



Statue of Responsibility Foundation

Whitepaper

The Statue of Responsibility: A Monument to Our Responsibility to Preserve Freedom

By David W. Johnson, Ph.D., and

Russell K. Thornley, Ph.D., Utah Valley University

September 2010

www.SORfoundation.org

Executive Summary

The Statue of Responsibility (SOR) Foundation was formed in 2004 in response to a call by Viktor E. Frankl, author of *Man's Search for Meaning*, to erect a Statue of Responsibility on the west coast of America which, in combination with the Statue of Liberty on the east coast, would serve as constant reminders that freedom requires both liberty and responsibility. This whitepaper has been written in response to the many inquiries received by the SOR Foundation to further clarify the meanings of the words liberty and freedom and to explain the critical role of responsibility in preserving a high level of liberty and freedom.

The words liberty and freedom have been used throughout America's history in conflicts to gain independence and to expand the rights of liberty to all. Over the years the two words have essentially become synonyms but the word responsibility has seldom been mentioned. To help clarify this trend, this paper defines liberty as a set of rights and constraints (laws and rules) within an environment that provide the opportunity for freedom. Freedom is then defined as the ability to act within the liberty of an environment. It is clear that not everyone takes advantage of all the opportunities provided by liberty. For example, the opportunity for an advanced education is ignored by many. Why is this? Of course there are many reasons for this, however the root cause of most of these reasons is that people did not live up to their responsibilities to enable such individuals to act on the opportunity available, resulting in a loss of their freedom to advance educationally. The preceding definitions and example are further amplified in this paper to conclude that liberty requires responsibility to achieve freedom, or as the SOR Foundation puts it: *Liberty + Responsibility = Our Freedom*.

The paper then continues to describe our many responsibilities to ourselves, our family, others, and to our country. Words of concern are highlighted indicating that in many cases these responsibilities are being ignored as Americans are becoming self-centered, complacent, and are relying more and more on others and government to provide their freedoms. The concern is that if this trend continues we will fail to pass on to future generations the traditions, knowledge, and intellectual legacy necessary to perpetuate "the free life" and, as stated in the Constitution, "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity".

One way to help bring this concern to the forefront is to develop a focal point for these issues which will encourage an ongoing dialog about where this country, this land of liberty, is headed. This is the purpose of the Statue of Responsibility. The development of this monument will require participation from many people at all levels of community, education, business, and government not only nationally but internationally as well. The SOR Foundation is dedicated to making this a reality. Its two-fold mission is to first, raise the money and build the monument and second, to advance and maintain the core principles of liberty, responsibility, and freedom in society. This will be accomplished via educational initiatives in the monument's Visitor's Center along with out-reach programs to schools and universities including an educational scholarship endowment fund.

Introduction

Freedom and liberty are principles that have inspired individuals throughout history. Presidents, patriots, and leaders have used these words eloquently in speeches and writings to persuade men and women of conscience to take noble action. Who has not been touched by Patrick Henry's bold statement, "*Give me Liberty or give me death!*"? Who has not been lifted by Jefferson's declaration that all men are endowed with the unalienable rights of "*life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*"? The words of Abraham Lincoln continue to encourage Americans to honor freedom so that "*the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.*"

Despite such pleadings from the past, numerous voices today warn of the erosions of our liberty and freedom. There is trepidation that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people is in jeopardy. The concern is that there may have been too much focus on "for the people" and not enough attention to "of and by the people," and that, for the most part, people have been neglecting their responsibilities as citizens and even as human beings. Perhaps President John F. Kennedy recognized this when he said, "*Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country.*" Many people feel that significant decline has occurred in Western societies since the Second World War. Others argue that the whole modern era from the seventeenth century onward has been a prolonged period of decline. Thinkers and pundits cite symptoms of decline ranging from littering and bad manners, to climate change, biodiversity loss, economic collapse, and ecological peril (e.g., the oil leak in the Gulf of Mexico). Regardless of its manifestations, this decline results in lost liberties for individuals and an overall decay of "the free life" in America and around the world.

In the face of this peril, the Statue of Responsibility (SOR) Foundation was formed in 2004 with a mission to advance and maintain the core principles of liberty, responsibility, and freedom in society by erecting a Statue of Responsibility monument on the West coast to stand as a bookend to the Statue of Liberty on the East coast. This monument is intended as a "wake up call" to America and the world that freedom is not free, liberty can erode, and living up to our responsibilities as citizens and human beings is critical. It is hoped that the building of this monument will create a national dialog which will inspire many to become involved in the effort to breathe renewed life into the ideas of our founding fathers to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Recently, Daniel L. Bolz, President and CEO of the Statue of Responsibility Foundation wrote,

"There comes a time in a nation's history when its core values must be revisited, re-energized, and re-enthroned, in order for that nation to endure. We live in such a time. We all know what America stands for. Our beacon of hope and freedom reaches out to all. For democracy to thrive under the banner of freedom, responsibility must coexist with liberty."

