Journal of Liberty and International Affairs | **Vol. 2, No. 1, 2016 | UDC 327 | eISSN 1857-9760**
Published online by the Institute for Research and European Studies – Bitola at www.e-jlia.com

Date of acceptance: May 09, 2016
Date of publication: June 15, 2016
Review article
UDC 355.45:[329.12:321.7(100)

LIBERTY, SECURITY AND THE DEGENERATIVE CYCLE OF DEMOCRACY

William Barclay, BA Honors
Carleton University, Canada
willbarclay13v[at]gmail.com

Abstract

Unfortunately, modern liberals have long misrepresented and misused the foundational principles of liberalism, in order to claim that the fundamental function of every democratic state is the pursuit of its citizens' liberty, as well as to viciously attack all states and leaders that do not consider liberty to be sacrosanct. Via an appeal to the essential works of liberalism and realism, this paper has thoroughly contradicted the claims of modern liberalism and has definitively argued that security, not liberty, is the fundamental purpose of every state. Furthermore, this paper has comprehensively analyzed the USA, in order to demonstrate that, if a state sacrifices the liberty of its citizenry in order to maintain its national security, then the state's actions are not merely just and ethical vis-à-vis its citizenry, but, rather, fulfill the state's fundamental, protective, function and are, in fact, an inevitable, benevolent, aspect of the state's existence.

Key words: Liberty; Locke; Machiavelli; Montesquieu; Security; Tocqueville; USA

INTRODUCTION

After the Cold War expired in 1991 (Brown 2011), the international political system endured a profound transformation. Liberalism usurped realism as the dominant political ideology within the international political system and began to rapidly permeate throughout various international political structures and actors. As a consequence of the deep ideological transformation that occurred within the international political system post-Cold War, innumerable modern political actors and theorists currently embrace a decidedly liberal political philosophy and argue that the fundamental function of every democratic state is the preservation of its citizens' freedoms and liberty, whereas, prior to the conclusion of the Cold War, national security was consistently considered to be the foremost concern of every democratic state (Jervis 2001, 36-60).

Furthermore, contemporary political pundits overwhelmingly contend that, since the fundamental function of every democratic state is the preservation of its citizens' liberty, if a democratic state sacrifices the liberty of its citizenry in order to preserve national security, then the state violates its citizenry abhorrently, as well as fundamentally destabilizes the rudiments of its own society (Dunne 2008, 116).

However, despite the fact that modern liberals so vehemently assert the paramount importance of liberty within democratic states, their assertions are impressively incorrect. Rather, when the hallowed texts that constitute the foundation of liberal political theory are consulted, such as Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, the Baron de Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws*, and John Locke's *Two Treatises on Government*, these foundational liberal documents resoundingly confirm that security, not liberty, is the fundamental concern of every democratic state.

Moreover, the essential, constituent, works of realism, in addition to the foundational works of liberalism, such as *Discourses on Livy* and *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline* for example, comprehensively confirm that liberty and security oscillate according to a predictable and inevitable cycle within every democratic state, and that, due to this oscillation, democratic states consistently reject national security in favor of liberality, which results in their ineludible collapse and implosion, if they are not summarily reoriented towards security.

Furthermore, if modern democratic states are analyzed, their unfortunate experiences unequivocally demonstrate that liberty and security vacillate according to the aforementioned cycle within every modern democratic state, and that, consequently, modern democratic states consistently reject their own national security in order to obsessively pursue liberality, which culminates in their inevitable decline and collapse, if they are not hastily reoriented towards security.

Therefore, it is eminently apparent that, if a democratic state sacrifices the liberty of its citizenry in order to maintain or improve its national security, then the state's actions are not merely just and ethical vis-à-vis its citizenry, but, rather, the state's actions fulfill the state's fundamental, protective, function and are, in fact, an inevitable aspect of the state's existence. More importantly, it is clear that, although liberalism and its foundational principles have been stubbornly misrepresented and misused by modern liberals, in order to viciously attack all states and leaders that do not consider personal liberty to be sacrosanct, modern liberals are foolish and emphatically incorrect to argue that the fundamental function of every democratic state is the preservation of its citizens' liberty, as well as to criticize states and leaders that sacrifice the liberty of their citizenry in order to preserve national security.

