




# The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy

Michael J. Perry

CAMBRIDGE



In this important new work in political and constitutional theory, Michael J. Perry elaborates and defends an account of the political morality of liberal democracy: the moral convictions and commitments that in a liberal democracy should govern decisions about what laws to enact and what policies to pursue. The fundamental questions addressed in this book concern (1) the grounding, (2) the content, (3) the implications for one or another moral controversy, and (4) the judicial enforcement of the political morality of liberal democracy. The particular issues discussed include whether government may ban previability abortion, whether government may refuse to extend the benefit of law to same-sex couples, and what role religion should play in the politics and law of a liberal democracy.



**Michael J. Perry** holds a Robert W. Woodruff Chair at Emory University, where he teaches in the law school. Previously, Perry held the Howard J. Trienens Chair in Law at Northwestern University, where he taught for fifteen years, and the University Distinguished Chair in Law at Wake Forest University. Perry has written on American constitutional law and theory; law, morality, and religion; and human rights theory in more than sixty articles and ten books, including *The Idea of Human Rights*; *We the People: The Fourteenth Amendment and the Supreme Court*; *Under God? Religious Faith and Liberal Democracy*; *Toward a Theory of Human Rights: Religion, Law, Courts*; and *Constitutional Rights, Moral Controversy, and the Supreme Court*.

Jacket photo: © istockphoto.com/Lief Norman

Author photo: © Daniel Perry O'Leary

Jacket design: Wendy Bedenbaugh

Printed in the United States of America

# The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy

MICHAEL J. PERRY

*Emory University, School of Law*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# Contents

Introduction	page 1
<i>Part I. Liberal Democracy, Human Rights, and Religious Faith</i>	
1. Liberal Democracy and Human Rights	9
2. Liberal Democracy and Religious Faith	27
<i>Part II. First Principles</i>	
3. The Right to Moral Equality	61
4. The Right to Religious Freedom	65
5. Beyond Religious Freedom: The Right to Moral Freedom	88
6. Religion as a Basis of Lawmaking	100
<i>Part III. First Principles Applied</i>	
7. Abortion	123
8. Same-Sex Unions	138
<i>Part IV. The Constitution of Liberal Democracy</i>	
9. Protecting Constitutionally Entrenched Rights: The Courts' – In Particular, the U.S. Supreme Court's – Proper Role	159
Conclusion: In the Matter of the Adoption of John Doe and James Doe	198
<i>Index</i>	205

# Introduction

My overarching aim in this book is to elaborate and to defend an account – an understanding – of the political morality of liberal democracy.<sup>1</sup> By “political” morality, I mean the moral convictions and commitments that govern decisions about what laws to enact (or to maintain on the books), what policies to pursue, such as:<sup>2</sup>

- Should we retain capital punishment – or abolish it? (By “we,” I mean here “we the citizens of a liberal democracy, acting through our elected representatives.”)
- Should we ban abortion – or permit it?
- Should we ban physician-assisted suicide – or permit it?
- Should we refuse to extend the benefit of law to same-sex unions – or should we create civil unions for same-sex couples, and if so, should we call such unions “marriages”?
- Should we affirm, as a fundamental human right, freedom from severe poverty?

And so on. (I discuss abortion and same-sex unions in Chapters 7 and 8.) Such questions are not just moral questions, but they are, in part, moral questions: questions about what is morally right or morally wrong for us to do or not to do. And the political morality of liberal democracy, as I explain in this book, bears directly on such questions.

This book is my contribution to the Christian Jurisprudence Project, sponsored by the Center for the Study of Law and Religion at Emory Law School. As I originally conceived it, the book was to be about, and only about, an issue I have addressed in some of my

<sup>1</sup> Aidan O'Neill uses the term “post-Nuremberg democracy.” Aidan O'Neill, “Roman Catholicism and the Temptation of *Shari'a*,” 15 COMMON KNOWLEDGE 269, 297 et seq. (2009).

<sup>2</sup> Not that considerations other than moral convictions and commitments – including, of course, “political” considerations, in the popular sense of the term – don't govern such decisions.

previous books: the proper role of religion in the politics and law of a liberal democracy. As I began to draft the book, however, my focus broadened to include several other issues that have engaged me over the years.

