Ordered Liberty Reclaimed - A Foundation for Liberty

The Moral Structure of Duty, Restraint, and Peace in a Free Republic
v3.1 (07/11/2025)

By Jeff A. Pierson

A civic and moral framework grounded in natural law, constitutional fidelity, and the disciplined preservation of Ordered Liberty.

Jeff Pierson

Abstract

This document presents a comprehensive framework for sustaining liberty through moral discipline, civic duty, and lawful order. Drawing from the American Founding tradition, natural law, and constitutional design, *A Foundation for Liberty* argues that freedom is not preserved by force or impulse, but by the moral choices of a self-governing people and the restraint of those in authority.

The framework affirms that liberty requires more than rights—it requires responsibility. It outlines the mutual obligations between individuals and government, emphasizing relational trust, voluntary obedience to just law, and the rejection of both authoritarian control and populist disorder. Protest and resistance are addressed not as virtues in themselves, but as sober responses to the collapse of lawful redress and the betrayal of the constitutional covenant.

Through its analysis of personal conduct, public trust, and institutional integrity, this work offers a principled path toward peace in a fractured age. It calls citizens to truth, institutions to justice, and both to the enduring standard of Ordered Liberty .

Jeff Pierson

Description

A Foundation for Liberty sets forth a civic doctrine for the preservation of freedom through moral restraint, constitutional duty, and relational peace. It affirms that liberty is not sustained by law alone, but by the virtue of a self-governing people and institutions restrained by higher law. Drawing from the American Founders, natural law, and historical precedent, this framework defends the moral conditions of a just society: personal responsibility, public trust, and lawful order.

Where liberty is threatened—whether by tyranny from above or civic decay from below—this framework outlines the disciplined standards by which truth must be upheld, conscience preserved, and justice restored. Protest and resistance are addressed only in their proper moral context: as last responses when every duty of peace and redress has been denied. The aim of this work is not disruption but restoration—not grievance, but moral clarity.

© 2025 Jeff A. Pierson. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the author, except for brief quotations used for the purposes of scholarly review, commentary, education, or public discourse, provided proper attribution is given.

Jeff Pierson

Table of Contents

Preface 8

I. Introduction to the Ordered Liberty Framework 10

Balanced Responsibilities of Citizens and Government in Ordered Liberty 10

II. The Core Structure of Ordered Liberty 14

III. Ordered Liberty as a Relational and Constitutional Framework 16

Mutual Terms of Civic Relationship 16

IV. Person-to-Person: The Moral Contract of Civic Liberty 18

V. Person-to-Government: The Constitutional Covenant of Lawful Authority 20

VI. The Government's Duty to Defend Citizens' Rights Within and Beyond Its Borders 22

VII. The Stages of Lawful Protest and Civic Defense 24

1. Expression and Dissent *(Protected)* 24

2. Nonviolent Civil Disobedience *(Conditional)* 24

3. Active Obstruction of Injustice *(Grave Protest)* 24

4. Defensive Self-Protection *(Threshold of Force)* 25

VIII. Definitions and Moral Standards for Resistance 26

Civil Disobedience 26

Unjust Orders 26

Who Decides When an Order Is Unjust? 27

Violence 28

Violent Defensive Resistance 29

IX. Historical Examples and Application 30

1. Concord, 1775 30

2. Japanese American Internment, 1942 30

Conclusion of Application 31

X. Addressing a Breach of Ordered Liberty by Elected or Appointed Officials 32

Introduction 32

Purpose 32

Not A Scorecard 32

Jeff Pierson

What Makes the Ordered Liberty Form Unique 33
Ordered Liberty Threshold Evaluation Form 34
Appendix: External Reference Sources by Section 36
I. Understanding Ordered Liberty 36
II. The Core Structure of Ordered Liberty 36
III. Ordered Liberty as a Relational and Constitutional Framework 36
IV. Person-to-Person: The Moral Contract of Civic Liberty 37
V. Person-to-Government: The Constitutional Covenant of Lawful Authority 37
VI. Government's Duty to Defend Citizens' Rights Within and Beyond Borders 37
VII. Stages of Lawful Protest and Civic Defense 38
VIII. Definitions and Moral Standards for Resistance 38
IX. Historical Examples and Application 38
Appendix: Common Law References by Section 39
I. Understanding Ordered Liberty 39
II. The Core Structure of Ordered Liberty 39
III. Ordered Liberty as a Relational and Constitutional Framework 39
IV. Person-to-Person: The Moral Contract of Civic Liberty 40
V. Person-to-Government: The Constitutional Covenant of Lawful Authority 40
VI. Government’s Duty to Defend Citizens' Rights Beyond Its Borders 40
VII. Stages of Lawful Protest and Civic Defense 41
VIII. Moral Standards for Resistance 41
IX. Historical Examples and Application 41
Appendix: The Anti-Federalist Warning: Institutional Power and the Fragility of Liberty 43
Appendix: The Founders’ View of Protest and Resistance 45
1. Protest as a Moral Imperative 45
2. Resistance as a Right and Duty 45
3. Constitutional Protest as Built-In Safeguard 46
4. Obedience to Conscience, Not Command Alone 46
5. Disciplined Resistance, Not Mob Rule 46

Jeff Pierson

Conclusion 47
Appendix: The Founders' View of Obedience 48
1. Obedience Rooted in Conscience 48
2. Obedience to Just Authority, Not to Power Alone 48
3. Limited Government Requires Limited Obedience 48
4. Obedience Ends Where Tyranny Begins 49
5. Civic Virtue Includes Lawful Obedience 49
Conclusion 49
Appendix: The Founders' View of Protest and Violence That Harms Others 50
1. Liberty Must Not Violate Others' Rights 50
2. Power Must Be Disciplined, Even Among the People 50
3. Property Rights Are Fundamental to Liberty 50
4. Innocents Must Never Become Collateral in Protest 51
5. True Protest Seeks to Build, Not Destroy 51
Conclusion 51
Appendix: Counterpoints and Responses PT.1 53
Appendix: Counterpoints and Responses Pt.2 - The Moral Defense of Protest 56
Appendix: Interrogatories and Answers PT.1 59
Appendix: Interrogatories and Answers PT.2 61
Appendix: Explaining the Doctrine 68
1000 Word Summaries 68
A. General Public 68
B. Religious 69
C. Legislative 69
D. Legal 70
Appendix: Ordered Liberty Glossary 71
Bibliography - Citations 87
Appendix: Metadata - Publishing 88
Executive Summary 88

Jeff Pierson

Academic Abstract 89

Jeff Pierson

Preface

Ordered Liberty is not a theory it is the moral structure of a free people. It affirms that liberty is preserved not through chaos or control, but through a living relationship between the individual, the community, and the state. It is a framework built on natural law, sustained by conscience, and bound by the Constitution. In this view, obedience to law is a civic good only when that law is just; resistance is a moral duty only when all redress has failed.

The idea of Ordered Liberty is as old as the Republic itself. It guided the American Founders as they broke from tyranny, built a constitutional government, and warned against the excesses of both state power and popular fury. It appears in the Declaration of Independence, which declared liberty a right derived from the laws of nature and of nature's God. It is structured into the Constitution, which limits power through checks and balances, enshrines inalienable rights, and calls government to be a servant, not a master. Ordered Liberty , properly understood, is the enduring harmony between rightful restraint and moral freedom.

But every generation must adapt this principle to its own moment. Today, the American people face a convergence of destabilizing forces: the rise of populist violence, institutional authoritarianism (real and perceived), and the infiltration of civic unrest by foreign and domestic provocateurs. These forces do not all originate from the same side or ideology, but they share a common outcome: the erosion of trust, the abandonment of law, and the destruction of the moral conditions that sustain liberty.

Populist violence exploits grievance to justify lawlessness. Institutional authoritarianism, whether real or perceived uses complexity, legal insulation, or ideological control to suppress dissent. And provocateurs, both foreign and domestic, deliberately inflame conflict, undermine public confidence, and provoke reaction through deception and manipulation. Authoritarianism is not confined to government. It can be exercised through courts, agencies, corporations, media, activist groups, and digital platforms wherever power is used without accountability and justice is replaced with control.

This document is not a defense of government nor a license for revolt. It is a call to restore the moral balance that defines legitimate civic life. Ordered Liberty insists on mutual restraint: individuals must act with discipline and responsibility, and governments and institutions must operate under law, truth, and justice. Protest, when grounded in truth and carried out with restraint, is a noble act. Resistance, when every peaceful avenue has been denied, may become a necessary one. But violence for political gain whether from the mob, the magistrate, or the algorithm is a breach of duty.

Jeff Pierson

We offer this framework not to inflame, but to instruct. It is written for citizens who seek clarity in an age of confusion, courage in an age of compromise, and restoration in an age of decay. Its aim is not to preserve the status quo, but to preserve the structure by which liberty can be restored when violated. Ordered Liberty does not ask the people to bow to power. It calls them to govern themselves first so that they may hold others accountable with wisdom, justice, and peace.

Companion Works:

- *Breach of Ordered Liberty*
- *Concord Principle of Resistance*

Jeff Pierson

I. Introduction to the Ordered Liberty Framework

Ordered Liberty is the foundation of a free republic. It is the principle that liberty cannot survive without moral restraint, and that restraint cannot be justified without liberty. It affirms that freedom is not the absence of law, but the presence of rightful authority, authority that is limited by natural law, bound by the Constitution, and accountable to truth and justice.

In the American tradition, Ordered Liberty is not a compromise between chaos and control. It is the moral condition of civic life, in which both government and citizens are held to a higher standard. It begins with internal government. Individuals must govern themselves through conscience, discipline, and restraint in their relationships with one another and with those in authority. At the same time, government must adhere to the Constitution and restrain its natural tendencies toward expansion, overreach, and oppression. Law exists not to dominate, but to protect. Liberty is not a gift of the state. It is a condition of justice that the state is obligated to preserve.

The term "Ordered Liberty " appears throughout American constitutional history, particularly in judicial language. But too often, it has been reduced to an abstraction, defined by courts and removed from the public conscience. Properly understood, Ordered Liberty is not a legal theory. It is a living standard for self-governing people. It shapes how we relate to one another, how we hold power accountable, and how we preserve peace through justice.

Balanced Responsibilities of Citizens and Government in Ordered Liberty

The *Ordered Liberty Reclaimed* framework sets forth a balanced and reciprocal civic structure, with distinct but interdependent responsibilities for both citizens and government. These responsibilities are organized around five core expectations:

- **Moral Parity**
  Expectation: Both citizens and government must operate under the same moral standards.

  Citizens are expected to act with personal integrity, internal discipline, and respect for others' rights.