THE SUPREMACY OF SECURITY

Since its earliest articulation, liberal political ideology has acknowledged and embraced the paramount importance of security. In fact, although it is realism that is typically associated with a dogged pursuit of national security, liberal political ideology is identically committed to the pursuit of security and considers national security to be an imperative aspect of a healthy, successful state.

From the moment that it was conceived, liberalism's venerable patriarchs, such as Alexis de Tocqueville, John Locke, and the Baron de Montesquieu, recognized that, without security, it is impossible to maintain a state and to preserve the fundamental human rights that are an essential aspect of the human condition and, therefore, inalienable from every person. According to liberalism's august forebears, if a state is unable to maintain its national security, then the rights of the state's citizenry, as well as the state and its political structures, are inevitably and easily violated, since, without security, the state and its

citizenry are inevitably subject to the same anarchy, violence, and volatility that characterizes the state of nature,[1] and, under these conditions, human rights necessarily cease to exist, because the passions of the powerful determine the rudiments of humanity. Consequently, liberalism's ineffable progenitors confirm that, if a state cannot maintain its national security, then the state inevitably implodes and its citizens are left bereft of their natural rights.

Firstly, Alexis de Tocqueville, liberty's perennial champion, argues that every state exists specifically to protect and secure the liberty of its citizenry against violation. For instance, in one of the seminal works of liberal political theory, *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville states that:

> There is in fact a manly and legitimate passion for equality that incites men to all want to be strong and esteemed. This passion tends to elevate the small to the rank of the great; but one also encounters a depraved taste for equality in the human heart, that brings the weak to want to draw the strong to their level and that reduces men to preferring equality in servitude to inequality in freedom (De Tocqueville 2000, 52).

As a result, de Tocqueville contends that "In the United States…" and, indeed, within any democratic state, "[The people] associate for the goals of public security…" (De Tocqueville 2000, 181), due to the fact that"

> When citizens are all nearly equal, it becomes difficult for them to defend their independence against the aggressions of power. Since none of them is strong enough then to struggle alone to advantage, it is only the combination of the forces of all that can guarantee freedom (De Tocqueville 2000, 52).

Evidently therefore, via the aforementioned quotations from *Democracy in America*, it is clear that Alexis de Tocqueville, one of liberalism's most ardent exponents, considers security to be the fundamental function of every state, as well as the harbinger of liberty.

Moreover, in addition to Alexis de Tocqueville, one of liberalism's pre-eminent protagonists, Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, the man hailed by John Maynard Keynes as the "the real French equivalent of Adam Smith" (Keynes 1936), contends that the ultimate purpose of every state is security and that, unequivocally, the liberty of man is predicated upon his security. In one of the elemental elucidations of liberalism and political theory, *The Spirit of the Laws*, the Baron de Montesquieu states that "the laws [of a political state] must provide as much as possible for the security of individuals" (Montesquieu 2001, 95) and that, "while it is true that in democracies the people seem to act as they please…political liberty does not consist in an

[1] In the state of nature "…it is manifest that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war, and such a war is of every man against every man…Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to every man, the same is consequent to the time wherein men live without other security than what their own strength and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such a condition there is…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. In this state every person has a natural right or liberty to do anything one thinks necessary for preserving one's own life; and life is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Edwin Curley (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1994), 76.

unlimited freedom" (Montesquieu 2001, 172); instead, according to the Baron de Montesquieu, "political liberty consists in security…" (Montesquieu 2001, 206). Furthermore, in *The Spirit of the Laws*, the Baron de Montesquieu states that

> It is not sufficient to have treated of political liberty in relation to the constitution; we must examine it likewise in the relation it bears to the subject. We have observed that in the former case it arises from a certain distribution of the three powers; but in the latter, we must consider it in another light. It consists in security… (Montesquieu 2001, 206).