In the mid-1970s, at the beginning of my career as a law professor, I was principally engaged by – and I remain engaged by – constitutional controversies that are closely aligned with moral controversies: the constitutional controversy, for example, over laws banning abortion.<sup>3</sup> (I have also been engaged by the related question of the courts' proper role – especially the U.S. Supreme Court's proper role – in resolving such controversies.<sup>4</sup>) I was soon confronted by the question of the proper relationship of morality to constitutional law.<sup>5</sup> Because for most citizens of the United States morality is religiously grounded, another question – one that would become for me a scholarly obsession – quickly came into view: the proper role of religion in the politics and law of a liberal democracy.<sup>6</sup> Before long I was in the grip of this large question: Can any worldview that is not religious support – embed – the twofold claim to which liberal democracy is, as such – as *liberal* democracy – committed, namely, that each and every human being has equal inherent dignity and is inviolable?<sup>7</sup>

I can now see, in retrospect, that each of the principal questions that have engaged me over the course of my career concerns one or another aspect of the political morality of liberal democracy; in particular, each question concerns the grounding, the content, the implications for one or another moral controversy, or the judicial enforcement of the political morality of liberal democracy. In this

<sup>3</sup> My first article was "Abortion, the Public Morals, and the Police Power: The Ethical Function of Substantive Due Process," 23 UCLA L. REV. 689 (1976).

<sup>4</sup> See Michael J. Perry, *The Constitution, the Courts, and Human Rights* (1982); Michael J. Perry, *The Constitution in the Courts: Law or Politics?* (1994); Michael J. Perry, *We the People: The Fourteenth Amendment and the Supreme Court* (1999); Michael J. Perry, *Constitutional Rights, Moral Controversy, and the Supreme Court* (2009).

<sup>5</sup> See Michael J. Perry, *Morality, Politics, and Law* (1988).

<sup>6</sup> See Michael J. Perry, *Love and Power: The Role of Religion and Morality in American Politics* (1991); Michael J. Perry, *Religion in Politics: Constitutional and Moral Perspectives* (1997); Michael J. Perry, *Under God? Religious Faith and Liberal Democracy* (2003).

<sup>7</sup> See Michael J. Perry, *The Idea of Human Rights* (1998); Michael J. Perry, *Toward a Theory of Human Rights: Religion, Law, Courts* (2007).

book, I address all four aspects: grounding, content, implications, and judicial enforcement.<sup>8</sup>

Although broader in scope than I first conceived it, this remains a book about – although, now, only partly about – the proper, *and properly limited*, role of religious faith in the politics and law of a liberal democracy. The religious faith I know best is Christianity; my religious tradition is Roman Catholic. The liberal democracy I know best is the United States. Most of what I say in this book, however, is meant to speak to citizens of every liberal democracy – and to speak to them without regard to whether they are Christians or even religious believers. Nonetheless, the particular perspective from which this book is written – *my* perspective – is that of a citizen of the United States who, like most citizens of the United States, is a Christian.

Of the world's liberal democracies, the United States is one of the most religious.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the United States, although predominantly Christian, has become one of the most religiously diverse countries in the world.<sup>10</sup> According to a survey published in 2008 by the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, three out every four adult Americans identify as members either of a Protestant church or of the Catholic Church: 26.3% as members of “evangelical Protestant churches”; 18.1%, “mainline Protestant churches”; 6.9%, “historically black churches”; and 23.9%, the Catholic Church. Mormons account for only 1.7% of the adult population; Jehovah's Witnesses, 0.7%; Orthodox Christians, 0.6%; and “other Christians,” 0.3%. Jews account for 1.7%; Buddhists, 0.7%; Muslims, 0.6%; and Hindus, 0.4%. Adherents of “other world religions” account for less than 0.3%; adherents of “other faiths,” 1.2%. Those who identify as “unaffiliated” – a group that includes atheists (1.6%), agnostics (2.4%), and those claiming “nothing in particular” (12.1%) – account for

<sup>8</sup> Along the way, I borrow from and develop earlier work.

<sup>9</sup> See Jeffrey L. Sheler, “Faith in America,” *U.S. NEWS*, May 6, 2002, at 40, 42: “The United States may well be, as many experts claim, the most religious of the Western democracies.”