  Government is expected to act justly, enforce law without partiality, and restrain its own power. Neither side has a moral exemption—rights and duties apply equally and are judged by the same ethical standard.

Jeff Pierson

- **Covenantal Structure**
  Expectation: The relationship between the people and the state is a moral covenant, not a power contract.

  Citizens are not mere subjects of state power; they are active participants in its legitimacy.

  Government, in turn, must earn trust by upholding justice, not demand obedience through fear or ideology. This mutual agreement assumes shared accountability and voluntary, not coerced, participation in civic life.

- **Stages of Protest and Redress**
  Expectation: Protest and resistance are permitted only under strict moral conditions.

  Citizens must exhaust peaceful, lawful remedies before escalating protest.

  Government must allow dissent and protect avenues of redress. When redress is denied and injustice becomes systemic, citizens may resist—but only defensively, proportionally, and transparently, never through vengeance or ideological violence.

- **Mutual Restraint**
  Expectation: Both sides must voluntarily limit their power for liberty to endure.

  Citizens are expected not to weaponize liberty for selfish ends (e.g., exploiting legal loopholes or justifying chaos).

  Government is expected to restrain its tendency toward expansion and overreach. The strength of a republic depends on this shared restraint—not just legal limits, but ethical discipline.

- **Historical and Moral Anchoring**
  Expectation: All actions—by citizens or government—must be judged by timeless moral and constitutional standards.

  The framework draws from the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and natural law, setting a fixed reference point. Citizens cannot claim new rights through moral relativism, and government cannot justify power through legal formalism

Jeff Pierson

alone. Both must appeal to higher law and historical precedent to justify their actions.

Why is it important?
Because liberty without order becomes license, and order without liberty becomes tyranny. A society that protects rights without requiring virtue will collapse into self-interest. A government that demands order without honoring liberty will become illegitimate. Ordered Liberty is the only framework in which justice and freedom can coexist without destroying each other.

Why do we need to return to it?
Because we have lost the balance. In place of mutual responsibility, we have traded grievance. In place of moral law, we have elevated raw power, whether ideological or institutional. The people no longer trust their leaders, and leaders no longer fear violating the people's rights. In this vacuum, liberty erodes. Some call for revolution, others for submission. Ordered Liberty rejects both.

To restore a just society, we must restore Ordered Liberty. Not through expanded government, and not through chaos, but by returning to the civic covenant: self-governance, duty, mutual restraint, and constitutional fidelity. It begins with the individual, it binds institutions, and it preserves the peace only when all are held to the same standard.

A Call to Act—and a Place to Begin

Preserving liberty requires more than belief; it demands action. When public officials violate the limits of lawful authority; whether by coercing conscience, denying redress, or bypassing constitutional restraints—the people must respond. But response must begin with clarity, not chaos.

Ordered Liberty is not preserved through outrage or partisanship, but through principled accountability. That begins by examining the specific actions of those in power and asking whether a moral and constitutional threshold has been crossed.

The **Ordered Liberty Threshold Evaluation Form (Section X)** is designed for this purpose. It provides a structured, incident-based method, non-confrontational (as you choose) for assessing the conduct of elected or appointed officials; not according to ideology, but according to objective moral and constitutional standards. It is a tool of documentation, discernment, and civic responsibility.

Jeff Pierson

The remainder of this document examines the specific dimensions of Ordered liberty; how it governs relationships between individuals and institutions, and defines the outer boundaries of personal and governmental behavior. It offers a moral and constitutional standard by which liberty is sustained, trust is preserved, and excess is restrained.

Key Terms:
Accountability, Chaos, Civic Covenant, Conscience, Constitutional Fidelity, Constitutional Standard, Constitution, Discipline, Duty, Expanded Government, Freedom, Governmental Behavior, Grievance, Ideological Power, Individual, Institutions, Internal Government, Justice, Just Society, Law, Legal Theory, Liberty, License, Living Standard, Moral Law, Moral Restraint, Moral Standard, Mutual Restraint, Natural Law, Oppression, Order, Ordered Liberty, Overreach, Peace, Personal Behavior, Power Accountability, Protection, Public Conscience, Raw Power, Rightful Authority, Self-Governance, Standard, State, Submission, Trust, Truth, Tyranny, Virtue

Jeff Pierson

II. The Core Structure of Ordered Liberty

This document affirms Ordered Liberty not as legal theory but as a living standard for free people in both peace and crisis. It presents five interconnected principles:

1. The Framework of Ordered Liberty

Ordered Liberty functions through a relational and constitutional structure that moves from the individual to society and finally to lawful institutions. Each layer bears responsibility:

- The individual must govern himself according to truth.
- Citizens must treat one another with ethical restraint.
- Government must operate within the bounds of natural law and the Constitution.

When any layer fails, especially when government becomes unaccountable, the people have the right and duty to demand a return to justice.

2. Consent of the Governed

All legitimate authority derives from the consent of the governed but consent alone does not legitimize power. Consent must be conditioned by justice, truth, and constitutional order. No act of government; legislative, judicial, or administrative can nullify inalienable rights. When consent is extracted through coercion, deception, or abuse, it becomes illegitimate.

3. Rightful Use of Authority

Authority is not self-justifying. It becomes lawful only when it is restrained by morality, limited by law, and directed toward justice. Public officeholders are not rulers but stewards, bound by oath to uphold the Constitution and the natural rights of the people. Authority that punishes truth, shelters injustice, or violates conscience loses its legitimacy. It ceases to be authority and becomes oppression.

4. Protest as a Moral Response

Protest, when grounded in truth and discipline, is a civic duty. Ordered Liberty regards it as a necessary response to injustice an appeal to the moral law when legal mechanisms fail.

5. Thresholds for Resistance

When protest is suppressed and justice denied, a final threshold is crossed. Resistance may then become a moral necessity not as an act of rebellion, but as a defense of the constitutional covenant. To preserve moral clarity and prevent abuse, resistance must align

Jeff Pierson

with the Five Core Standards: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness, as defined in the dedicated framework. Resistance must be the last resort of a self-governing people who have exhausted every lawful means.

Key Terms:
Consent of the Governed, Constitutional Covenant, Constitutional Order, Five Core Standards, Natural Law, Oath of Office, Oppression, Ordered Liberty, Protest as Moral Duty, Relational Structure, Resistance, Rightful Use of Authority, Stewardship, Threshold of Force, Voluntary Obedience

Jeff Pierson

III. Ordered Liberty as a Relational and Constitutional Framework

Mutual Terms of Civic Relationship

Ordered Liberty does not merely restrain government; it establishes a two-way moral covenant—first between individuals and their neighbors, and second between the governed and those who govern. This covenant is the heart of a just republic. It affirms that liberty is not a possession to be asserted in isolation, but a shared trust sustained by reciprocal duty. The individual must be restrained by conscience, the citizen by law, and the government by both.

This covenant assumes equality in dignity, responsibility in conduct, and accountability under law. It rejects all forms of moral hierarchy that place some above justice and others outside of it. No person is beneath the protection of the law, and no official is above its restraint. Rights are not issued by the state; they are pre-political and universal. Likewise, power is not granted without condition—it is tethered to moral purpose and public trust.

Ordered Liberty recognizes that all authority—personal, civic, or governmental—must operate within a moral structure. Citizens are not mere subjects of law, but participants in its legitimacy. Their obedience must be voluntary, rooted in conscience, not coerced through fear. Likewise, government cannot compel loyalty through force or ideology. It must earn trust by defending truth, ensuring justice, and upholding the limits of its own design.

The strength of a free republic lies not in uniform agreement, but in mutual restraint—when neighbors do not exploit one another, when leaders serve rather than rule, and when law protects without overreaching. Ordered Liberty requires this balance at every level. When either side—citizen or state—abandons their responsibility, the covenant begins to unravel, and liberty cannot long endure.

Key Terms:
Accountability, Authority, Citizen, Civic Relationship, Conscience, Covenant, Dignity, Duty, Equality, Fear, Force, Free Republic, Government, Ideology, Individual, Isolation, Justice, Law, Leaders, Legitimacy, Liberty, Loyalty, Moral Hierarchy, Moral Purpose, Moral Structure, Mutual Restraint, Neighbors, Obedience, Ordered Liberty, Overreaching, Participants, Personal, Power, Pre-Political, Protection, Public Trust, Reciprocal Duty, Relational Framework, Responsibility, Rights, Rule, Shared Trust, State, Strength, Subjects, Truth, Universal, Voluntary Obedience

Jeff Pierson

Jeff Pierson

IV. Person-to-Person: The Moral Contract of Civic Liberty

1. Natural Rights and Moral Agency

Under Ordered Liberty, rights are not created by the state but endowed by God and discovered through natural law. They are inalienable because they arise from the intrinsic worth and agency of each person. However, these rights are not license for selfishness—they are entrusted to moral beings capable of choosing good over harm. Moral agency is the capacity to govern oneself in alignment with truth, conscience, and duty. Internal moral discipline is the starting point of a just society: a citizen who exercises rights without regard for others' dignity ultimately undermines the legitimacy of those rights.

2. Civic Trust and Mutual Restraint

Liberty cannot survive in a culture of suspicion, exploitation, or hyper-individualism. Civic trust—the belief that one's fellow citizens will act with basic fairness, honesty, and restraint—is essential to social cohesion. Mutual restraint is the public expression of moral discipline: the decision not to take advantage of another's vulnerability, not to exploit legal gray areas, and not to weaponize liberty against the common good. When individuals act as neighbors, not enemies, a free people can flourish without the need for constant surveillance or coercive control.

3. Accountability and Redress

In a moral republic, justice does not mean vengeance or unchecked power—it means a principled and impartial response to wrongdoing. When rights are violated, there must be lawful and accessible mechanisms of redress. Without this, the social contract collapses into grievance and retaliation. Accountability ensures that no individual becomes a law unto themselves. Redress affirms that victims are not forgotten and that liberty includes the right to be protected from abuse. Ordered Liberty demands a system where justice is not only possible but expected.

4. Freedom Within Moral Order

Freedom, to have enduring value, must be rooted in a framework of right and wrong. True liberty is not the ability to indulge every desire, but the opportunity to pursue the good. A society that treats all choices as equally valid, regardless of consequence or morality, will soon discover that liberty unbound becomes liberty undone. Ordered Liberty insists that rights are safeguarded not by abandoning moral truth but by aligning freedom with it. When rights are used to silence conscience, destroy property, or destabilize peace, they cease to be rights and become tools of disorder.