Consequently, via the aforementioned quotations from *The Spirit of the Laws*, it is readily apparent that the Baron de Montesquieu, one of liberalism's most stalwart exponents, considers security to be the essential purpose of every state.

Finally, John Locke, the "father of liberalism" (Bailey et al. 2008, 495), emphatically states that people elect to leave the state of nature, sacrifice their liberty, and shackle themselves with the bonds of civil society, the state, specifically in order to protect and secure their lives, their natural rights, and their property from any violation. In one of the obligatory works of liberal political theory, *Two Treatises of Government*, Locke states

> But, whatever flatterers may talk to amuse people's understandings, it hinders not men from feeling; and when they perceive, that any man, in what station soever, is out of the bounds of the civil society which they are of, and that they have no appeal on earth against any harm, they may receive from him, they are apt to think themselves in the state of nature, in respect of him whom they find to be so; and to take care, as soon as they can, to have that *safety and security in civil society*, for which it was first instituted, and for which only they entered into it (Locke 1980, 50-51).

Moreover, Locke explicitly states that

> MEN being, as has been said, by nature, all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of this estate, and subjected to the political power of another, without his own consent. The only way whereby any one divests himself of his natural liberty, and puts on the *bonds of civil society*, is by agreeing with other men to join and unite into a community for their comfortable, safe, and peaceable living one amongst another, in a secure enjoyment of their properties, and a greater security against any, that are not of it (Locke 1980, 50-52).

Therefore, via the aforementioned quotations from *Two Treatises of Government*, it is readily apparent that John Locke, the primogenitor and paterfamilias of liberalism, unequivocally confirms that security is the quintessential function of every state.

Subsequently, it is indisputable that Alexis de Tocqueville, the Baron de Montesquieu, and John Locke, three of liberalism's most revered apostles, all unequivocally confirm that the fundamental function of every state is security. Moreover, as a result, it is readily apparent that, since its earliest articulation, liberal political ideology has embraced the paramount importance of national security.

Journal of Liberty and International Affairs | **Vol. 2, No. 1, 2016 | UDC 327 | eISSN 1857-9760**
Published online by the Institute for Research and European Studies – Bitola at www.e-jlia.com

THE DEGENERATIVE DEMOCRATIC CYCLE

The essential documents of realism, in addition to the canons of liberalism, comprehensively confirm that liberty and security fluctuate according to a predictable and inevitable cycle within every democratic state, and that, due to this fluctuation, democratic states consistently reject national security in favor of liberality, which results in their ineludible collapse and implosion, if they are not summarily reoriented towards security.

When people initially unite into a community and create a state, they undertake this endeavor specifically in order to extricate and protect themselves from the anarchic, volatile, and insecure 'state of nature'. In the state of nature:

> … it is manifest that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war, and such a war is of every man against every man…Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to every man, the same is consequent to the time wherein men live without other security than what their own strength and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such a condition there is…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. In this state every person has a natural right or liberty to do anything one thinks necessary for preserving one's own life; and life is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short (Hobbes 1994, 76).

Therefore, due to the fact that every state is created specifically in order to extricate and protect its citizenry from the violent, volatile, anarchic, and profoundly insecure 'state of nature', every state begins its existence oriented predominantly towards national security, and, as a result, initially fosters a meager amount of liberality within its society.

However, despite the fact that every state is oriented primarily and fundamentally towards security throughout its formative years, once national security is achieved and has been maintained within a democratic state, the state incontrovertibly begins to undergo a fundamental transformation.[2] Due to the fact that the state insulates and safeguards its citizenry against the anarchy that is inherent within the state of nature, the state's citizenry becomes undaunted by the state of nature and its latent insecurity. As a result, a tyranny of the majority manifests within the body politic and forces the state to orient itself towards an increasingly liberal ideology, norms, values, and policies, in spite of any proximate insecurity.