<sup>10</sup> See Diana Eck, *A New Religious America: How a “Christian Country” Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation* (2001). See also Sheler, n. 9, at 42: “Since the Immigration Act of 1995 eliminated quotas linked to national origin, Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, Sikhs, Jains, Zoroastrians, and others have arrived in increasing numbers, dramatically altering the religious landscape of many communities. . . . Nationwide, there are now more Buddhists than Presbyterians and nearly as many Muslims as Jews.”

16.1%; those who “don’t know,” 0.8%.<sup>11</sup> That the country is both so religious and so religiously diverse helps to explain why in the United States the question of the proper role of religion in politics and law remains hugely controversial even after more than a generation of sustained debate.<sup>12</sup>

During the time I was writing this book, I would occasionally read something – a book, an article, an op-ed piece, or a blog – and get a whiff of a sentiment to the effect that persons of deep religious faith can be, *at best*, only weakly (halfheartedly) committed to liberal democracy.<sup>13</sup> (“All religion is toxic to the liberal project, something we should have learned from the events of September 11, 2001 . . . Enlightenment rationalism, not religion, made liberal democracy possible.”<sup>14</sup>) I hope this book demonstrates just how confused and mistaken – indeed, how ignorant – such a sentiment is.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> <http://religions.pewforum.org/pdf/affiliations-all-traditions.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> Since the early 1980s, a large literature has emerged, principally in the United States, about the legitimacy *vel non* of religiously grounded morality as a basis of law – in particular, of *coercive* law – in a liberal democracy. That literature includes three books of my own. See n. 6. For some other, important contributions to the literature, see Richard John Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Politics in America* (2d ed. 1986); Kent Greenawalt, *Religious Convictions and Political Choice* (1988); Stephen L. Carter, *The Culture of Disbelief* (1993); Robert Audi & Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Religion in the Public Square: The Place of Religious Convictions in Political Debate* (1997); Kent Greenawalt, *Private Consciences and Public Reasons* (1997); Paul J. Weithman, ed., *Religion and Contemporary Liberalism* (1997); Robert Audi, *Religious Commitment and Secular Reason* (2000); Symposium, “Religiously Based Morality: Its Proper Place in American Law and Public Policy?” 36 WAKE FOREST L. REV. 217–570 (2001); Christopher J. Eberle, *Religious Convictions in Liberal Politics* (2002); Paul J. Weithman, *Religion and the Obligations of Citizenship* (2002); Terence Cuneo, ed., *Religion in the Liberal Polity* (2005).

Not everything I say in this book is consistent with everything I have said in my earlier writings. (For example, in Chapter 6, I argue for a position I argued *against* in chapter 2 of *Under God?*, n. 6.) “Only the hand that crases can write the true thing,” said Meister Eckhart.

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., Mark Lilla, “The Politics of God,” NEW YORK TIMES, Aug. 9, 2007; Mark Lilla, *The Stillborn God: Religion, Politics, and the Modern West* (2007); Stanley Fish, “Liberalism and Secularism: One and the Same,” NEW YORK TIMES online, <http://fish.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/09/02/liberalism-and-secularism-one-and-the-same/>.

<sup>14</sup> This is how Thomas F. Farr summarizes the sentiment – which he rejects – in his book *World of Faith and Freedom: Why International Religious Liberty Is Vital to American National Security* (2008), at xi.

<sup>15</sup> In commenting on Lilla’s *The Stillborn God* (see n. 13), Damon Linker writes:

Lilla appears to have been led to this extreme and unconvincing position [that the authenticity of a political-theological view is determined entirely by its willingness to challenge by force of arms the legitimacy of all governments that fall short of complete conformity to divine law] by his desire to place the United



Religious believers, no less than nonbelievers, can, and many do, enthusiastically affirm the political morality of liberal democracy; moreover, many religious believers affirm the political morality of liberal democracy partly *on the basis of their religious faith*. Of course, given that the citizenry of liberal democracies – not least, the citizenry of the United States – includes many religious believers, no elaboration of the political morality of liberal democracy according to which religious faith is, as such, necessarily illiberal would be a plausible elaboration.