Jeff Pierson

Key Terms:
Accountability, Civic Trust, Conscience, Defiance, Freedom, Internal Moral Discipline, Justice, Lawful Redress, Liberty, Moral Agency, Moral Order, Moral Truth, Mutual Restraint, Natural Law, Natural Rights, Public Good, Redress, Responsibility, Rights, Self-Governance, Social Cohesion, Social Trust, Trust, Voluntary Restraint

Jeff Pierson

V. Person-to-Government: The Constitutional Covenant of Lawful Authority

Section V Explained:

This section outlines the moral and legal terms of engagement between the individual and the state. It reasserts the ***Constitutional Covenant***—a phrase meant to highlight the binding, reciprocal agreement between citizens and their government. Rather than viewing law as a top-down imposition, this covenant treats it as a mutual trust where both governed and governors are morally and legally accountable to one another under a shared standard of justice.

1. Voluntary Obedience to Just Rule
This principle anchors civic obedience not in fear, coercion, or blind habit, but in conscience. Citizens are not morally bound to every law simply because it is codified—they are bound to obey only those laws that are just, meaning those passed through lawful authority and aligned with natural law and constitutional limits. This affirms that moral legitimacy, not raw power, is what makes a law worthy of obedience. Voluntary obedience, then, is a sign of moral health in a republic: it means people still recognize just authority and submit to it freely, not under duress.

2. Lawful Government as Protector of Rights
The government's role is not to engineer culture, dictate belief, or command allegiance to ideology. Its legitimate function is to protect liberty, not to manipulate it. This clause reasserts the constitutional limits of government power: it may not define ultimate truth (e.g., through compelled speech or ideological dogma), suppress conscience (e.g., through mandates that violate religious freedom), or punish dissent (e.g., through surveillance, cancellation, or weaponized enforcement). The state serves justice; it does not possess it.

3. Mutual Restraint Between Citizens and Officials
This element introduces the core concept of **reciprocity in governance**. Citizens are expected to obey just laws, but officials must also exercise restraint in how they wield power. When this mutual trust collapses—when officials begin to act without lawful boundaries or citizens begin to reject all authority—the covenant dissolves. Ordered Liberty depends on both sides honoring their role: the governed must remain disciplined, and the governors must remain constrained.

Jeff Pierson

4. Redress, Resistance, and Restoration

This is the outer boundary of the covenant—the final moral threshold. If every avenue of lawful redress is denied (through courts, elections, petition, protest), and if conscience is criminalized or justice abandoned, then resistance may become necessary. Crucially, this is not rebellion for its own sake—it is the last act of fidelity to the higher law. Restoration is the goal, not destruction. Resistance in this framework is not license to chaos, but a sober defense of the constitutional covenant when the government has already broken it.

Key Terms:
Conditions for Resistance. Constitutional Covenant, Limits of Obedience, Reciprocity of Governance, Redress of Grievances, Restoration

Jeff Pierson

VI. The Government's Duty to Defend Citizens' Rights Within and Beyond Its Borders

A government founded on the principles of Ordered Liberty cannot limit its moral obligations to lines drawn on a map. Liberty is not a geographical privilege—it is an inalienable right bestowed by the Creator and recognized by just law. If the government exists to secure those rights, then its duty does not evaporate at the edge of its territory. Ordered Liberty requires that the state protect its citizens not only at home but wherever their rights are threatened.

Within its borders, this duty is foundational and non-negotiable. The government is morally and constitutionally bound to defend the life, liberty, and property of its people from all threats, whether foreign or domestic, institutional or individual. This includes protection against violent crime, ideological coercion, unlawful surveillance, systemic corruption, and the failure of public officials to uphold their oaths. A government that will not secure rights within its own jurisdiction has no credibility to speak of liberty at all. Ordered Liberty begins with national fidelity—with ensuring that the law protects the innocent, restrains the powerful, and acts impartially in defense of every citizen.

Beyond its borders, the duty to defend shifts from control to protection. It does not grant a blank check for global intervention, empire-building, or ideological conquest. Instead, it affirms that when citizens find themselves in danger abroad—whether by hostile regimes, foreign detention, or denial of basic human rights—their government retains a moral obligation to advocate, intervene diplomatically, or assist when justly possible. Liberty, like dignity, travels with the person. It cannot be checked at the port of entry or denied due to international inconvenience.

This principle is not a call to perpetual war or entanglement. It is a call to integrity. Ordered Liberty means that the government must act not only to preserve sovereignty but to defend the rights of its citizens in every sphere where its protection is lawfully possible. It means refusing to treat Americans as expendable abroad and refusing to tolerate injustice at home. A government that respects borders but neglects citizens has failed. Likewise, a government that protects foreign interests while ignoring domestic violations betrays its moral charter.

To preserve Ordered Liberty, the defense of rights must be consistent, principled, and non-partisan—anchored in the recognition that liberty is not a favor granted by the state, but a sacred trust the state is sworn to guard. Whether the citizen stands in Idaho or Istanbul, in

Jeff Pierson

New York or Nairobi, the obligation to protect remains rooted in the same covenant: that the government serves the people, not the reverse.

Key Terms:
Accountability, Constitutional Obligation, Covenant, Defense of Rights, Diplomacy, Domestic Protection, Foreign Detention, Government Duty, Human Rights, Ideological Coercion, Inalienable Rights, Institutional Corruption, International Obligations, Justice, Lawful Protection, Liberty, Moral Authority, Moral Obligation, National Fidelity, Ordered Liberty, Public Trust, Right to Life, Rule of Law, Sovereignty, Systemic Corruption, Territorial Jurisdiction, Threats to Liberty, Unlawful Surveillance

Jeff Pierson

VII. The Stages of Lawful Protest and Civic Defense

In a republic governed by Ordered Liberty, protest is not merely tolerated, it is essential. But like liberty itself, protest must be ordered. It must serve justice, not chaos. It must preserve the conditions of freedom, not destroy them. Below is a graduated outline of acceptable civic protest leading up to acts of lawful self-defense, grounded in the moral principles and constitutional order already affirmed in this document.

1. Expression and Dissent *(Protected)*

- **Lawful speech**, publication, assembly, and petition for redress.
- **Examples:** Peaceful rallies, critical essays, boycotts, and symbolic protest.
- **Protection:** Fully protected under natural rights and the First Amendment.

2. Nonviolent Civil Disobedience *(Conditional)*

- Intentional violation of specific laws to expose injustice or provoke reform, done openly and nonviolently.
- **Examples:** Sit-ins, refusals to comply with unconstitutional mandates, peaceful blockades.
    - *Not* blocking public access to services, private businesses, or preventing safe travel on streets or sidewalks.
    - *Must leave* immediately when ordered.
    - *Must not* resist arrest passively or aggressively.
- **Condition:** Must accept legal consequence; aims to restore lawful order, not undermine it.

3. Active Obstruction of Injustice *(Grave Protest)*

- Peaceful but assertive disruption of unjust acts, systems, or agents without violence.
- **Examples:** Forming human chains to prevent unlawful seizure, blocking access to enforce unjust decrees.

Jeff Pierson

    - *Not* blocking access to essential services or impeding general public rights.
    - *Must comply* with lawful orders.
    - *Must not* resist arrest.
- **Justification:** Must be provably defensive, aimed at protecting rights under imminent threat.

4. Defensive Self-Protection *(Threshold of Force)*

- Physical restraint or force only when one's life, liberty, or property is directly and unlawfully threatened.
- Protestors who initiate confrontation are not considered defenders; violence in such cases loses moral justification.

Note:
This scale exists not to glorify confrontation, but to preserve clarity. Protest becomes abuse when it turns aggressive, ideological, or destructive. But protest becomes sacred when law is used to destroy liberty. The moral duty of protest rises with the collapse of lawful redress.

Key Terms:
Active Obstruction of Injustice, Civil Disobedience, Clarity, Collapse of Redress, Conditional Protest, Constitutional Order, Defensive Self-Protection, Dissent, First Amendment, Grave Protest, Imminent Threat, Justice, Lawful Order, Lawful Protest, Liberty, Moral Duty, Moral Justification, Natural Rights, Nonviolence, Ordered Liberty, Peaceful Assembly, Protected Expression, Protest, Public Access, Redress, Self-Defense, Symbolic Protest, Threshold of Force, Unjust Acts, Unlawful Threats

Jeff Pierson

VIII. Definitions and Moral Standards for Resistance

Civil Disobedience

Civil disobedience is the intentional and public refusal to comply with a specific law, regulation, or directive as a form of moral protest. It is practiced to highlight injustice, provoke reform, or appeal to a higher law not to defy law wholesale, but to restore its moral foundation.

To be considered legitimate under Ordered Liberty, civil disobedience must meet the following conditions:

- **Nonviolent:** It must not inflict harm, threaten others, or incite destruction.
  Acts of property destruction, obstruction of travel, or prevention of access to public or private facilities are considered forms of violence and fall outside the bounds of civil disobedience.
- **Transparent:** It must be carried out openly, without deception or disguise, and with the clear intent to appeal to conscience and justice does not manipulate, intimidate, or conceal intent.
- **Defensive:** It must respond to a specific and unjust imposition, not aim to subvert general law or impose ideological will on others.
- **Submissive to Lawful Consequence:** Practitioners must obey lawful orders to disperse and must not resist arrest, whether passively or aggressively. Acceptance of legal consequence is essential to the moral clarity of civil disobedience.

Civil disobedience is not an act of rebellion, but of disciplined defiance, where fidelity to truth takes precedence over blind compliance. It is most justifiable when all lawful redress has been denied and peaceful alternatives are exhausted. It is a last-resort act of conscience not a first step of political confrontation.

Unjust Orders

Unjust orders are commands, directives, or mandates issued by lawful authority that violate higher moral law, natural rights, or constitutional limits. Though they may appear procedurally legal, they lack moral legitimacy because they compel actions that suppress liberty, violate conscience, or serve ideological ends at the expense of justice.
An order is unjust when it:

Jeff Pierson

- Requires the suppression of constitutionally protected speech, religion, property, or due process.
- Forces a citizen to act against moral conscience or religious conviction without lawful cause.
- Compels participation in unlawful enforcement, surveillance, or discrimination.
- Demands obedience to ideological policies in place of neutral, equal protection under the law
  Violates the Constitution's structural safeguards, such as the separation of powers or enumerated rights.

Obedience to unjust orders may appear lawful, but it is morally disordered. Ordered Liberty affirms that conscience, not coercion, must govern obedience. When law is weaponized to compel silence, participation in wrongdoing, or surrender of God-given rights, disobedience becomes not only permitted it becomes duty.

Who Decides When an Order Is Unjust?