Eventually, the tyranny of the majority causes the state to become overwhelmingly liberal and to accept a liberal political ideology that grievously contradicts its foundational, security-oriented, political ideology, norms, and values. Consequently, security within the state begins to collapse, and, subsequently, in an attempt to preserve its nation, the state's regime adopts extreme policies that abruptly separate the state's citizens from their personal liberty, in order to immediately re-establish national security and reorient the state towards its original, security-based, norms, values, and political ideology. If, at this vital juncture, the state is successfully reoriented towards its foundational, security-oriented, political

[2] This fundamental transformation occurs within democratic states, specifically, due to the vulnerability that democratic political states possess vis-à-visa tyranny of the majority.

ideology, values, and norms, and the primacy of national security is appropriately re-established within the state, then the state will be saved and continue the afore stated political cycle. However, if the state's regime fails to reorient the state towards its foundational, security-based, political ideology and to re-establish the primacy of national security within the state, then the state will inevitably collapse under the bloated, dead, weight of its hyper - liberal citizenry.

Numerous revered political theorists emphatically confirm that liberty and security oscillate according to a predictable and inevitable cycle within every democratic state, and that, due to this oscillation, democratic states consistently reject national security in favour of liberality, which results in their ineluctable implosion and collapse, if they are not summarily reoriented towards security.

Firstly, the primogenitor of realism, Niccolò Machiavelli, argues, in one of the seminal works of realist political theory, *Discourses on Livy*, that:

> It is a very true thing that all worldly things have a limit to their life; but generally those got the whole course that is ordered for them by heaven that do not disorder their body but keep it ordered so that it does not alter or, if it alters, it is for safety and not to its harm. Because I am speaking of mixed bodies, such as republics and sects, I say that those alterations are for safety that lead them back towards their beginnings. So these are better ordered and have longer life that by means of their orders can often be renewed or indeed that through some accident outside the said order came to the said renewal. And it is a thing clearer than light that these bodies do not last if they do not renew themselves (Machiavelli 1996, 209).

Moreover, Machiavelli states that:

> The mode of renewing them is, as was said, to lead them back towards their beginnings. For all the beginning of sects, republics, and kingdoms must have some goodness in them, by means of which they may regain their first reputation and their first increase. Because in the process of time that goodness is corrupted, unless something intervenes to lead it back to the mark, it of necessity kills that body (Machiavelli 1996, 209).

Furthermore, in *Discourses on Livy,* Machiavelli also explains that, once a state stabilizes itself and secures its citizenry against the rigors of the state of nature, within ten years, the state will begin to liberalize and to degenerate, due to the fact that:

> When [ten years] is past, men begin to vary in their customs and to transgress the laws...Soon so many delinquents join together that they can no longer be punished without danger…Men began to dare to dare to try new things and to say evil; and so it is necessary to provide for it, drawing [the state] back toward its beginnings (Machiavelli 1996, 210-211).

Via the aforementioned quotations from *Discourses on Livy*, Niccolò Machiavelli clearly explains that every democratic[3] state is subject to an inevitable cycle, whereby the state absorbs and manifests foreign political ideologies and values that inherently contradict

[3] Machiavelli extends his assertions to every type of state

the state's foundational, security-oriented[4], political ideology and values. Moreover, via the aforementioned quotations, Machiavelli clearly states that, once a democratic state has been penetrated by foreign, inherently contradictory, values and ideologies, the state must undergo a political renewal or regeneration process, whereby the state divests itself of the foreign, inherently contradictory, ideologies and values that have come to rest within its borders and reorients itself according to its original, security-based, national ideology, values, and norms. According to Machiavelli, if a democratic state fails to successfully undergo this political renewal or regeneration, divest itself of the contradictory ideologies and values that have penetrated into its society, and reorient itself according to the security-based ideology and values that constitute the rudiments of its political structures and society, then the state will inevitably implode, since the ever-increasing influence of the myriad, inherently contradictory, foreign ideologies and values that have penetrated within the state will inevitably subvert and destabilize the state by causing it to abandon its security-oriented foundational ideology, and, thereby, the primacy of security, within its borders.