Again, this book is my contribution to the Christian Jurisprudence Project, sponsored by Emory Law School's Center for the Study of Law and Religion, funded by the Alonzo L. McDonald Family Agape Foundation, and directed by my colleagues (and friends) John Witte Jr. and Frank S. Alexander. I am grateful to John and Frank for inviting me to participate in the project and to the Foundation – in particular, to Ambassador Alonzo McDonald, his son Peter, and the other Foundation Trustees – for generous financial support. I am also grateful, for helpful discussion, to the other participants in the project. Of course, nothing I say in this book necessarily reflects the views of the Foundation or of the Center for the Study of Law and Religion, where I am privileged to be a Senior Fellow.

States, along with the world's other liberal democracies, firmly on the opposite shore from political theology. . . . The reality, however, is more complicated than this. Not only does the United States need to cope with the political theologies that dominate the Islamic world. Americans who engage in political reflection without reference to religion also need to come to grips with the presence of political theology right here at home – with the fact that millions of their fellow citizens are perfectly comfortable making theological assumptions about the political foundations of the nation, its principles, and its institutions.

Damon Linker, "Political Theology in America," *Cato Unbound*, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2007/10/10/damon-linker/political-theology-in-america/>. Micah Watson makes a similar criticism:

The American constitutional experiment in religious liberty was made possible in part not only by those who adhered to Hobbes's "great separation," but by many who saw religious toleration and church-state separation as themselves reflective of God's will for politics. In other words, Lilla does not consider the possibility that the most authentic *Christian* understanding of the New Testament may very well be congruent with much of the American approach to religion and politics.

Micah Watson, Book Review, 50 J. CHURCH & STATE 158, 159 (2008). See also Daniel Philpott, "Political Theology and Liberal Democracy, The Immanent Frame," [http://www.ssrc.org/blogs/immanent\\_frame/2008/01/23/political-theology-liberal-democracy/](http://www.ssrc.org/blogs/immanent_frame/2008/01/23/political-theology-liberal-democracy/).

## *Introduction*

I owe a special word of thanks to the fourteen scholars – philosophers, theologians, and professors of law – who gathered in Atlanta in April 2008, for a roundtable sponsored by the Center for the Study of Law and Religion, to discuss several chapters of this book.

And, as always, I am greatly indebted to my perennially indispensable conversation partners: my students, who in this case include not only my students at Emory Law, where I have taught since August 2003, but also my students at the University of Western Ontario (Canada) School of Law, where I taught a January term course in 2009. While in productive conversation with my students at Western Law, I turned the penultimate draft of this book into the final draft.

"Michael Perry is clearly one of our best and most prolific legal scholars, and *The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy* is one of his finest books. Not the least strength of this volume is the way Perry artfully performs what he commends to us. The thoughtful, challenging arguments Perry offers teach us in the doing how Perry would have us conduct our political arguments with one another."

– Milner S. Ball, Harmon W. Caldwell Chair Emeritus in Constitutional Law, University of Georgia

"This book is the capstone of Professor Perry's long and fruitful engagement with the difficult question of how religion should inform lawmaking in a liberal democracy. As a political liberal who belongs to a culturally conservative religion, I have found Professor Perry's work both intellectually enlightening and personally meaningful. *The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy* is an excellent work that forces one out of reflexive responses to religion in politics."

– Frederick Mark Gedicks, Guy Anderson Chair and Professor of Law, Brigham Young University

"*The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy* is a focused, original, and important contribution to the discussion of religion and liberal democracy. Perry focuses on two of the most controversial cases in current debate: abortion and same-sex unions, and he offers a theoretical account of liberal democracy that reframes the terms in which those debates should be conducted. The argument of the book is clear and compelling."

– Robin W. Lovin, Cary M. Maguire University Professor of Ethics, Southern Methodist University

"This is vintage Michael Perry. He addresses a big, fundamental, and timely issue: What are the moral convictions that should govern legislation and policy in a liberal democracy? He discusses the topic with verve, clarity, wide scope, and astounding learning and both formulates general rules and analyzes specific cases. If you have been unsettled by attacks over the past several decades on our form of government, *The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy* is the book to read to quiet your doubts."

– Nicholas Wolterstorff, Noah Porter Professor Emeritus of Philosophical Theology, Yale University

**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS  
[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

ISBN 978-0-521-11518-6