1. **The Individual Conscience (First Line of Discernment)**
   Every citizen is morally responsible for discerning whether an order violates truth, justice, or God-given rights. Conscience is not infallible, but it is the first test of moral clarity. If obedience would require a person to betray their moral or religious convictions, that order demands scrutiny.

2. **The Constitution (Legal Standard)**
   An order that violates the plain meaning of the Constitution its protections of speech, property, religion, due process, or equal protection is unjust by legal definition. Constitutional fidelity is not a matter of interpretation by power, but a matter of restraint upon power.

3. **Natural Law (Moral Standard)**
   If an order violates objective moral truths such as compelling participation in evil, suppressing truth, or punishing the innocent it is unjust, even if it is temporarily legal. As the Declaration affirms, "laws of nature and of nature's God" precede and inform civil authority.

4. **The Public Conscience (Civic Accountability)**
   When individuals protest unjust orders openly and peacefully, they appeal to the judgment of the public. Through protest, litigation, and lawful defiance, they test the legitimacy of power in the court of public reason and history.

Jeff Pierson

5. **The Courts (Guardrails, Not Final Authority)**
   Courts may review and overturn unjust orders, but they can also err. Judicial rulings are not always morally correct see *Dred Scott* or *Korematsu*. When courts fail, the people retain the right and duty to resist tyranny through nonviolent means or, if all lawful redress is denied, through measured and principled resistance.

Summary Answer:

No one "grants" the authority to judge an order unjust. That responsibility begins with the individual and is tested against moral law, constitutional order, and the public record. It is not an excuse for anarchy, but a safeguard against obedience to evil. Ordered Liberty holds that *obedience to law is sacred only when the law is just* and when it is not, the duty to disobey begins.

Violence

Under the doctrine of Ordered Liberty, violence is any act physical or psychological that imposes coercion, harm, or intimidation outside the bounds of lawful self-defense or just enforcement.

Violence includes, but is not limited to:

- **Aggression:** Physical intimidation, menacing behavior, or threats intended to instill fear, compel submission, or silence lawful expression
- **Destruction of Property:** Deliberate damage, vandalism, or sabotage of public or private property
- **Forceful Obstruction:** Blocking access to buildings, roads, or services through physical means or mass coercion
- **Assault:** Any harmful or provocative physical contact, including throwing objects, spitting, or physical provocation

Violence is never justified under the banner of protest when it targets innocent persons, public order, or the equal rights of others. In an ordered republic, protest must be lawful, persuasive, and disciplined not coercive, destructive, or retaliatory.

Jeff Pierson

Violent Defensive Resistance

Violent defensive resistance is the use of limited, targeted physical force by citizens in response to clear, imminent, and unlawful harm that cannot otherwise be redressed through lawful means. It is not rebellion, revenge, or ideological warfare it is the final act of a self-governing people seeking to restore justice, not dismantle order.

To be justified under Ordered Liberty, violent defensive resistance must meet the Five Core Standards (adapted from Andrew Branca's *Law of Self Defense*):

- **Innocence:** The resisting party must not have provoked or participated in unlawful harm
- **Imminence:** The threat must be immediate and unavoidable by lawful or peaceful means
- **Proportionality:** Force must be strictly limited to what is necessary not vengeful or excessive
- **Avoidance:** All lawful, peaceful alternatives must have been exhausted or denied
- **Reasonableness:** The act must be judged by objective moral standards, not personal grievance

Under Ordered Liberty, violent resistance is always a tragedy, not a tactic. It is the last resort of moral conscience. Its legitimacy ends the moment it becomes vengeful, excessive, or directed at innocent parties.

Key Terms:
Accountability, Aggression, Avoidance, Civil Disobedience, Coercion, Conscience, Constitutional Fidelity, Constitutional Order, Courts, Defiance, Defensive Resistance, Destruction of Property, Due Process, Equal Protection, Forceful Obstruction, Five Core Standards, Higher Law, Ideological Warfare, Imminence, Individual Conscience, Innocence, Judicial Error, Justice, Lawful Consequence, Lawful Redress, Legal Standard, Legitimacy, Moral Clarity, Moral Law, Natural Law, Natural Rights, Obedience, Ordered Liberty, Peaceful Protest, Personal Grievance, Physical Force, Procedural Legality, Proportionality, Public Conscience, Public Order, Resistance, Rights, Rule of Law, Separation of Powers, Self-Governance, Structural Safeguards, Submissive Obedience, Suppression of Liberty, Transparency, Tyranny, Unjust Orders, Violence, Violent Defensive Resistance

Jeff Pierson

IX. Historical Examples and Application

1. Concord, 1775

The opening battle of the American Revolution was a defensive response to a long train of abuses and usurpations by the British Crown. It was not an impulsive uprising but the result of years of disciplined protest, petitions for redress, and self-restraint by the American colonists.

When British forces moved to disarm the colonial militia at Concord, the response was limited, localized, and defensive in character. The moral justification for violent resistance was rooted in:

- **Innocence:** The colonists did not initiate force.
- **Imminence:** A real, immediate threat to liberty and property.
- **Proportionality:** The force used was measured and directed only at aggressors.
- **Avoidance:** All peaceful petitions to Parliament had failed.
- **Reasonableness:** The action aligned with the natural right of self-preservation.

Concord represents the outer boundary of justified defensive resistance. It remains a historical example of violence that upheld liberty rather than undermined it.

---

2. Japanese American Internment, 1942

The forced relocation and internment of over 100,000 Japanese Americans during World War II represents a grave violation of constitutional rights—particularly due process, equal protection, and property rights. Though justified at the time under national emergency powers, the Supreme Court's 1944 ruling in *Korematsu v. United States* upholding the policy has since been formally repudiated as a failure of justice. In hindsight, the internment was not only unconstitutional but morally indefensible;driven more by racial prejudice and political hysteria than by military necessity.

Under the principles of Ordered Liberty and the Concord Principle of Resistance, violent defensive force may have been morally justifiable in this context, particularly if individuals had resisted imminent detention or the forcible seizure of property. Innocence, Imminence, and Proportionality were arguably met; the threat was real, state-driven, and rooted in collective punishment rather than individual guilt. However, the standards of Avoidance and Reasonableness carry special weight here. Violent resistance—while defensible in

Jeff Pierson

theory—would have almost certainly resulted in mass tragedy, fueling anti-Japanese sentiment and legitimizing further state retaliation. That it was not used reflects the extraordinary restraint of the Japanese American community under extreme injustice.

In moral retrospect, their nonviolent endurance became one of the strongest long-term indictments of the government's abuse of power. The lesson is not that violence was wrong in principle—but that its absence, in this case, preserved a moral high ground that ultimately led to national reckoning, apology, and legal reform.

Conclusion of Application

Both episodes demonstrate that violent defensive resistance is only justified in the narrowest and most extreme cases when all lawful means have failed, when the threat is direct and unlawful, and when the response is restrained, principled, and transparent.

Most modern acts of protest fail this test, particularly when:

- Conducted on behalf of those who are not innocent under the law.
- Directed against lawful institutions executing duly enacted authority.
- Motivated by ideology, not conscience.
- Aimed at subversion, not redress.

Key Terms:
Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, Reasonableness, Self-Restraint, Defensive Resistance, Collective Punishment, Redress, Moral High Ground, Historical Threshold

Jeff Pierson

X. A First Step – Assessing the Actions of Elected and Appointed Officials.

Introduction

In any just society, liberty must be preserved not only through laws, but through vigilance, conscience, and accountability. An easy entry point into becoming active in your community is a non-confrontational review of decisions and statement they make. The Ordered Liberty Evaluation Form is included below.

This form is designed to evaluate specific actions by public officials to determine whether a threshold has been crossed that violates the standards of Ordered Liberty. It is a tool for documenting breaches—acts that coerce conscience, suppress redress, or subvert constitutional limits—not to score ideology, but to protect principle. Each completed evaluation serves as a moral record and civic resource for those seeking redress, institutional correction, or public awareness of governmental overreach.

The form is unique to this framework

Purpose

This form provides a structured method for evaluating whether a specific government action or decision constitutes a breach of the moral and constitutional standards defined in the Ordered Liberty Framework. Unlike traditional ideological or policy-based report cards, this tool is incident-specific and centers on the moral threshold of governmental restraint, conscience protection, and civic legitimacy. It is not used to grade political alignment but to document, assess, and prepare responses to specific violations of Ordered Liberty.

Not A Scorecard

This form differs from scorecards like those issued by political advocacy groups in that it evaluates a single, identifiable act or policy rather than an official's general voting record or ideological tendencies. It focuses on the *nature of the breach*, not the *popularity of the position*. Where report cards measure conformity to a set of policy goals, this tool seeks to

Jeff Pierson

determine whether a foundational boundary of liberty, law, or conscience has been crossed.

The completed evaluation may serve as:

- Educational tool for groups or students
- Evidence in a petition for redress of grievances
- Documentation to support public censure, legislative inquiry, or citizen complaint
- A historical record of abuse or breach of public trust
- A component in a broader accountability report or moral review

Example

In 2024, a state education commissioner mandated gender identity training for all public school employees, including those with religious objections. The action bypassed the state legislature and denied conscience exemptions. Evaluators used this form and determined that it constituted:

- A conscience violation
- A bypass of legal limits
- A serious breach (Level 3)

Recommended actions included formal public opposition, legal challenge, and a call for resignation. The documented form was submitted to a legislative oversight committee and archived by a local civic watchdog group.

This form may supplement broader accountability reports or civic scorecards, but its primary function is to create a record of a singular act or policy that constitutes a civic breach—supporting lawful redress, public awareness, and historical preservation of violations against ordered liberty.

Use this form to assess whether a specific government action or official decision has breached the moral or constitutional standards defined by the Ordered Liberty Framework. This tool supports preparation for lawful redress or public accountability.

What Makes the Ordered Liberty Form Unique

- It's not legalistic or partisan.
- It focuses on moral thresholds and constitutional restraint.

Jeff Pierson

- It empowers citizens. not just victims. to record, review, and respond to breaches of civic trust.
- It aims to create a living archive of violations against the people's liberty, even if no legal remedy is immediately available.
- It is adaptable to use in protests, public petitions, historical reviews, and institutional correction.

Ordered Liberty Evaluation Form

Use this form to assess whether a specific government action or official decision has breached the moral or constitutional standards defined by the Ordered Liberty Framework. This tool supports preparation for lawful redress or public accountability.