The Statue of Responsibility Foundation takes its impetus in part from the life and thinking of Viktor E. Frankl – most widely known as the author of *Man’s Search for Meaning*. Frankl lived through the most intense deprivation of personal freedom imaginable, and challenged America with his account by declaring that liberty must be embraced along with responsibility to maintain freedom. Likewise, the Statue of Responsibility Foundation declares,

“Our hope is that the monument will stimulate an international discussion on the role responsibility plays – hand in hand with liberty – in maintaining freedom. Only by balancing Liberty with Responsibility can Freedom be sustained.”

This White Paper is intended as a springboard to further conversations about the meanings of liberty and freedom and the connection of responsibility to these foundational principles. The following section discusses the notions of freedom, liberty and responsibility including the authors’ definitions of liberty and freedom. This is followed by a discussion of responsibility and its relationship to liberty and freedom. The paper then concludes with a discussion about monuments and the Statue of Responsibility and their connection to liberty, responsibility, and freedom.

Freedom, Liberty, and Responsibility

Most people today when asked about the difference between liberty and freedom would probably respond that they are the same - synonyms for each other. Indeed, the word liberty comes from Latin (through old Norman French), *libertatem*, meaning the condition of a free-born man (as contrasted with a slave); and the word freedom from a German-Gothic pedigree, *freihals*, meaning literally “free-neck” and referring to a person who does not wear a collar of servitude. Drawing on the intellectual tradition of Locke and Rousseau, *the Declaration of Independence* boldly affirms several “self-evident” truths: “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.” It is noteworthy that, although *the Declaration of Independence* clearly decrees *liberty* to be an unalienable right, the document does not contain the word *freedom*.

For the founders, liberty was the fundamental value in an American way of life, for which responsible patriots fought and died. It meant more than just lacking a collar. It was liberty that Patrick Henry demanded – or else death. It was liberty that the ringing bell in Philadelphia proclaimed, commemorating William Penn’s *Charter of Privileges*, and calling to assembly the heroes of the Founding. It was liberty, contrasted against the tyranny of the British King and the tax-imposed servitude to England, for which the tea was spilt in Boston. Following the War of Independence, the history and connotations of the word liberty conjured up not only privileges, but also calls to public duty in relation to the state and foreign threats that maintained its dominant use for the next century.

Yet the idea of liberty and all it entailed for the founders allowed for interpretation and provisions that openly recognized the institution of slavery, and made women second-class citizens. Many among the framers recognized this inconsistency, but they also believed that persistent efforts to achieve the “progressive actuation of the free life” would eventually “secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.” This meant that, like the “Liberty Bell,” the definition and practical import of “individual liberty” and “freedom” would have to be recast, worked out and renewed by subsequent generations to achieve the right note. Accordingly, a conception of liberty that included the emancipation of slaves was not achieved until about 100 years after the principles of equality and liberty first gave rise to this great nation. It was a painful progression, as this actualization of the free life for all US citizens regardless of race was only achieved through the great and bloody Civil War.

During the Civil War period, the change in the conception of liberty corresponded to a change from the use of the more philosophically technical word *liberty*, to the use of the more popular, emancipated word *freedom*. As President Abraham Lincoln sought to preserve the Union, he called for a “new birth of freedom.” Lincoln knew full well that different men defined liberty in different ways and that the time had come for a new understanding. In an April 18th, 1867 address in Baltimore, Maryland, he said:

“The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty, but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men’s labor.”

Over the century following their participation in the momentous founding of a new nation, the people of France watched as the Civil War in America tested whether that nation and the idea of liberty it represented could long endure. In recognition of the fact that the United States of America survived being torn asunder and almost annihilated as a union, the gift of the *Statue of Liberty* was a given as a poignant reminder of a 100-year anniversary that very nearly did not take place. With that anniversary came a new and expanded understanding of liberty and freedom.

The dominant use of the word freedom didn't really come into its own, however, until the era of the New Deal, when the Great Depression provoked economic programs focused on providing relief, recovery and reform. Later, the Civil Rights movement made "freedom now" its rallying cry and “equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons” began to define freedom. As Nunberg notes, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. used *freedom* 19 times in his "I Have a Dream" speech, reminding the nation that the dignity of equality and freedom that was the promise of America was still being withheld from a large number of its citizens a century after emancipation. In more recent years, President Ronald Reagan, understanding the power the

word had acquired, mentioned *freedom* 14 times and *liberty* only once in his second Inaugural Address.

