attribution was out of the question, and *Das Kapital* later in the 19th C barely mentions the topic as his writings gradually moved from the philosophic to the economic.

There have been attempts to seek out some of his statements inferring consistency with natural law.¹¹ It is clear, however, that he viewed customary laws based on human reason in response to local circumstances as relativistic, varying from society to society. But natural law, as described earlier, is fairly consistent in all societies in which it has been sought. It can be concluded that natural law was not in his vocabulary.

Natural law therefore might be considered an issue of little importance. If humans can devise their own laws based on theories and social experience and yet muddle on, what is to be gained by appealing to natural law. It might seem more relevant to set highway speed limits. At least there would be an objective measure of a law and its infractions. And if Marx, considered a veritable genius in his field and a person who, with enormous scholarly effort, devised a social structure deemed, almost two centuries later, still worth revisiting and explicating despite a mountain of evidence of its implausibility and unparalleled destructiveness of human lives and well-being, it would seem that overlooking the transcendental wisdom of natural law is no great loss.

Such is not the case, however, for natural law has a purpose other than preventing bad manners and laying a foundation of trust. It exists to protect our natural rights. And it is because of natural rights that we can freely, openly and safely reason, argue, improve and invent. In medical practice, this interaction has led to vastly improved medical care and a doubling or more of life expectancy, all within a span of little more than two centuries. Natural law infractions, as they interfere with natural rights of the individual, can exact retribution not on the guilty individual but on society itself. As an extreme example, an assassin may escape capture or retribution and live on in luxury, but the loss of his prominent victim, whether apolitical or political, can precipitate darkness on an entire society.

It is obvious why Marx had little to say about natural law. He did not believe in natural rights common to all humanity. To him, each society, large or small, evolves its own system of “rights.” This relativity was of no use, for it just complicated his efforts in redefining our social structure. More importantly, he viewed those “rights” as intrinsically helpful in maintaining and expanding the power of the powerful. He considered natural rights a bourgeois invention, not opportunity, Divine or otherwise.

But there is one exception to the preceding. Natural law is irrelevant in judging the morality of Marx’s writings. It is, instead, through the implementors of Marxist theories that morality can be fairly judged. Marx himself may have been a prince of morality, and his hope of easing the burdens of the downtrodden by restructuring society was, at face value, well-meaning. With this in mind, it is difficult to pass judgment on pieces of paper. They represent the culmination of reasoning, a praiseworthy human attribute upon which all else depends. But in anticipation of the implementors, judgment will be attempted.

The immorality of collectivism

- (1) Traditionally, collectivism is contrasted with individualism. This simple semantic conflict alone reveals the inevitable immorality of collectivism. Natural law is our personal conscience. In Judeo-Christianity the Ten Commandments are directed at “you”

¹¹ Peterson, G. P., Karl Marx and his vision of salvation: the natural law and private property, in *Rev. Soc. Economy*, 52:377-390, 1994.

in the singular, not plural. Natural law is directed at the individual, not an ethnic group, and its purpose is to protect the natural rights of other individuals from transgressions by you. Similarly, by its presence in the conscience of others, you are protected from them. The resulting removal of fear from social interactions promotes social interactions that are beneficial for all of a society. Thus, the great value of natural law to society is an indirect effect of individual moral action. *Collectivism, by denying individualism, abandons the benefits of natural law.*

- (2) Collectivism is inherently harmful. It infringes on the natural right of an individual to attempt self-betterment by redistribution of individual effort or the products of that effort in order to benefit the society as a whole. The collectivist assigning of effort and the taking of product is unnatural and will be resisted by some individuals, thus making coercion necessary. *Theft, the taking, against one's will, of the results of one's fair effort is an infraction of natural law and is immoral.*
- (3) Collectivism, by assigning duties and penalties and by prohibiting personal attempts at self-betterment, is a misdirection of effort that guarantees continuance of ignorance and the absence of progress for society. *The absence of progress can be considered a penalty for disobeying natural law by interfering with the natural right of free expression.*
- (4) Collectivism is a yes-or-no "ism." Disagreement is illegal. Viewed as a threat to society as a whole, the position and the protections for the individual account for little. *Disagreement with collectivist policies that incurs physical or capital punishment, whether for the purpose of intimidation or as penalty for disagreeing with policy, infringes on the natural right to life and liberty and is an infraction of natural law.*
- (5) Collectivism also immobilizes society in that it is built on the assumption that society is now being optimized and further improvements are unnecessary. All that needs be done is to more "fairly" do what is already being done. The role of the individual is to work for benefit of society, and leadership will decide what that benefit is to be. The enforced exclusion of most of the reasoning public produces tunnel vision that will reveal the incompetence inherent in collectivist leadership, incompetence to meet the unexpected, whether meteorological, geological, medical, political, or martial. There will then be none to sagely advise, and the danger of *dissolution of society, by excluding the competency of the citizenry, can be attributed to the denial of their natural rights, the penalty for transgression of natural law.*
- (6) As if the preceding were not sufficient reason to abandon collectivism, there will always be the criminal elements of prevarication, bribery, personal aggrandizement, revenge, and sociopathic behavior that gravitate toward political figures and muddy the water and put political efforts in disarray. *Some will be due to transgressions of natural law, some will be from laws that transgress natural law, and others will come from transgressions of appropriate positive law.*