SECTION I:
CASE INFO Official/Agency: _____
Title: _____
Jurisdiction: _____
Date: _____
Action/Policy Under Review: _____

SECTION II: THRESHOLD ASSESSMENT (Mark Yes if applicable)
[ ] Conscience Violation – Compels moral/religious objection
[ ] Protest Suppression – Limits peaceful dissent or redress
[ ] Power Overreach – Bypasses legal/constitutional limits
[ ] Double Standard – Exempts self from enforced rules
[ ] Ideological Enforcement – Driven by dogma over law

SECTION III: SEVERITY OF BREACH (Select One)
[ ] Level 1 – Minimal: Symbolic or minor technical issue
[ ] Level 2 – Concerning: Erodes trust, redress impaired
[ ] Level 3 – Serious: Violates rights, coerces conscience
[ ] Level 4 – Disqualifying: Enduring harm or subverts order

SECTION IV: REDRESS RECOMMENDATIONS

Jeff Pierson

SECTION V: EVALUATOR

Name: _____

Affiliation: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: External Reference Sources by Section

I. Understanding Ordered Liberty

- **The Declaration of Independence (1776)**: Establishes liberty as a right derived from "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God," asserting that government exists to secure—not grant—liberty. This affirms that liberty is prior to the state.
- **Federalist No. 51 (James Madison)**: Explains the necessity of internal government and mutual restraints to prevent tyranny. The phrase "If men were angels…" supports the premise that liberty must be governed by moral discipline.
- **Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America**: Tocqueville emphasizes that liberty depends on personal morality and civic virtue, supporting the argument that freedom without restraint leads to decay.

II. The Core Structure of Ordered Liberty

- **John Locke, Second Treatise of Government (1689)**: Explains that consent is the foundation of legitimate authority, but consent is void when extracted through coercion. Reinforces the moral basis of governance.
- **Federalist No. 39 (James Madison)**: Asserts that republican government derives from the people and must be exercised within constitutional limits. Supports the idea of authority as stewardship.
- **Romans 13:3–4, KJV**: Biblical foundation for rightful authority: rulers are ministers for good, not a terror to good works. Echoes the need for justice-bound power.
- **Martin Luther King Jr., Letter from Birmingham Jail (1963)**: Affirms protest as a moral duty when law is unjust. Just protest is disciplined and appeals to higher moral law.
- **The Declaration of Independence (1776)**: When protest is denied and rights are trampled, resistance becomes duty. This provides historical grounding for the "Thresholds for Resistance" clause.

III. Ordered Liberty as a Relational and Constitutional Framework

- **James Wilson, Lectures on Law (1790)**: Declared that government is founded on reason and justice—not force. Rights precede government and form a shared civic trust.

Jeff Pierson

- **Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Samuel Kercheval (1816)**: Stated that the Constitution must bind both rulers and the ruled, affirming the necessity of mutual restraint.
- **James Madison, Federalist No. 49**: Argues that both people and government must be restrained by the same constitutional order.
- **James Otis, The Rights of the British Colonies (1764)**: Asserted that no law or government is legitimate if it violates natural equity or moral justice.

IV. Person-to-Person: The Moral Contract of Civic Liberty

- **The Bible, Micah 6:8**: "Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly"—a call to personal virtue that undergirds civil liberty.
- **C.S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man**: Warns of the collapse of moral order when objective values are denied. Highlights the need for internal moral discipline.
- **Hadley Arkes, Natural Rights and the Right to Choose**: Emphasizes natural rights as pre-political and rooted in moral law. Rights exist to pursue the good, not to gratify desire.

V. Person-to-Government: The Constitutional Covenant of Lawful Authority

- **U.S. Constitution, Article VI (Oaths Clause)**: Binds officials to the Constitution, affirming that governance is a covenant not a command.
- **James Madison, Memorial and Remonstrance (1785)**: Conscience is sacred and not subject to civil authority. Reinforces the idea that obedience must be voluntary and just.
- **Jefferson, A Summary View of the Rights of British America (1774)**: The government is servant to the people's rights, not their master. Authority must always be conditioned by liberty.

VI. Government's Duty to Defend Citizens' Rights Within and Beyond Borders

- **The Declaration of Independence (1776)**: The government is instituted to secure inalienable rights. This duty does not dissolve at the border.
- **U.S. Constitution, Preamble**: Commits government to secure liberty and justice for "ourselves and our posterity"—a generational and boundary-crossing obligation.

Jeff Pierson

- **Federalist No. 3 (John Jay)**: Calls for federal action to ensure safety from foreign threats, affirming government's role as protector beyond its own soil.

VII. Stages of Lawful Protest and Civic Defense

- **First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**: Protects speech, assembly, and petition, laying the legal foundation for expression and protest.
- **Martin Luther King Jr., Letter from Birmingham Jail**: Civil disobedience must be nonviolent, transparent, and rooted in moral truth.
- **Henry David Thoreau, Civil Disobedience**: Calls for resistance to unjust laws as a matter of conscience, but only after peaceful avenues are exhausted.

VIII. Definitions and Moral Standards for Resistance

- **Andrew Branca, The Law of Self Defense**: Outlines key criteria for justified force: innocence, imminence, proportionality, avoidance, and reasonableness.
- **Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, II-II, Q.42**: Endorses resistance to tyranny when all peaceful means have failed.
- **Korematsu v. United States (1944)**: A cautionary legal precedent where obedience to unjust orders was judicially upheld, later repudiated.
- **Dred Scott v. Sandford (1857)**: Illustrates that courts may fail morally even when acting legally. Resistance must appeal to higher law.

IX. Historical Examples and Application

- **Concord, 1775 (American Revolution)**: Demonstrates all Five Core Standards were met: defensive, limited, and moral in response to imminent government aggression.
- **Japanese American Internment (Korematsu v. U.S., 1944)**: A failure of Ordered Liberty, where collective punishment was upheld under color of law. Resistance was restrained, revealing deep civic integrity.
- **Declaration of Independence**: Historical precedent for principled resistance rooted in moral law and exhaustive appeals for redress.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Common Law References by Section

I. Understanding Ordered Liberty

- **Sir William Blackstone**, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765–1769)

Blackstone defined liberty not as the absence of law but as "the right of doing whatever the laws permit." He emphasized that just laws derive from natural law and are designed to secure individual rights.

- **Edward Coke**, *Institutes of the Lawes of England* (1628)

Coke famously held that the common law was superior to acts of Parliament that contradicted natural justice. His rulings formed the basis of early resistance to arbitrary authority in both England and the colonies.

II. The Core Structure of Ordered Liberty

- **Calvin's Case** (1608), 7 Co. Rep. 1a, 77 Eng. Rep. 377

This foundational case in common law affirms that allegiance (or consent) creates the reciprocal duty of protection by lawful authority. It grounds the legitimacy of authority in mutual obligation.

- **Dr. Bonham's Case**, 8 Co. Rep. 114a, 77 Eng. Rep. 646 (1610)

Sir Edward Coke ruled that even acts of Parliament are void if "against common right and reason," establishing an early English precedent for the supremacy of natural law over arbitrary power.

III. Ordered Liberty as a Relational and Constitutional Framework

- **Magna Carta (1215, reaffirmed 1297)**

Clause 39: "No free man shall be seized or imprisoned… except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land." The Magna Carta embodies the reciprocal duties of protection, restraint, and accountability central to Ordered Liberty.

- **Entick v. Carrington**, 19 Howell's State Trials 1029 (1765)

Jeff Pierson

A key ruling on the limits of state power, holding that government agents cannot act against private persons without legal warrant. This case laid the groundwork for Fourth Amendment protections in the U.S.

IV. Person-to-Person: The Moral Contract of Civic Liberty

- **Case of the Swans (1592)**, 7 Co. Rep. 15b

Lord Coke emphasized that the king cannot change common law or seize private property without legal authority—affirming that rights are not subject to sovereign will, but grounded in law and tradition.

- **Semayne's Case (1604)**, 5 Co. Rep. 91a

Established the principle that "the house of every one is to him as his castle," reinforcing personal sovereignty and lawful redress as foundational to liberty.

V. Person-to-Government: The Constitutional Covenant of Lawful Authority

- **Case of Proclamations (1610)**, 12 Co. Rep. 74

Lord Coke ruled that the king could not create law by proclamation. Authority must be exercised under law, not above it—a fundamental tenet of rightful and limited power.

- **R v. Hampden (Ship Money Case, 1637)**

Though decided against Hampden, this case sparked debate on the limits of royal taxation and the right of subjects to resist financial coercion. It became a rallying cry for the English Civil War and American resistance.

VI. Government's Duty to Defend Citizens' Rights Beyond Its Borders

- **R v. Keyn (The Franconia Case, 1876)**

Dealt with the jurisdiction of British courts over crimes on the high seas, affirming that legal protections and responsibilities of the Crown extend with the citizen, though limited by sovereignty and statute.

- **Somerset v. Stewart (1772)**, 98 Eng. Rep. 499

Jeff Pierson

Lord Mansfield ruled that slavery was unsupported by English common law and that a slave brought to England was free. This affirmed the government's duty to defend liberty wherever its law applied.

VII. Stages of Lawful Protest and Civic Defense

- **Bushell's Case (1670)**, Vaughan 135

Established jury independence and the right to resist judicial coercion. Jurors cannot be punished for their verdict, even when contrary to court expectations—defending liberty of conscience and lawful dissent.

- **The Trial of William Penn (1670)**

Penn's refusal to remove his hat and his street preaching tested limits on civil protest. The jury's acquittal (despite court opposition) confirmed the right to protest unjust laws under English common law.

VIII. Moral Standards for Resistance

- **R v. Dudley and Stephens (1884)**, 14 QBD 273 DC

While it denied necessity as a defense for murder, this case clarified moral and legal boundaries for extreme resistance. The ruling reinforced proportionality and the sanctity of life—even in survival contexts.

- **The Petition of Right (1628)**

Reasserted the subject's right to resist unlawful imprisonment, forced loans, and arbitrary martial law. It laid the groundwork for legal redress as a barrier to state overreach.

IX. Historical Examples and Application

- **Trial of the Seven Bishops (1688)**

Seven Anglican bishops resisted King James II's order to read the Declaration of Indulgence. Their acquittal confirmed the right to refuse royal orders inconsistent with conscience and law—paralleling Concord's principled resistance.

- **U.S. v. Korematsu, 323 U.S. 214 (1944)** [repudiated]

Jeff Pierson

Though technically not common law, its de facto rejection reflects the same trajectory as cases like *Somerset*—affirming that state power exercised without regard to justice or natural rights ultimately lacks legitimacy.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: The Anti-Federalist Warning: Institutional Power and the Fragility of Liberty

Ordered Liberty requires more than a good Constitution. It requires vigilant citizens who remember that no institution is self-correcting. The Anti-Federalists, often dismissed by history as mere skeptics, foresaw the very dangers modern citizens now face: the gradual accumulation of power by institutions insulated from public accountability, and the erosion of liberty through bureaucratic complexity, judicial arrogance, and executive overreach.