What notes sound in our minds when we hear these words today? What do the words *liberty* and *freedom* mean for us in the postmodern world of technology and globalization? The evolution from the use of the one word to other seems quite natural. As America transformed from an eclectic new nation concerned with liberation and the establishment of the Constitution, into a more mature democratic society with its own national identity, the memories of past external tyrannies, and the heroic efforts necessary to break free of them, began to fade. In their place new internal concerns about social and economic justice arose for which the word *liberty* seemed less suitable. Consequently, more emphasis has come to be placed on what it means to have *rights*, and how those rights can be demanded and enforced, rather than on the rich tradition and history of community values, responsibility, and public service that informed the use of the word *liberty*.

Perhaps the best way to view the difference between liberty and freedom is to provide definitions for each. For this paper we will use the following:

- Liberty is a set of rights and constraints within an environment that provides the opportunity for freedom.
- Freedom is the ability to act within the liberty of an environment.

In some cases liberty is inherent, in other cases it is provided by established norms, rules and laws. To further understand these definitions we need to recognize that each individual truly exists only within a set of environments, or contexts. Examples of environments include one's family, neighborhood, job, governmental unit, religion, etc. For the most part, these environments could also be thought of as cultures and subcultures. The all-encompassing environment to which all individuals belong is that of the human race. Each individual also belongs to a unique environment - that of his or her own life's experience. Associated with each environment are a set of rights and a set of constraints which make up the environment's "liberty." At any particular point in time an individual's overall liberty is some function of the liberties of each of the environments to which the person belongs. It follows therefore that no two individuals have the same overall level of liberty.

We can think of liberty and freedom as variables that can take on values. Since there is no unit of measure for these values we can only associate subjective levels such as *high*, *moderate*, and *low* in describing the amount of liberty and freedom we have. Although some write about positive and negative liberty and freedom, it is clear that, based on our definitions, zero is a lower bound for liberty and hence freedom. It is equally clear that, at any given time, liberty has some upper bound, although in the future this upper bound may increase because of advances in technology or other changes, or it may decrease because of changes in the environment due to a lack of responsibility. A sense for the level of a person's liberty is determined by examining its

rights and constraints. Rights are the vehicles of liberty that provide the opportunity for freedom. Most rights are universal, that is they are available to all individuals within an environment. Other rights are afforded only to subgroups of an environment for which they are deemed necessary in order to provide subgroup members greater parity with the overall environment. Such rights are generally paired with corresponding constraints to those in the environment who are not members of the particular subgroup receiving the right. For example, handicapped individuals are granted special parking places which others are constrained from using. Constraints are those aspects of liberty that restrict rights. Some constraints provide restrictions on some in order to provide rights to others. Other constraints imposed by the environment restrict the rights of all members of the environment.

In an ideal environment, a high level of rights with minimal constraints would be sought after. In the real world such an environment reduces to anarchy and survival of the fittest. On the other hand, a high level of constraints with minimal rights is oppression. In our democracy, the actual value of liberty at a given point in time, if it could be measured, would be that balance of rights and constraints such that most people are happy with their level of rights while at the same time are not revolting because of the constraints placed on them.

So what then is the relationship between freedom and liberty? To answer this, let's ask another question. Just because liberty provides the opportunity to do something, does that mean that a person automatically has the ability to act on the opportunity? A simple example will show that this is not the case. Suppose that a man living in Michigan wants to visit his ageing parents living in Florida. Since America provides the right/opportunity for unrestricted travel within its borders, does that mean that a travel genie will automatically appear and whisk the man away to Florida? Of course not! The man is responsible for making his own travel arrangements. He may choose to drive his car, in which case he must make sure that the car is capable of getting him to Florida. He must also make motel arrangements and choose the route he will follow. Finally, on the trip he is responsible for following the rules of the road and obeying speed limits. Once all this is accomplished we can now say yes, the man has the ability and hence the freedom to visit his parents in Florida. The key ingredient in this example is responsibility. Without the effort in preparation the man would not have the ability and hence the freedom to make the trip to visit his parents.

As a second example, consider the handicapped parking spaces discussed earlier. In this case, the responsibility of those without handicaps to not park in handicapped spaces illegally or with someone else's permit is required in order to make sure that the spaces are available to provide the intended freedom for the handicapped. Putting this all together in a sentence we might say that freedom requires liberty and responsibility or as shortened by the SOR Foundation, "*Liberty + Responsibility = Our Freedom.*"

Responsibility

Our responsibilities arise because of the relationships we have within the various environments (contexts) in which we live. These responsibilities are tied to the rights and constraints (laws, rules, regulations, and expectations) within an environment. The responsibilities may be to oneself, to others within the environment, or to the environment itself.