Moreover, in addition to the supreme realist, Niccolò Machiavelli, one of the seminal architects of liberal political thought, Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, states, in one of the quintessential works of liberal political theory, *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline,* that:

> The strength of the [Roman] republic consisted in discipline, austerity of morals, and the constant observance of certain customs, they corrected the abuses that the law had not foreseen, or that the ordinary magistrate could not punish…In Rome, everything that could introduce dangerous novelties, change the heart or mind of the citizen, and deprive the state — if I dare use the term — of perpetuity, all disorders, domestic or public, were reformed by the censors (Montesquieu 1999, 86).

Additionally, the Baron de Montesquieu explains that, when the Roman citizenry began to eschew their foundational, security-oriented, ideology, "The distracted city no longer formed a complete whole." (Montesquieu 1999, 92-93).

Furthermore, in *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline,* the Baron de Montesquieu explicitly states that

> Contrary maxims employed by the new government made [Rome's] greatness collapse. Thus, they established practices wholly contrary to those that had made them universal masters. And, as formerly their constant policy was to keep the military art for themselves and deprive all their neighbors of it, they were now destroying it among themselves and establishing it among others…Here, in a word, is the history of the Romans. By means of their maxims they conquered all peoples, but when they had succeeded in doing so, their republic could not endure… (Montesquieu 1999, 168-169).

[4] Machiavelli explains that the fundamental ideology of every state is fundamentally and unequivocally security-oriented in: Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 98- 101.

Via the aforementioned quotations from *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, it is clear that the Baron de Montesquieu, one of liberalism's most illustrious and antecedent champions, emphatically confirms that liberty and security vacillate according to a predictable and inevitable cycle within every state, and that, due to this vacillation, certain[5] states consistently reject national security in favour of liberality. In addition, via the aforementioned quotations, the Baron de Montesquieu confirms that, if a state deviates from its foundational, security-based, ideology, then security within the nation will rapidly degenerate and the state will incontrovertibly implode, if the state is not summarily reoriented towards security and its foundational political ideology.

Therefore, via the aforementioned quotations from *Discourses on Livy* and *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, two essential, constituent, works of realism and liberalism, respectively, it is evident that revered political theorists, august realists such as Niccolò Machiavelli and ardent liberals such as the Baron de Montesquieu, comprehensively confirm that liberty and security oscillate according to a predictable and inevitable cycle within every democratic state, and that, due to this oscillation, democratic states consistently reject national security in favour of liberality, which results in their ineludible implosion and collapse, if they are not summarily reoriented towards security.

[5] Predominantly democratic.

LIBERALITY AND THE MODERN DEMOCRATIC COLLAPSE

If modern states are analyzed, it becomes readily apparent that liberty and security vacillate according to the afore stated cycle within modern democratic states, and that, consequently, modern democratic states consistently reject national security in order to obsessively pursue liberality, which results in their inevitable decline and collapse, if they are not hastily reoriented towards security. For example, if the political trajectory of the USA is analyzed, then it becomes clear that that the 'progress' of the United States of America reflects an ineluctable, repetitive, and degenerative political cycle, whereby, once national security is established and maintained within the American state, liberality subsequently flourishes, and, as a result, security deteriorates dramatically, which causes a precipitous national decline to consume the American nation, and prompts the American state, in order to save its citizens from their own tyranny, to reorient itself towards security, and initiate the aforementioned cycle anew.

Initially, the USA was founded explicitly in order to protect the American people and their natural rights from being violated and suppressed by the British Empire (Woodburn 2008). Therefore, when the USA was founded, the personal liberty of the American citizenry was unequivocally considered to be secondary to the security of the American nation. The primacy of national security in the USA during the American state's formative years is reflected via many of the USA's early national political policies. For instance, in 1861 the United States of America began to utilize conscription in order to bolster its national security, despite the fact that the conscription process forced American men, regardless of their personal autonomy and irrespective of their personal liberty, to fight and, if need be, die, for the national interests and security of the American state (Flynn 1998). However, despite the fact that national security was clearly the ultimate concern of the USA during its seminal years, the primacy of security did not remain entrenched within USA society.