They warned that even a written Constitution could become meaningless if the people ceased to guard its spirit. Patrick Henry, George Mason, and Brutus did not oppose government. They feared centralized, unanswerable government. They understood that the great threat to liberty was not merely unlawful power, but lawful power unrestrained by conscience and proximity to the governed.

Institutions, once corrupted, do not collapse. They adapt. They learn how to appear lawful while suppressing dissent. They entrench policies behind procedure, insulate officials through legal immunity, and claim moral neutrality while enforcing ideological dogma. This is not tyranny by seizure. It is tyranny by sediment, the slow burial of liberty under layers of unchecked authority.

The Anti-Federalists argued for a system grounded in local control, frequent elections, and a deeply armed and educated citizenry. Not as a recipe for chaos, but as the only enduring check on institutional betrayal. Today, their warnings resonate more urgently than ever. The most dangerous government is not the one that acts brutally, but the one that pretends to protect while slowly criminalizing conscience, property, and resistance.

Ordered Liberty , to survive, must include institutional humility. No agency, no court, no presidency is immune from corruption when disconnected from the people's virtue and oversight. When institutions become self-justifying, declaring their actions lawful simply because they are legal, the republic has entered a state of constitutional decay.

We honor the Anti-Federalist tradition by reaffirming this truth: institutions are never morally superior to the people who created them. They exist to serve liberty, not to redefine it. When they fail in that service, protest is not disloyalty. It is the last instrument of accountability. And when protest is silenced, resistance becomes not only justified but necessary.

Jeff Pierson

Key Terms:
Accountability, Aggression, Avoidance, Civil Disobedience, Coercion, Conscience, Constitutional Fidelity, Constitutional Order, Courts, Defiance, Defensive Resistance, Destruction of Property, Due Process, Equal Protection, Forceful Obstruction, Five Core Standards, Higher Law, Ideological Warfare, Imminence, Individual Conscience, Innocence, Justice, Lawful Consequence, Lawful Redress, Legal Standard, Legitimacy, Moral Clarity, Moral Law, Natural Law, Natural Rights, Obedience, Ordered Liberty, Proportionality, Public Conscience, Public Order, Reasonableness, Resistance, Rights, Rule of Law, Separation of Powers, Structural Safeguards, Suppression of Liberty, Transparency, Tyranny, Unjust Orders, Violence, Violent Defensive Resistance

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: The Founders' View of Protest and Resistance

Protest and resistance were not disruptions to order in the minds of the American Founders they were essential instruments of liberty. Grounded in natural law, affirmed in the Declaration of Independence, and framed within the Constitution, protest and resistance were seen as both rights and duties of a free people. The following principles reflect the Founders' enduring convictions:

1. Protest as a Moral Imperative

The Founders believed protest was a sign of civic health. It was not rebellion against government, but a defense of justice against its abuse.

"The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions, that I wish it always to be kept alive."
Thomas Jefferson

"If ever a time should come… when vain and aspiring men shall possess the highest seats in Government, our country will stand in need of its experienced patriots to prevent its ruin."
Samuel Adams

Protest, to the Founders, was a way of preserving order not undermining it.

2. Resistance as a Right and Duty

When protest is silenced and justice denied, resistance becomes morally necessary. The Declaration of Independence affirms this principle:

"Whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends [life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness], it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it…"

Resistance was not romanticized. It was to be rare, reasoned, and restrained justified only when no other remedy remained. This moral threshold mirrors the Five Core Standards of the Ordered Liberty Framework.

Jeff Pierson

3. Constitutional Protest as Built-In Safeguard

The Founders did not merely tolerate dissent they codified it. The Constitution protects protest through speech, assembly, petition, and redress. These were not accidents of liberty, but its design.

"The people are the only legitimate fountain of power… they have the right to alter the constitution… whenever they shall find it inconsistent with the happiness of the people."
James Madison, Federalist No. 49

Lawful protest is the first tool of self-governance. It must be preserved if liberty is to survive.

4. Obedience to Conscience, Not Command Alone

The Founders insisted that obedience to government must be bound by conscience, not compulsion. Authority without moral restraint was illegitimate, no matter how well-institutionalized.

"An act against the Constitution is void. An act against natural equity is void. And if the law be void, so is the authority that enforces it."
James Otis

This echoes the Framework's position on unjust orders: legality is not the same as legitimacy.

5. Disciplined Resistance, Not Mob Rule

While they affirmed protest and resistance, the Founders feared mob action and lawless insurrection. Resistance must be principled, not impulsive.

"Government is not reason; it is not eloquence it is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."
George Washington

The defense of liberty demands both courage and discipline. When resistance becomes retaliation, it ceases to be just.

Jeff Pierson

Conclusion

The American Founders did not leave protest and resistance to chance. They defined it, justified it, and warned against its misuse. In their vision, liberty is not self-sustaining. It must be guarded through protest when rights are threatened, and through resistance when redress is denied. The enduring lesson is clear: when law is used to destroy liberty, the people must act not out of rage, but out of duty to restore the order that liberty requires.

Key Terms:

Built-In Safeguard, Civic Health, Command, Compulsion, Conscience, Constitution, Constitutional Protest, Courage, Declaration of Independence, Defiance, Discipline, Disciplined Resistance, Dissent, Duty, Five Core Standards, Free People, Government, James Madison, James Otis, Justice, Law, Lawful Protest, Legitimacy, Liberty, Mob Rule, Moral Imperative, Moral Necessity, Moral Restraint, Natural Equity, Natural Law, Obedience, Ordered Liberty Framework, Patrick Henry, Petition, Power, Protest, Reasonableness, Rebellion, Redress, Resistance, Rights, Samuel Adams, Self-Governance, Speech, Thomas Jefferson, Unjust Orders, Vain and Aspiring Men

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: The Founders' View of Obedience

The Founders of the American republic rejected the idea that obedience to government is absolute. They affirmed that **obedience must be voluntary, moral, and conditioned by justice**. While they supported lawful authority, they warned that blind submission to power invites tyranny. In their writings and actions, obedience was always tied to legitimacy, not force.

1. Obedience Rooted in Conscience

The Founders held that obedience to law is only virtuous when the law itself is just. Conscience, not fear or compulsion is the foundation of rightful obedience.

"All men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience."
James Madison, Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments

This principle extends beyond religion. It affirms that no law or order can command the soul. Citizens are bound first to truth, and only second to statute.

2. Obedience to Just Authority, Not to Power Alone

The legitimacy of government depends on its alignment with natural law and the protection of inalienable rights. Obedience is not owed to offices that have become instruments of oppression.

"Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God."
Attributed to Thomas Jefferson and widely circulated in the colonies.

This was not religious rhetoric. It was a civic principle. To obey a tyrant is to betray justice. To resist unjust command is to restore moral order.

3. Limited Government Requires Limited Obedience

The Constitution was designed to restrain power, not to elevate it. The Founders understood that unrestricted government will eventually demand unrestricted submission.

Jeff Pierson

“A free people claim their rights as derived from the laws of nature, and not as the gift of their chief magistrate.”
Thomas Jefferson

If rights come from nature and nature’s God, then no ruler, judge, or legislature can demand obedience that violates them.

4. Obedience Ends Where Tyranny Begins

The Founders believed that citizens have the duty to obey lawful rule, but also the duty to withdraw that obedience when laws are perverted into tools of injustice.

“Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God.”
Patrick Henry

To submit to unlawful or immoral commands is not peace it is surrender. The preservation of liberty sometimes requires the refusal to comply.

5. Civic Virtue Includes Lawful Obedience

Although they warned against blind obedience, the Founders did not endorse lawlessness. They believed a free people must obey just law willingly and honorably.

“The good citizen will be ever willing to sacrifice private interest to the public good… and to obey the laws.”
Benjamin Franklin

True liberty is not the right to do whatever one pleases. It is the right to live under laws that serve the common good, and to resist only when those laws cease to serve justice.

Conclusion

The Founders’ view of obedience was balanced, sober, and moral. Obedience is a civic virtue only when the law is just, the authority is legitimate, and the conscience is free. When any of these fail, obedience becomes complicity. Ordered Liberty rests on this paradox: citizens must submit to rightful law, and they must resist unlawful power. The measure of a free people is not whether they obey it is *what they are willing to obey, and why*.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: The Founders' View of Protest and Violence That Harms Others

The American Founders affirmed the right of the people to protest, petition, and resist injustice but they firmly rejected any form of protest or resistance that harmed innocent citizens. In their view, liberty must never become a license to injure others. A republic grounded in Ordered Liberty demands that protest be principled, proportionate, and morally restrained. Violence that targets bystanders, destroys property, or punishes dissent is not a defense of freedom, it is the breakdown of it.

1. Liberty Must Not Violate Others' Rights

The Founders drew a sharp line between protest that defends liberty and protest that violates the rights of others. While they supported vigorous dissent, they warned that liberty, if abused, could become its own form of tyranny.

"Liberty may be endangered by the abuses of liberty as well as the abuses of power."
James Madison

A protest that tramples the rights of neighbors or silences opposition does not preserve liberty it corrupts it.

2. Power Must Be Disciplined, Even Among the People

The Founders were deeply wary of mob rule. They feared that unrestrained collective anger could become more dangerous than any king or legislature.

"The mob is the most ruthless of tyrants."
Alexander Hamilton

While the people are the guardians of liberty, Hamilton believed their power must be guided by principle, not passion. Protest that becomes lawless loses its moral claim.

3. Property Rights Are Fundamental to Liberty

The protection of property was central to the Founders' understanding of justice. Acts of protest that destroy, seize, or damage private property were seen not as civil disobedience but as violations of core natural rights.

Jeff Pierson

“The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God… anarchy and tyranny commence.”
John Adams

True protest seeks justice without theft or destruction. To violate property in the name of liberty is to undermine liberty itself.

4. Innocents Must Never Become Collateral in Protest

The Founders believed resistance must preserve justice even in its methods. Violence that harms the innocent or endangers the public turns protest into aggression.

“The means of defense against foreign danger have been always the instruments of tyranny at home.”
James Madison

This warning applies not only to governments but to protest movements. When the innocent suffer in the name of reform, justice has already been lost.

5. True Protest Seeks to Build, Not Destroy

For the Founders, the purpose of protest was not to burn down institutions but to restore them to their rightful function. Dissent was meant to call the nation back to its principles not abandon them.