Our Responsibilities to Ourselves

There are many individual liberties provided by the environments in which we live. For the most part, these liberties are based upon the first foundational principle of ethics, namely the “principle of right desire” which says that we ought to desire what is really good for us and nothing else. Several amendments to the U.S. Constitution identify the most well-known of these liberties within the environment of our country. At first glance, some of the rights provided may seem to require very little responsibility on our part to become freedoms. Take, for example, the right to free speech. Most everyone has the ability to talk and write, but that ability brings with it many responsibilities. For example, to expound one’s position on a particular issue requires considerable thought to properly articulate the position. Until this is done, there is no ability and hence no freedom to convey the opinion. In addition, other responsibilities come with our right to free speech. These include speaking in a civil manner, refraining from putting others down, harassing them, or slandering their good name. Similar arguments could be made connecting responsibilities to our right to vote, to worship as we choose, and other amendments to the Constitution.

In addition to the above rights, our educational environment provides the right to obtain a good education, and our economic environment provides the opportunity to work to meet our needs and wants. If we are to be able to enjoy the freedoms associated with these rights we must exert considerable effort/responsibility to make sure that we are qualified for a particular job or to advance educationally. Surely these opportunities and responsibilities are what our founding fathers had in mind when they spoke of the “blessings of liberty.”

But liberty may also have its dark side. Just as there are many opportunities to build us up as individuals, there are also numerous opportunities (dare we say rights) that would tear us down and enslave us. Because of the challenges of their environments, there are many individuals who turn to such vices as alcohol, drugs, food, gambling, games, entertainment, extensive leisure, etc., to escape their responsibilities and provide an artificial and temporary form of freedom. Repeated and continual use of such mechanism brings with it addiction and a deepening inability to be responsible and utilize the benefits of true liberty. Because of the gravity and scope of this dark side of liberty, freedom loving people everywhere must live up to their individual responsibility to avoid the lure of such sirens. Indeed, as Frankl warned us, we all need to

recognize that through our responsibility or irresponsibility we essentially build our own palaces or prisons.

Our Responsibilities to Others

Let us turn next to our responsibilities to others and how they are related to liberty and freedom. If we lived by ourselves in isolation, we might well expect as did Buck the insane, one-eyed weasel in *Ice Age 3*: “no dependents and no limits.” However such is seldom the case. Hence the second foundational principle of ethics, namely that of “Respect for Persons” comes into play. In essence, this principle places certain constraints on our liberty. This principle has two forms. The first of these corresponds to the “*Harm Principle*” described by John Stuart Mill, which states that whatever a person does, it should not harm others. This principle corresponds to the following, slightly altered, form of the Golden Rule (sometimes called the Silver Rule), namely, “*Do not do anything to others that you would not like them to do to you.*” The second form of the principle of “Respect for Persons” is positive and corresponds to the normal proactive form of the golden rule, namely “*Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.*”

We will first consider the environment of the family. Since young children are not able to provide for their own care, a natural responsibility is recognized by society (the State) that parents have the responsibility to provide the opportunity for the basic freedoms of life for their children. In other words, the liberty of one person, the child, is provided by placing constraints/responsibilities on other persons, the parents. As parents live up to these responsibilities, the child is enabled and is, therefore, free to learn, grow, and mature. The freedom of the child requires the liberty of the environment and the responsibility of the parents.

But what if the parents do not or are not able to live up to their responsibilities for one reason or another? When this happens, the child’s freedom is reduced. In the worst case, the child will die. In most cases, however, liberty requires that help be sought from others. This may come from the child’s extended family, from a religious or social environment to which the family belongs, or as a last resort from a unit of government. In any case, as the original responsibilities of the parents are supplemented or completely filled by others, the child’s freedoms are increased. In this case, the freedom of the child requires the liberty of the environment and the responsibility of others beyond the family. Because most societies recognize the importance of children for the future, these constraints and responsibilities are, for the most part, readily accepted.

As a child matures into adulthood, the responsibilities of the family, and others, for the child decrease, and the individual responsibilities of the child for him/herself increase. For some this maturing process can be problematic. Eleanor Roosevelt observed,

“Freedom makes a huge requirement of every human being. With freedom comes responsibility. For the person who is unwilling to grow up, the person who does not want to carry his own weight, this is a frightening prospect.”

President Theodore Roosevelt added,

“If an American is to amount to anything he must rely upon himself, and not upon the State; he must take pride in his own work, instead of sitting idle to envy the luck of others. He must face life with resolute courage, win victory if he can, and accept defeat if he must, without seeking to place on his fellow man a responsibility which is not theirs.”

As we move beyond the environment of the family, an understanding of how our responsibility to others relates to freedom becomes less clear. The myriad of environments in which one is involved adds multiple degrees of complexity to the question. Add to this the fact of individual differences and the hope of reaching conclusions about our responsibility to others and freedom seems to fade. In such situations, the best approach is to rely on basic principles and build from there. We have previously mentioned the second foundational principle of ethics, namely that of “Respect for Persons.” This principle can be derived from the principle of “Right Desire” making the two principles inexorably linked together.