- (7) Finally, there is the great unchangeable, human nature. People will disagree, often violently, with enforced homogeneity. Disruptive internal conflict is inevitable, for there will always be some who will view as evil the denying of natural rights. That realization of freedom is a product of their conscience, i.e., the subtle envoy of natural law. *Activation of conscience will lead some to refuse to acknowledge or accept the purported merits of collectivism, will prompt associating with others who are in agreement, and thereby will be a permanent violent threat to the social structure.*

The contrast of individualism

The collectivist approach contravenes natural law in many ways, whereas individualism, by not transgressing natural law, leads to efforts at self-betterment that can release the ingenuity of any citizen. The benefits of that ingenuity can then be transferred to society at large by capitalism. Multidimensional capitalistic enterprises are basically a form of corporatism in which benefits of the enterprise are shared more or less equally, with the “more equally” being those more qualified for particular positions and therefore worth more in salary to the commercial enterprise in question. Competence, industriousness and innovation are rewarded. This is because choices are broadened and differing opinions are heard. That which is unsatisfactory loses popularity, and alternatives are considered. Natural law is not being disobeyed.

There is considerable opposition to capitalism, both local and global, but that criticism is the standard negative response to anything capitalistic, including claims of racism, sexism, exploitation, etc., issues not inherent in capitalism, being blamable instead on personal transgressions by some individuals in the system. But given the open and competitive nature of capitalism and its international face, natural law itself is not transgressed. Protection against individual abusers of the system are therefore unrelated issues and can be managed by “positive,” i.e., man-made, laws. In contrast, collectivism is, whether implemented or recognized from historical documentation, immoral according to natural law, and all its implementors are acting immorally. By candy-coating its message it also ensnares otherwise innocent bystanders in its web.

Egalitarianism is inconsistent with human nature, whereas equality of opportunity and equality before the law are bedrocks of Western civilization. Equality of opportunity and equality before the law are not examples of true egalitarianism; they are correctives that remove unfairness and thereby are consistent with natural law. In contrast, true egalitarianism is utopian, and even in part will quickly fail in the modern age because no society will ever voluntarily agree to it. It is of abstract interest historically but of no practical value and therefore it can be considered outside the reach of natural law. It is but one example out of millions of social systems that have been the product of human reason over the ages. It is dragged into the natural law arena only when it is enforced. So, we can guiltlessly dream about a utopian egalitarian society, but the true culprits in the room are those who claim to implement egalitarianism by enforcing collectivism.

And it is here that the fallacy and danger of the popular “critical theory” is exposed.¹² By attributing abuses of capitalism to the intrinsic social structure of a capitalistic society rather than the true source of abuse, i.e., unfair implementors, a process is underway that will weaken the existing social structure of the capitalist nations and societies by implementing an inherently immoral collectivist national and global order, one that transgresses natural law. Those defects that can arise in capitalistic systems are errors of individuals or miscalculations and are correctable; those inherent in collectivist systems are not. Capitalist systems disseminate progress, as proven by increases in life span and the relief of sickness that has spread globally over the past two centuries, whereas collectivist systems will never progress and will often revert to primitive empiricism. “Critical theory,” by seeking a restructuring of society and ignoring the composite of successes and errors of individualism, invites us to relive the source of mankind’s greatest failures.

¹² Critical theory, as described in Britannica, is a “Marxist-inspired movement in social and political philosophy...[that] maintain[s] a primary goal of philosophy is to understand and to help overcome the social structures through which people are dominated and oppressed.” In this deceptive “definition,” which is a statement on goal rather than definition of a theory based on objective proofs sufficient to support a general principle, blame is sought in social structures, rather than individuals, for mankind’s social failures. For example, social structure affects child development. Since protection is desired to prevent children from evolving behavioral patterns considered antisocial therefrom, there must be a structural change in society. The recurrent theme is, in effect, “expression of human variability needs to be collectively restricted or eradicated so that human variability can ultimately flourish.” The search for utopia never ends. New associations ascribing to critical theory ignore the recently acquired global beneficence of Western freedom, instead attributing its authoritarian wars, other unrelated tragedies, and perceived injustices to lack of freedom inherent in its social structure, especially that of capitalism. There are, crudely, three arguments: (1) “my people are not included in that freedom,” (2) “those persons who control the structure of society prevent my people from enjoying their freedom,” and (3) “those persons who abuse their freedoms threaten my people’s freedom.” There are, therefore, three ways to solve these problems: (1) force those who inordinately benefited from those freedoms to give back their gains to my people, (2) replace those people with my people, and (3) change the structure of society so there are no more of those people. The first is egalitarian, the second is communistic, and the latter is utopian and the goal of critical theory, although there is overlap among categories. All are authoritarian, all are collectivist, and all exhibit a tribal nature: you either agree to support the association or you are unworthy of belonging to it. And if you do not belong to our tribe, tread carefully.