“I am not among those who fear the people. They, and not the rich, are our dependence for continued freedom.”
Thomas Jefferson

Yet Jefferson also insisted that the people must be principled, informed, and restrained. Protest that degenerates into vengeance or lawlessness forfeits its cause.

Conclusion

The Founders supported the right to protest, but they demanded that it be guided by justice. When protest injures the innocent, destroys property, or imposes ideology through force, it ceases to be protest and becomes a violation of the very order it claims to defend. Ordered Liberty demands that protest be disciplined, purposeful, and morally sound. It is not enough to stand against oppression one must also refuse to become its mirror.

Jeff Pierson

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Counterpoints and Responses PT.1

1. **Counterpoint:** "Protest should be disruptive. That's how real change happens."
   Response: Disruption that violates the rights of others or undermines lawful order is not protest it is coercion. Ordered Liberty permits principled dissent but forbids imposing ideology through force or obstruction.

2. **Counterpoint:** "Civil disobedience should include property damage if it draws attention to injustice."
   Response: Property destruction is violence. It undermines the moral force of protest and turns conscience into compulsion. Justice does not require vandalism to be seen.

3. **Counterpoint:** "Law is just a tool of the powerful. Why obey it at all?"
   Response: Ordered Liberty affirms that only just law deserves obedience. But when law serves liberty and protects rights, disobedience becomes nihilism, not justice.

4. **Counterpoint:** "If people are hurting, the rules don't matter."
   Response: Compassion must be real, but it must also be just. Abandoning the rule of law invites the very lawlessness that destroys the vulnerable first.

5. **Counterpoint:** "Illegal immigrants deserve protection from cruel enforcement policies."
   Response: Protection does not mean exemption from law. Compassion can shape how law is enforced, but it cannot replace law. Ordered Liberty defends both conscience and order.

6. **Counterpoint:** "Violent protest is justified if the system won't listen."
   Response: Violence is only justified in defense against imminent, unlawful harm. Protest that turns violent against lawful institutions discredits its cause and forfeits its moral legitimacy.

7. **Counterpoint:** "Your framework is just a way to defend authority and suppress change."
   Response: This framework defends moral authority, not arbitrary power. It protects the people from tyranny above and decay below, holding all parties to one standard: justice grounded in truth.

8. **Counterpoint:** "Police and government are the real threats. Citizens have the right to resist them."
   Response: When the government becomes the aggressor, resistance is justified but

Jeff Pierson

only after lawful redress is exhausted and only under strict moral standards. Not every grievance meets that threshold.

9. **Counterpoint:** "Rules like 'don't block traffic' are just ways to silence protest."
   Response: Public safety and freedom of movement are rights, too. Protest must not become the denial of someone else's liberty. Ordered protest preserves both message and justice.

10. **Counterpoint:** "The founders used violence. Why can't we?"
    Response: The founders resisted only after long, peaceful attempts failed and their rights were systematically denied. Concord was not their first act it was their last option.

11. **Counterpoint:** "Refusing to cooperate with ICE is civil disobedience."
    Response: Civil disobedience is individual and nonviolent. Public officials sworn to uphold the law cannot defy it without betraying their oath. That is breach of duty, not protest.

12. **Counterpoint:** "You're elevating law over people's pain."
    Response: Pain is real, but law exists to protect people from injustice and abuse. To abandon lawful order is to abandon protection for everyone, including the vulnerable.

13. **Counterpoint:** "If the Constitution allows this injustice, we should ignore it."
    Response: The Constitution provides lawful tools to reform injustice amendment, litigation, protest. Ignoring it entirely replaces republican liberty with arbitrary rule.

14. **Counterpoint:** "What about systemic injustice? Doesn't that justify radical action?"
    Response: Systemic problems must be addressed with systemic reform, not system-breaking violence. Ordered Liberty demands disciplined change, not destruction.

15. **Counterpoint:** "Silence is violence. Force is sometimes the only language power understands."
    Response: Speech and protest are powerful when rooted in truth. To answer silence with violence is to abandon reason for rage. That is not justice, it is escalation.

16. **Counterpoint:** "Your definitions protect the status quo."
    Response: They protect the moral structure that allows dissent without collapse. Ordered Liberty is not about preserving power it is about preserving the conditions for truth to be heard and acted upon.

Jeff Pierson

17. **Counterpoint:** "Why should protestors respect laws that are unjust?"
    Response: They shouldn’t but protest must still respect moral boundaries. Civil disobedience is powerful because it honors justice while defying injustice, not because it abandons restraint.

18. **Counterpoint:** "Peaceful protest doesn’t work."
    Response: Peaceful protest works over time and in truth. When protest becomes destructive, it provokes backlash and undermines its own cause. Discipline is strength.

19. **Counterpoint:** "This framework sounds like it's written to excuse federal authority."
    Response: It holds all authority to the same moral and constitutional standard federal, state, or local. It condemns tyranny and lawlessness wherever they appear.

20. **Counterpoint:** "If enough people agree, isn’t that consent of the governed?"
    Response: Consent must be conditioned by justice. Majorities do not have the right to violate individual liberty or natural rights. True consent is bound by moral law.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Counterpoints and Responses Pt.2 - The Moral Defense of Protest

1. **Counterpoint:** "If protest is always disruptive, isn't it wrong by your standard?"
   Response: Protest may disrupt comfort or expose corruption but that is not disorder. Ordered Liberty permits disruption when it is peaceful, truthful, and aimed at restoring justice.

2. **Counterpoint:** "Your framework sounds too focused on law. What about conscience?"
   Response: This framework begins with conscience. Protest is a moral response when conscience is violated and law becomes a tool of suppression. Conscience grounded in truth is higher than unjust law.

3. **Counterpoint:** "Why not demand obedience until the next election?"
   Response: When rights are stripped or truth is criminalized, protest cannot wait for political cycles. Obedience to injustice is not peace it is surrender.

4. **Counterpoint:** "Isn't refusal to comply with unjust orders dangerous?"
   Response: It is essential. Noncompliance with injustice done openly, peacefully, and with discipline is one of the highest forms of civic virtue. It awakens conscience and exposes corruption.

5. **Counterpoint:** "Protest rarely changes anything."
   Response: Protest changes the protestor first. It shifts the moral atmosphere and invites public courage. Many reforms began as ignored protests, but none succeeded without them.

6. **Counterpoint:** "Why make protest conditional on politeness or obedience?"
   Response: It is not about politeness, but principle. A protest loses legitimacy the moment it punishes the innocent or silences others. Disciplined protest shows moral clarity, not passivity.

7. **Counterpoint:** "Civil disobedience is still illegal. Isn’t that wrong?"
   Response: Legality and morality are not the same. Civil disobedience accepts legal consequence precisely to show the injustice of the law being broken. That is not rebellion it is witness.

8. **Counterpoint:** "Protest is messy. Why demand order?"
   Response: Order is not silence. Protest within Ordered Liberty is strong because it

Jeff Pierson

preserves justice while exposing abuse. Disorder without principle weakens even righteous causes.

9. **Counterpoint:** "Isn't protest just noise if it doesn't achieve immediate policy change?"
   Response: Protest speaks truth before it wins results. The aim is not only policy it is conscience. Delayed justice still begins with present courage.

10. **Counterpoint:** "Shouldn't protestors avoid confrontation entirely?"
    Response: Confrontation is not the problem compulsion is. Protest can and must confront lies, power, and indifference, but it must never become the mirror image of the injustice it opposes.

11. **Counterpoint:** "If you condemn violence, aren't you limiting the oppressed?"
    Response: No. Ordered Liberty empowers the oppressed by defending truth over force. Violence may feel powerful, but it rarely builds justice. Protest is strongest when it refuses to become what it resists.

12. **Counterpoint:** "So protestors must play by the rules of those they protest?"
    Response: Protestors must obey truth, not tyranny. The rules of protest are moral, not institutional. They protect dignity, not power.

13. **Counterpoint:** "But isn't disobedience divisive?"
    Response: Justice is always divisive to those who benefit from injustice. Division is not always a threat. It is sometimes the first sign of awakening.

14. **Counterpoint:** "Aren't you giving the government too much control over protest?"
    Response: No. The framework restricts government control. It demands that officials uphold protest rights and limits only what threatens others' liberty, not dissent itself.

15. **Counterpoint:** "Isn't noncompliance with unjust mandates a threat to stability?"
    Response: Stability is not the goal justice is. A stable tyranny is still a tyranny. Ordered Liberty prefers short-term disruption to long-term decay.

16. **Counterpoint:** "What good is protest when media or government won't listen?"
    Response: Protest is not performance for the powerful. It is a declaration of conscience to the public, the future, and the moral order. It endures even when ignored.

17. **Counterpoint:** "Isn't your framework too rigid for real-world suffering?"
    Response: It is precisely because suffering exists that the framework is needed. It

Jeff Pierson

prevents the misuse of protest while protecting its most vital purpose confronting evil without becoming it.

18. **Counterpoint:** "Does protest ever truly restore liberty?"
    Response: Yes. Every meaningful restoration of liberty has involved principled protest against slavery, censorship, segregation, and state overreach. Protest is often the first sign that liberty is not dead.

19. **Counterpoint:** "Why honor protest if the government doesn't fear it?"
    Response: Because protest isn't about fear. It is about truth. Governments that fear protest often deserve it. Governments that don't fear protest must still be reminded of their limits.

20. **Counterpoint:** "Is protest still valuable in a democracy with voting?"
    Response: Yes. Voting is slow, partisan, and often delayed. Protest is immediate, public, and moral. It reminds leaders that authority is conditional, and that conscience never submits.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Interrogatories and Answers PT.1

What is the purpose of this framework?
To preserve liberty through moral discipline, constitutional restraint, and civic responsibility. It equips citizens with clear standards for protest, obedience, and resistance—rejecting both authoritarian rule and anarchic revolt.

Does this framework encourage rebellion?
No. It rejects rebellion as premature and undisciplined. Resistance is justified only under specific, extreme conditions when all lawful redress has been denied and the Five Core Standards have been met. Most grievances do not meet this threshold.

Who decides when resistance is justified?
The individual bears first responsibility through conscience. That conscience must then be tested by natural law, constitutional text, public accountability, and the moral standards affirmed in this document. There is no institutional shortcut for moral clarity.

What makes this different from populist or revolutionary ideology?
This framework binds both citizen and state to moral law. It honors restraint, responsibility, and lawful protest over ideological zeal, partisan rage, or mob action. It demands evidence, principle, and proportion—not slogans or sentiments.

Why oppose violence, even when the cause seems righteous?
Because protest loses moral clarity when it harms innocents, destroys property, or substitutes retaliation for justice. Violence is justified only in narrow cases of self-defense under imminent and unlawful threat. Even then, it must remain disciplined, defensive, and limited.