Another way of saying this is that those who have our own individual freedoms also have a degree of responsibility to help others obtain and maintain their own freedoms as well. As he reluctantly exercised his powers as Commander in Chief to call upon millions to give their lives to emancipate other Americans, Abraham Lincoln recognized this when he said *“Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves.”* Lincoln also said,

“Freedom is not the right to do what we want, but what we ought. Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.”

Alexis de Tocqueville anticipated this sentiment, writing *“America is great because she is good. If America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.”* Thus, the application of the principle of Right Desire is embodied within a set of moral ideals that obligate us toward what is right and good for humanity.

But what is the scope and magnitude of this responsibility and when is it needed? The answer to these questions depends on the capacity of an individual to help others. In other words, we are responsible to help others to the extent that we have the capacity to do so. But this is not an idealistic and impractical obligation. It is very personal. Mother Teresa’s perspective on the capacity to help others was focused and poignant:

“I never look at the masses as my responsibility; I look at the individual. I can only love one person at a time - just one, one, one. So you begin. I began - I picked up one person. Maybe if I didn't pick up that one person, I wouldn't have picked up forty-two thousand...”

The same thing goes for you, the same thing in your family, the same thing in your church, your community. Just begin - one, one, one."

This notion of service at the individual, group, and community level encapsulates the true Spirit of America. Without it, the moral duty to help others becomes abstract and empty, and defaults to the government. When this happens, bit-by-bit, liberty and freedom diminish.

From the above, it seems clear that there are multiple ways in which fulfilling our responsibilities to others brings freedom. First, by helping those in need we enable them to find freedom from whatever burdens have limited them. Second, as we help others we ourselves find freedom from our own worries and problems in the joy of service. Another quote from Abraham Lincoln captures this same idea – *"When I do good, I feel good; when I do bad, I feel bad."* Finally, in service to others we contribute to the goodness of our society and strengthen our country and contribute to the preservation of our liberty.

Our Responsibility to Preserve Freedom

Closely related to our responsibility to others is our responsibility to future generations. President Ronald Regan reminded us,

"Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free."

If a generation fails to pass on the traditions, knowledge, and intellectual legacy necessary to perpetuate "the free life," then we fail to fulfill the promise of the Constitution "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity". But the legacy of the free life may slip through the cracks between generations if we are not poignantly aware of how subtle the slippage is, and if we fail to remain vigilant against the surreptitious forces that would steal it unawares. What are those forces?

When we speak of liberty, we are almost always speaking of *individual* liberty. Charles Taylor points out that many people rightly believe individualism to be the greatest achievement of modern civilization. Today individuals have a right to choose for themselves their own ways of life, to decide their own beliefs and convictions, and to shape their lives in ways their ancestors couldn't have imagined. Indeed, many people think the promises of individualism and the freedom to be ourselves are still unfulfilled. Inequitable and exploitative economic institutions, oppressive patterns of family life, or corrupting ideas of hierarchy are seen by many people as obstacles to the individual liberty and fulfillment that are the promise of America.

On the other hand, modern individualistic freedom was achieved by escaping traditional social life in small communities dominated by the authority of the Church, public concern and shared community values. As defended by many great thinkers, the right to rule over others was based on a moral order with those at the top of society having a divine mandate to rule over subordinates. This traditional worldview enabled people to see themselves as part of a larger social and cosmic order, and to feel secure in a given identity, social station and role in a structured society. These social, political, and religious orders gave meaning to the world and significance to human existence, as Frankl observed. But modern freedom came about through the discrediting of such orders with the *Age of Enlightenment* and the *Age of Reason*. Arguments against the “divine right of kings” were taken directly from John Locke’s *Two Treatises on Government* and incorporated by Thomas Jefferson and his peers into the *Declaration of Independence*. With the decline of the old moral and communal orders set in motion by the battle for individual liberty came a gradual and increasing loss of a sense of higher purpose and meaning in life beyond the self.

In *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville warned that democratic equality is continually at risk of slipping into a distorted form of individualism that centers on the self. Such egoism tends to draw individuals toward themselves, resulting in a loss of larger purpose and meaning, a loss which makes them less concerned with others, society at large, notions of duty and responsibility, or future generations. A century after Tocqueville’s observations, Viktor E. Frankl (*Man’s Search for Meaning*) posited that the most important and fundamental motive of human life is a search for purpose and meaning. He observed that human beings, isolated and alienated in prison camps, struggle to find meaning outside themselves. Foreshadowing this observation, Tocqueville observed that a society in which people become the kind of individuals who are “enclosed in their own hearts” – as if in a prison – is a society where few will want to participate actively in self-government. Succumbing to the despair of real or perceived political helplessness, they may prefer to stay at home and enjoy the satisfactions of private life – so long as the government of the day produces the means to these satisfactions and distributes them widely.