After the USA was founded, and the turmoil that surrounded its early, tectonic, years was overcome, the security of the American citizenry was established, re-entrenched, and consistently maintained. Consequently, as a result of the persistent presence of security within USA society, the American people became ignorant of their volatile and violent origins within the anarchic 'state of nature', and, due to their ignorance, the American citizenry began to demand that the liberality within the USA be increased, despite the fact that this increase in liberality would unequivocally necessitate the sacrifice of the USA's national security. Subsequently, in response to the demands of the American citizenry, the United States of America rejected its security-based foundational ideology and, instead, reoriented itself towards a fundamentally liberal political ideology, as well as the abject freedom of the American people, rather than their security.

For example, throughout the 1920's, the United States of America experienced the "progressive era" (Sklar 1992), an era of dynamic socio-political activism and reform, wherein the USA rejected many of its original, security-based, foundational traditions, values, norms, and policies, specifically in order to manifest an increased liberality within its society, and, as a result, the American citizenry became hesitant to go to war and to protect the integrity of the American nation against violation from within, as well as without (Sklar 1992). Moreover, during the late 1960's and the early 1970's, the USA's national political ideology, values, norms, and policies endured a further, profound

liberalization, due to the fact that the USA citizenry poignantly rejected America's security-based political ideology and its conservative norms, as well as, specifically, the USA military intervention in Vietnam (Berry et al. 1998, 327-348). In fact, during the late 1960's and the early 1970's, innumerable American citizens illegally evaded the national draft for Vietnam and, thereby, emphatically proclaimed the American citizenry's explicit rejection of the USA's foundational, security-oriented, ideology, as well as one of the USA's earliest security-based political policies in particular: conscription (Erikson and Stoker 2011, 221-237).

As the United States of America deviated from its original, security-based, ideology and embraced an overwhelming liberality within its social fabric, the American state experienced a violent and virulent national decline. For example, during the 1960's, as a result of the American citizenry's obsession with liberality, the USA's national security collapsed and crime within the USA increased dramatically (Berry et al. 1998, 327-348). Consequently, the natural rights of the American citizenry were often and easily violated, which caused the American populace to abruptly recall their origins in the state of nature. Ominously, on 22 November 1963, the President of the United States of America, John F. Kennedy, was assassinated, which unambiguously underscored the nigh-anarchic conditions and the insecurity that now terrorized USA society. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that the United States of America had boasted the strongest economy within the international political system throughout the early 1960's, by the 1970's, as a result of America's incessant liberalization, the USA economy had deteriorated dramatically and was wracked by a murderous recession, unbridled energy shortage, vast inflation, and extensive unemployment (Free 2010, 350). Yet, although, by the end of the 1970's, the USA citizenry had nearly doomed the American nation via its insatiable appetite for liberality, security was eventually and arduously restored within America, and, as a result, the USA was saved before it could completely implode.

During the early 1980's, in response to America's impending collapse, the USA's national political ideology was fundamentally transformed and the American state was abruptly re-oriented towards safeguarding the security and the natural rights of the American nation, rather than the pursuit of abject liberality. Readily, the American citizenry accepted this dramatic reorientation towards security, as well as the consequent reduction in liberality that it entailed within the American state, due to the fact that, over the two previous decades, the American citizenry and their natural rights had become endangered, insecure, and, as a result, inconsistent, within a volatile American society, which forced the American citizenry to recall their origins within the anarchic state of nature, as well as the American state's original, vital, function: security. For example, during the 1980's, the Reagan administration abruptly curtailed the liberality of the American citizenry and reoriented the American state towards national security via the enforcement of novel, stringent, laws and penalties. As a result, national security was re-established within America, which allowed USA citizens to once again experience their natural rights and, moreover, caused the American nation to become virtuous, healthy, and prosperous anew.[6] During the decades that followed the resurrection of the American state and America's national re-orientation towards security, the USA and its citizenry adhered obediently to a security-based political ideology and policies, since the American nation

[6] "Inflation fell from 10.3% in 1981 to 3.2% in 1983." Rhona C. Free, ed., *21st Century Economics: A Reference Handbook* (SAGE Publications, 2010), 352.