Such learned helplessness and dependency raises the danger for a new, specifically modern form of despotism, which Tocqueville calls “soft despotism.” It is not a tyranny of terror and oppression as in previous ages. Stepping in to provide what the masses of isolated individuals want, the government becomes mild and paternalistic – an “immense tutelary power,” over which people will have little influence and no control. Consequently, “we, the people” are at risk of losing the shared political will and identity necessary for opposing expanding governmental power, and as we raise subsequent generations without an understanding of what is at stake, we fail “to preserve the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”

Taylor insists that the answer is not to reject modernity, individualism, technology, and utilitarian logic, nor is it to compromise in some sort of simple trade-off. Instead, we must find our way to steer these societal developments towards their greatest promise and avoid the slide

into the debased forms. The only defense against soft despotism, Tocqueville thinks, is a vigorous political culture in which participation is valued at several levels of government and in voluntary associations as well. Thus, a proper notion of liberty requires a social responsibility to preserve the equality, dignity, and individuality of each person, but not in solitary isolation; rather, in the human context which is the only context within which a notion of individuality makes sense at all. Thus, the answer is in extolling the virtues of responsible citizenship. The call of the Statue of Responsibility is a call for the next stage in actualizing the free life by an open national and international dialog about what responsibility should and does mean to a free people.

Former justice of the Utah Supreme Court, Dallin H. Oaks, emphasized that responsible citizenship entails not only the responsible personal conduct that is necessary for peace, opportunity, and freedom to prosper – but also entails such virtues as honesty, respect for personal and property rights, self-reliance, and willingness to sacrifice for the common good. Responsible citizenship also entails respect for *enforceable* responsibilities: obedience to the law, military service and support, and paying taxes, despite our disagreements over them. No government can survive very long when the enforceable responsibilities of its citizens are disregarded by citizens who simply disagree with them. Freedom does not mean each citizen is free to choose which laws he will or will not obey. Responsible citizenship gives rise to more citizens participating more actively and more effectively in democratic government, using their votes and communications to elected representatives to identify and solve some of the major problems that threaten the perpetuation of freedom. For instance, the increasing federal budget deficit burdens our children and grandchildren, and the shift of power from state and local to federal government further disenfranchises future generations.

Ultimately, our responsibility to maintain our freedom is a choice each of us must make to be more responsible citizens. It is both our opportunity and our duty. Our actions to maintain and preserve freedom can be both outwardly and inwardly manifested. Some actions are seen as the ultimate, as in giving one's life. Others are less easily noticed, such as obeying laws, being educated on the issues of the country, and voting with a solid understanding of the platforms of the candidates. In the words of President Barack Obama,

“What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility – a recognition, on the part of every American, that we have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task. This is the price and the promise of citizenship.”

The Role of Monuments

The word monument comes from the Latin *monumentum*, meaning "that which reminds". A monument is thus a type of structure either explicitly created to commemorate a person or important event or which has become important to a social group as a part of its remembrance of past events. Monuments may be statues, buildings, cemeteries, geological structures, rivers, roads, places, or anything else as so deemed. Some 100 American monuments have been designated as National Monuments under the *Antiquities Act of 1906*. These national monuments celebrate the history, heroes, beauty, successes, and mistakes of America. In addition to these some 600 plus other monuments, historic sites, and memorials dot the American landscape. Add to this state, religious, and community monuments and the opportunity for reflection is enormous. David Lowenthal points out that "*Heritage is everywhere, in the news, in the movies, in the marketplace. It is the chief focus of patriotism and a prime lure of tourism. One can barely move without bumping into a heritage site.*"

There is nothing so inspiring to a true American than to see our country's flag flying high in the breeze, passing by in a parade, or adorning our homes and neighborhoods. The flag symbolizes the growth of our country from the original thirteen colonies (stripes) to the current fifty states of the union (stars). But more than that the colors of the flag are also symbolic of and represent the responsibilities which we have written about in this white paper, red for courage, white for virtue, and blue for loyalty.

Historical Monuments

Many monuments document the unfolding of American history and way of life from the east coast to the west coast. Examples from our country's early history include the Plymouth Rock National Monument, historic sites along Boston's Freedom trail, Freedom Hall, and the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, and, of course, the many monuments in Washington, DC. As one travels westward places such as Gettysburg, Harper's Ferry, the Cumberland Gap (the first doorway to the west), the Saint Louis Gateway Arch (the second doorway to the west and part of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial), and the Alamo remind us of other important aspects of America's expansion and hunger for freedom.

Probably the most well-known and recognizable symbol of the great idea of the United States of America is the Statue of Liberty, standing on Liberty Island in New York harbor. Lady Liberty, as the statue is known, was a gift to the United States from the people of France to commemorate the centennial of the American *Declaration of Independence*. To most immigrants to America however, the Statue of Liberty was a symbol of the future, of opportunity (liberty), and of a new life. In this sense, the Statue of Liberty is much more than a monument of

remembrance. It is also a symbol of inspiration, of hope, and of greatness. Probably more than any other monument, it achieves what Robert Musil, an early twentieth century Austrian writer, challenged monuments:

“Monuments today should do what we all have to do, make more of an effort! Anybody can stand quietly by the side of the road and allow glances to be bestowed on him; these days we can demand more of monuments.”

Perhaps it was because many Americans had lost sight of the visions of liberty, opportunity, and greatness espoused by their forefathers that Austrian Viktor E. Frankl suggested the need for a new monument, a monument to rekindle hope in the future, a monument to inspire each American to accept the responsibility and effort associated with success and greatness – a Statue of Responsibility to stand on the west coast along with the Statue of Liberty on the east coast to symbolize not only America’s great heritage but her great future as well. As Frankl put it, these two great monuments will be “bookends.” Bookends to what? To all of the other monuments across America that symbolize those who founded this great nation, those who served their country in times of war, those who worked to extend freedom to all, and to every person who adds to the greatness of America.

The Statue of Responsibility

The Statue of Responsibility represents visually what Americans have learned since 1776, after experimenting with democracy for 234 years. Our westward movement, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, has taught us many valuable lessons about freedom, and what it takes to preserve it. We have made our share of mistakes along the way, but with each mistake made we have learned important lessons which we have worked hard to internalize and manifest into better actions. After all, a mistake is an opportunity to learn and do better. The correct application of lessons learned from mistakes made can become the bedrock of wisdom.

So from the Statue of Liberty on the east coast, to the Statue of Responsibility on the west coast, America has learned what it takes to preserve freedom. The core message of the Statue of Responsibility speaks to this understanding - with great liberty comes great responsibility. Building a statue that will complement the Statue of Liberty in recognition, inspiration, and grandeur is no small undertaking. Creating a statue that will help open the eyes of Americans to their responsibilities and usher in a New Birth of Responsibility will take more than concrete and steel. Indeed, as Musil challenged, a great deal will be required of the Statue of Responsibility. Such a significant effort will not be accomplished by one man or even one organization. Indeed, a broad national effort much like that required to build the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty involving students and teachers, organizations and leaders, citizens and politicians must take place. Because of this the Statue of Responsibility will be a gift to America by Americans, and other ‘friends of freedom’ from around the world. We are taking ownership of our grand

experiment in democracy. We are acknowledging what we have learned, and we are sharing this knowledge, this hard won wisdom, with future generations. This is the core message of the Statue of Responsibility, a message that will permeate the heart and minds of freedom loving people into the 21st Century.

Such an effort cannot be a onetime event but rather must extend in perpetuity. It must involve ongoing education, dialog, and reminders in communities and families across the country. In today's era, much of this effort will come to the project via social media efforts. As President Obama has said "*What is required now is for this country to pull together, confront boldly the challenges we face, and take responsibility for our future once more.*" Following this vein, the mission of the SOR Foundation is two-fold. First, raise the money and build the monument. Second, and on-going, is to advance and maintain the core principles of liberty, responsibility, and freedom in society via our educational initiatives in the monuments Visitor's Center, through our out-reach programs to schools and through our educational scholarship endowment fund.

To accomplish this mission, the SOR Foundation has developed a strategic plan to keep the project moving forward. The start-up phase has successfully been completed, the pre-launch phase is now in place where the monument will be presented to several vying west coast port cities, with one being awarded the monument, and soon thereafter, efforts in the national capital campaign phase will begin. For those wishing to stay current on the progress of the Statue of Responsibility monument project, please visit www.SORfoundation.org.

Conclusion

This white paper has been written at the request of the Statue of Responsibility Foundation to help more clearly define liberty and freedom and to articulate the role of responsibility in preserving freedom. The paper began by indicating a growing concern that America and our system of liberty is in decline. It was noted that there has been a cultural change of focus from the use of the word liberty as espoused by our country's founding fathers to the use of the word freedom which was more focused on the rights of Americans. Definitions of liberty and freedom have been provided along with a rationale linking responsibility to the enjoyment of freedom. Our responsibilities to ourselves, others, and our country were identified and examples given showing how these responsibilities are required for the freedom of all.