had been forced to recall its origins within the anarchic state of nature, as well as the American state's original, vital, function: security. However, by 2008, the USA citizenry had been sufficiently insulated against insecurity and rendered ignorant of its origins within the anarchic, volatile, state of nature. Summarily, the USA citizenry began to lust after liberality once more, and, consequently, during the presidency of Barack Obama, the USA profoundly re-liberalized its fundamental political structures, despite the fact that this endeavor required the concurrent sacrifice of American national security. As a result, during the modern era,[7] the USA has experienced a distinct national degradation and decline. For example, since the most recent re-liberalization of the American state, recession has become an essential aspect of the USA economy, insecurity and nigh-anarchic conditions have begun to manifest within the USA, and the USA's dominance of the international political system has deteriorated dramatically (Schweller and Pu 2011, 41-72).

Subsequently, it is evident that the political trajectory of the United States of America unequivocally reflects an ineluctable, repetitive, and degenerative political cycle, whereby, once national security is established and maintained within the American state, liberality subsequently flourishes, and, as a result, security deteriorates dramatically, which causes a precipitous national decline to consume the American nation, and prompts the American state, in order to save its citizens from their own tyranny, to reorient itself towards security, and initiate the aforementioned cycle anew. Moreover, due to the fact that the USA and other modern democratic states manifest the aforementioned cycle so readily, it is therefore clear that liberty and security inevitably vacillate according to the aforementioned cycle within every modern democratic state, and that, consequently, modern democratic states consistently reject national security in order to obsessively pursue liberality, which results in their inevitable decline and collapse, if they are not hastily reoriented towards security.

[7] From 2008 onwards.

CONCLUSION

It is unquestionable that, since the end of the Cold War, liberal political ideology has become synonymous with the international political system and permeated throughout innumerable international political structures and actors. Unfortunately, despite the fact that the international community has so readily embraced liberalism, modern liberals have profoundly misunderstood the foundational principles of liberal political theory and, consequently, liberalism's contemporary adherents are woefully ignorant of liberalism's rudimentary tenets and principles.

The overwhelming majority of modern liberals argue that the fundamental function of every democratic state is the preservation of its citizens' freedoms and liberty, whereas, prior to the conclusion of the Cold War, national security was consistently considered to be the foremost concern of every state (Jervis 2001, 36-60). Furthermore, contemporary liberals categorically contend that, since the fundamental function of every democratic state is the preservation of its citizens' liberty, if a democratic state sacrifices the liberty of its citizenry in order to preserve national security, then the state violates its citizenry abhorrently, as well as fundamentally destabilizes the rudiments of its own society (Dunne 2008, 116).

However, despite the fact that modern liberals so vehemently assert the paramount importance of liberality within democratic states, their assertions are strikingly incorrect. When the hallowed texts that constitute the foundation of liberal political theory are consulted, such as Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, the Baron de Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws*, and John Locke's *Two Treatises on Government*, these quintessential liberal documents resoundingly confirm that security, not liberty, is the fundamental concern of every state.

Moreover, the essential, constituent, works of realism, in addition to the foundational works of liberalism, comprehensively confirm that liberty and security oscillate according to a predictable and inevitable cycle within every democratic state, and that, due to this oscillation, democratic states consistently reject national security in favour of liberality, which results in their collapse and ineludible implosion, if they are not summarily reoriented towards security. For example, via *Discourses on Livy* and *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, two ineffable, obligatory, works of realism and liberalism, respectively, it is evident that revered political theorists, such as realism's pre-eminent protagonist, Niccolò Machiavelli, and liberalism's vital architect, the Baron de Montesquieu, comprehensively confirm that liberty and security fluctuate according to a predictable and inevitable cycle within every democratic state, and that, due to this fluctuation, democratic states consistently reject national security in favor of liberality, which results in their inexorable implosion, if they are not summarily reoriented towards security.

Furthermore, if modern states are analyzed, it becomes readily apparent that liberty and security inevitably vacillate according to the aforementioned cycle within modern democratic states, and that, consequently, modern democratic states unfailingly reject their own national security in order to obsessively pursue liberality, which results in their inevitable decline and collapse, if they are not hastily reoriented towards security. For example, it is evident that the political trajectory of the United States of America unequivocally reflects an ineluctable, repetitive, and degenerative political cycle, whereby,

once national security is established and maintained within the American state, liberality subsequently flourishes, and, as a result, security deteriorates dramatically, which causes a precipitous national decline to consume the American nation, and prompts the American state, in order to save its citizens from their own tyranny, to reorient itself towards security, and initiate the aforementioned cycle anew.

Therefore, it is readily apparent that, if a democratic state sacrifices the liberty of its citizenry in order to maintain or improve its own national security, then the state's actions are not merely just and ethical vis-à-vis its citizenry, but, rather, the state's actions fulfill the state's fundamental, protective, function and are, in fact, an inevitable aspect of the state's existence. More importantly, it is clear that, although liberalism and its foundational principles have been stubbornly misrepresented and misused by modern liberals, in order to viciously attack all states and leaders that do not consider personal liberty to be sacrosanct, modern liberals are foolish and emphatically incorrect to argue that the fundamental function of every democratic state is the preservation of its citizens' liberty, as well as to criticize states and leaders that sacrifice the liberty of their citizenry in order to preserve national security.

As a result, the criticisms that are meted out by modern liberals are entirely remiss and nigh laughable. However, it is necessary to avoid dismissing modern liberals as harmless fools, because, if their perverse interpretation of liberalism's foundational principles continues to be embraced by modern democratic states and to permeate throughout the international political system, then their corrupted liberal ideology will inevitably cause innumerable nations to implode. Therefore, it is evident that the ignorance of modern liberals endangers the lives of countless people, and, consequently, it is imperative that modern liberalism be emphatically and categorically rejected from the international political system.

REFERENCES

1. Baron de Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat. Considerations on the Causes of The Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline. trans. David Lowenthal. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1999.
2. Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat, The Spirit of the Laws. trans. Thomas Nugent. Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001.
3. Bailey, Andrew et al., ed. "John Locke." in The Broadview Anthology of Social and Political Thought: From Plato to Nietzsche. Broadview Press, 2008.
4. Berry, William D. et al. "Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States, 1960-93." in American Journal of Political Science. Midwest Political Science Association, 1998.
5. Brown, Archie. "Reform, Coup and Collapse: The End of the Soviet State." BBC History. 17 February 2011. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/coldwar/soviet_end_01.shtml> [13 March 2016].
6. De Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America. trans. and ed. Harvey Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
7. Dunne, Tim. "Liberalism." in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations. Fourth Edition.* ed. John Baylis et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
8. Erikson, Robert S. and Laura Stoker. "Caught in the Draft: The Effects of Vietnam Draft Lottery Status on Political Attitudes." in The American Political Science Review. American Political Science Association, 2011.
9. Flynn, George Q. "Conscription and Equity in Western Democracies." in Journal of Contemporary History. 1998.
10. Free, Rhona C. ed. 21st Century Economics: A Reference Handbook. SAGE Publications, 2010.
11. Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan. ed. Edwin Curley. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1994.
12. Jervis, Robert "Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma?" Journal of Cold War Studies. 2001.<http://www.ou.edu/uschina/SASD/SASD2006/Jervis2001CWSecDil.pdf> [13 March 2016].
13. Locke, John. Second Treatise of Government. ed. C.B. Macpherson. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1980.
14. Maynard Keynes, John. The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money. Palgrave Macmillan: 1936.
15. Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy. trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
16. Machiavelli, Niccolò. The Prince. trans. Harvey C. Mansfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

17. Schweller, Randall L. and Xiaoyu Pu. “After Unipolarity: China's Visions of International Order in an Era of USA Decline.” in International Security. 2011.
18. Sklar, Martin J. “Political Development in the Progressive Era.” in The United States as a Developing Country: Studies in USA History in the Progressive Era and the 1920s. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
19. Woodburn, James Albert. Causes of the American Revolution. Read Books, 2008.