The paper then described the role of monuments in helping us remember the rich heritage of our country as events unfolded from the East to the West coast. Viktor E. Frankl's idea of a Statue of Responsibility on the West coast was presented as a bookend to the Statue of Liberty on the East coast to help focus America's attention on the responsibilities needed to preserve liberty and freedom. The herculean task of building such a statue was described along with the plans of the SOR Foundation to make this happen. The paper then concluded with a call for dialog and involvement which contributes to the Foundation's two-fold mission. This is the vision of the

Statue of Responsibility: to proclaim to the world that in order for our cherished freedoms to endure, liberty (or our rights) must be lived in balance with responsibility. A message well learned over the past 234 years. It's really that simple, that sublime, and that powerful.

Bibliography

Bauerlein, Mark (2008). *The Dumbest Generation: How the Digital Age Stupefies Young Americans and Jeopardizes Our Future*. NY: Penguin.

Benveniste, Emile (1973). *Indo-European Language and Society*.

Berlin, Isaiah (1969). Two Concepts of Liberty. In Isaiah Berlin (2002), *Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bloom, Harold (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students*. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Frankl, Victor (1946/2006). *Man's Search for Meaning* (On the U.S. Library of Congresses' "Top Ten List of Most Influential Books of All Time"), 4th Ed., Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hardy, Henry (2006). *Political Ideas in the Romantic Age: Their Rise and Influence on Modern Thought*, Henry Hardy (ed.), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Harper, (1949/1993). *Liberty: A Path to Its Recovery*. Irvington-on-Hudson, NY: The Foundation for Economic Education.

Hayek, F.A. (1960). *The Constitution of Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holland, Matthew S. (August, 2006). *The Power of One Generation Over Another: The Founder's Constitutional Liberalism*. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Lincoln, Abraham (1867/1907). *Address at Sanitary Fair in Baltimore, Maryland, April 18, 1867*. Quoted John G. Nicolay and John Hay, Editors, *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln: Volume Two*, 1907.

Lehmann, Winfred P. (1986). *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*.

Lowenthal, David (1998). *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

MacCallum, Gerald C. (1967). Negative and Positive Freedom, *Philosophical Review*, (76), p. 312–334.

Mill, John Stuart (1859/1913). *On Liberty*. London: Longmans, Green and Company.

Musil, Robert (1932). *Monuments*. In Neel Senhauser, *Robert Musil on Monuments*, February 28th, 2010. <http://blog.selfportrait.net/2010/02/28/robert-musil-on-monuments/>

Nunberg, Geoffrey (2003). *What We're Fighting For: The Difference Between Liberty and Freedom*. New York Times Week in Review, March 23, 2003.

Oaks, Dallin H. (1994). *Some Responsibilities of Citizenship*. Keynote speech at America's Freedom Festival, Provo, UT, July 3, 1994.

Obama, Barack (2009). *A New Era of Responsibility: Renewing America's Promise*. Published by the Office of Management and Budget, US Government Printing Office. [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/fy2010_new_era/A New Era of Responsibility2.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/fy2010_new_era/A_New_Era_of_Responsibility2.pdf)

Shelton, Ken & Bolz, Daniel L. (2008). (Editors) *Responsibility 911*. Provo, UT: Executive Excellence Publishing.

Taylor, Charles (1991). *The Ethics of Authenticity*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Tocqueville, Alexis (1847). *Democracy in America*, translated by Henry Reeve, Esq. NY: Edward Walker.

About the Authors



Dr. David W. Johnson is currently a Professor in the College of Technology & Computing at Utah Valley University where he also serves as chair of the Technology Management Department. He received his Ph.D. Degree from The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in Industrial Engineering and Business. Dr. Johnson also taught at Florida Gulf Coast University and Western Michigan University prior to coming to UVU. In addition, he has twenty-five years of industry experience in technology and management. Dr. Johnson teaches courses in “Global, Ethical, and Professional Issues in Technology” and “Current Topics in Technology and Management.” He has published numerous articles in academic journals and conference proceedings. Dr. Johnson has been associated with the Center for the Advancement of Leadership (CAL) for the past five years representing his college. He is currently serving as a CAL Advisory Board member and chair of the Program Implementation and Evaluation Committee.



Dr. Russell K. Thornley is an Assistant Professor in Technology Management at Utah Valley University, a former President of the Northern Utah Chapter of the Project Management Institute, by whom he is a certified Project Management Professional (PMP). He received his Ph.D. from Brigham Young University in Organizational and Applied Social Psychology. He has expertise in technology management and technology organization development, business-technology integration, and enterprise project and portfolio management. His research interests include exploring ways to overcome the “knowing-doing” gap in the management of technology organizations; managerial biases in interpersonal interaction and decision-making; and implicit theories and philosophies of management and leadership. Dr. Thornley has published articles in corporate publications and academic journals, and has consulted and lectured in the United States and Canada.