What if the Constitution is not being enforced?
This framework calls for principled protest, litigation, civic exposure, and legislative correction—not abandonment of the constitutional order. The Constitution is fixed, but its survival depends on the moral fidelity of the people and their representatives.

Can public officials practice civil disobedience?
No. Civil disobedience is an individual moral witness. Public officials have sworn oaths to uphold the law. When they defy it, they violate their duty. That is not protest—it is a breach of office.

Is disobedience ever moral?
Yes—when the law itself violates higher law, conscience, or constitutional fidelity. In such

Jeff Pierson

cases, peaceful noncompliance may be morally necessary, but only if the protest is public, nonviolent, transparent, and willing to accept lawful consequence.

What is the Conditional Constitution?
It is the practice of applying constitutional principles only when they align with ideology or convenience. This selective enforcement erodes liberty by turning law into a partisan tool. The Ordered Liberty Framework rejects it completely.

How should citizens respond to tyranny by sediment?
By recognizing that liberty can be lost incrementally. Protest early. Demand clarity. Reject the lie that slow injustice is tolerable. Resist the procedural burial of freedom with moral vigilance and principled exposure.

Does this framework excuse federal authority?
No. It holds all authority—federal, state, local—to the same standard: constitutional fidelity, moral restraint, and public trust. When federal power violates liberty, it too must be opposed lawfully and morally.

Can this framework be weaponized?
Only if its standards are ignored. By requiring innocence, imminence, avoidance, proportionality, and reasonableness, it protects against both false accusations and reckless defiance.

What is Ordered Liberty in one sentence?
It is the moral condition of a free people, where liberty is preserved not by the absence of restraint but by the presence of just, moral, and limited authority, voluntarily obeyed and constitutionally bounded.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Interrogatories and Answers PT.2

Is Ordered Liberty authoritarian or institutionalist?
Neither. Ordered Liberty rejects authoritarianism outright—and does not place blind trust in institutions. It affirms that all authority must be restrained by moral law, and all institutions must remain accountable to the people they serve. It is not about control. It is about conscience.

Authoritarianism demands obedience by force. Ordered Liberty demands obedience to *just* law, freely given through moral conviction. It never excuses coercion in the name of order, nor does it idolize systems simply because they are longstanding. Institutions are not the guardians of liberty. People are—and institutions either serve that liberty or forfeit their legitimacy.

Ordered Liberty is also not anarchic. It recognizes that freedom without order becomes chaos, but insists that order without liberty becomes tyranny. It affirms the necessity of structure, but only under the condition that structure serves justice, preserves natural rights, and operates within constitutional bounds.

So no—Ordered Liberty is not authoritarian, and it is not institutionalist. It is constitutional. It is moral. And it is radically pro-freedom—but only the kind of freedom that does not devour itself.

Interrogatory: Didn't the Supreme Court already define Ordered Liberty?
Yes—but narrowly, and incompletely. The phrase *Ordered Liberty* has appeared in Supreme Court rulings for over a century, especially in debates about substantive due process. But in most cases, it has been reduced to a legal abstraction—a balancing test between individual rights and state interests, filtered through judicial interpretation.

That is not the full meaning of Ordered Liberty. It is not merely a doctrine for lawyers. It is the moral structure of a free society. It begins with the self-government of the individual, extends to mutual restraint among citizens, and culminates in constitutional fidelity from public institutions. Courts may interpret liberty—but they do not own it.

This framework reclaims Ordered Liberty from the courtroom and returns it to the people. It is not a judicial balancing act. It is a civic covenant grounded in natural law, conscience, and duty. The Supreme Court's definitions may serve legal purposes, but they are not the final word. Ordered Liberty belongs to the republic—not to the bench.

Jeff Pierson

Aren't you defining / making up new words?
Yes—unapologetically.

The Ordered Liberty Framework defines new terms because old language has been compromised, co-opted, or rendered meaningless through legal abstraction and ideological manipulation. This is not linguistic vanity; it is moral necessity. Words like *Voluntary Obedience*, *Threshold of Force*, *Tyranny by Sediment*, and *Conditional Constitution* are coined or redefined with precision to diagnose conditions no longer addressed by conventional civic discourse. These are not slogans; they are tools of clarity in an age of euphemism and evasion.

In the tradition of the Founders and Anti-Federalists, who themselves redefined tyranny, sovereignty, and consent in their day, we define terms to rescue meaning. This is not an act of invention. It is an act of restoration.

Why New Words Matter
Language is not neutral. It can be used to clarify reality or to obscure it, to restrain power or to serve it. In an age when terms like "justice," "democracy," and even "truth" are repurposed to justify coercion or suppress dissent, the defense of liberty begins with the defense of language itself.

The Ordered Liberty Framework defines new words—and reclaims old ones—for a singular purpose: to name what is real when others will not. Terms like *Tyranny by Sediment*, *Conditional Constitution*, *Institutional Humility*, and *Voluntary Obedience* are not intellectual flourishing. They are diagnostic tools, forged to describe civic conditions that the legal and political lexicon now evades. When public institutions rebrand suppression as safety, or lawlessness as equity, it becomes the duty of free people to rebuild the moral vocabulary of self-government.

The Founders did not inherit their language—they shaped it. Jefferson did not quote textbooks; he declared truths. The Anti-Federalists coined warnings still echoed today. In that spirit, this framework names things plainly: the slow suffocation of liberty by bureaucracy (*tyranny by sediment*), the selective enforcement of constitutional duties (*conditional constitution*), and the sacred responsibility to obey only when obedience is just (*voluntary obedience*).

New words matter when old ones are corrupted. The right to define is the right to resist. And in a republic built on reason and conscience, naming the truth is the first step in restoring it.

Jeff Pierson

What new terms have you made up?
We have created or reclaimed several terms—not to confuse, but to clarify. These terms were coined because the modern civic vocabulary no longer tells the truth plainly. Courts evade. Bureaucracies obscure. Media reframes. So we define—boldly, precisely, and with purpose. Each term names a civic condition that traditional language refuses to confront.

Here are some of the most important:

- **Tyranny by Sediment** – The slow, layered burial of liberty under bureaucratic and ideological encroachments. Not a coup, but a suffocation.
- **Conditional Constitution** – A critique of the modern practice of enforcing the Constitution selectively, based on ideology, identity, or expediency.
- **Voluntary Obedience** – The moral condition of submitting to just law from conscience, not fear. Obedience that is earned, not coerced.
- **Ordered Liberty Violation Standard** – A civic threshold identifying when public officials breach their duty through action, intent, and harm.
- **Institutional Humility** – The principle that no institution is morally superior to the people it serves, and all must remain constrained by law and truth.
- **Threshold of Force (Non-Military Context)** – The moral and legal line that must be crossed before limited, defensive force is justified by citizens.
- **Defensive Self-Protection** – Resistance grounded in the Five Core Standards: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness.

These are not semantic games. They are moral instruments. In an age where language is weaponized to blur accountability, precision is a form of resistance.

Which leaders seem to align with Ordered Liberty?
Few—but not none. True alignment with Ordered Liberty requires more than patriotic language or partisan loyalty. It requires moral clarity, constitutional restraint, courage under pressure, and the humility to submit power to principle. Most modern leaders fall short because they seek authority without accountability, and popularity without sacrifice.

But some have shown glimpses of alignment:

Jeff Pierson

- **Ronald Reagan**, for his insistence that "government is not the solution… government is the problem," and his defense of limited, constitutional self-government grounded in moral truth.
- **Calvin Coolidge**, for his quiet fidelity to constitutional limits and his understanding that "a government which does more than it ought will necessarily do it badly."
- **Clarence Thomas**, for his unwavering commitment to original meaning, natural law, and the moral order beneath constitutional text.
- **Ron DeSantis**, in his rejection of bureaucratic overreach and ideological compulsion, particularly in defense of parental rights, local control, and constitutional boundaries.
- **Senator Josh Hawley**, for calling attention to moral law, civic virtue, and the erosion of natural rights in the administrative state.
- **Kristi Noem**, for her early resistance to federal overreach during the COVID-19 crisis without collapsing into populist chaos.

But the greatest defenders of Ordered Liberty are not always in office. They are the citizens, writers, jurists, and pastors who restrain themselves before restraining others, who tell the truth when it costs them, and who govern their own conduct according to a higher standard than political gain.

Ordered Liberty does not begin with power. It begins with conscience—and most leaders will not align with it until the people demand it.

Do dead White guys have relevance today?

Yes—if liberty, law, and moral truth still matter. The relevance of the American Founders does not rest on their skin color, but on the principles they articulated: that all men are created equal, that rights come from God not government, and that power must be restrained by conscience and constitution. These truths are not racial—they are universal.

To reduce the Founders to their demographic is to commit historical malpractice. Their ideas launched the only revolution in history aimed not at raw power, but at just order. Were they flawed? Yes. But they also built the architecture that allowed future generations to abolish slavery, expand rights, and correct injustice—without burning the structure down.

If we discard their wisdom because they were White and male, we are not advancing justice—we are abandoning the very foundations that make justice possible. Their ideas

Jeff Pierson

outlived their failings. That's why they still matter. Liberty isn't preserved by forgetting the past. It is preserved by learning from those who fought to secure it.

Don't we have it pretty good?
In material terms, perhaps. But liberty is not measured by comfort. A people can be well-fed, well-entertained, and well-surveilled—and still not be free. The illusion of prosperity can conceal the erosion of principle. When truth is censored, conscience is punished, and law is bent to favor ideology over justice, the comforts of the present become the chains of the future.

Ordered Liberty is not about nostalgia or grievance. It is about recognizing when peace has become passivity and when security is bought at the price of submission. Tyranny often arrives not with boots, but with bureaucrats, not with decrees, but with "nudges," policies, and cultural pressure that make dissent feel dangerous and obedience feel inevitable.

So yes, we may have it "pretty good"—but only if we forget what liberty is supposed to look like. Comfort without conscience is not peace. It is surrender in slow motion.

Aren't we too big to fail?
No nation is too big to fail—only too proud to notice when it's falling. Size is not immunity. History is filled with powerful empires that collapsed under the weight of corruption, decadence, or moral decay while still projecting strength abroad. The Roman Empire, the Soviet Union, even the British Empire—all once seemed permanent, indispensable, invincible. None survive in their original form.

The danger is not just in collapse, but in the delusion of invulnerability. A republic does not fall when its enemies breach the gates—it falls when its people forget why the gates mattered. Ordered Liberty reminds us that greatness is not sustained by GDP, global influence, or technological prowess. It is sustained by moral clarity, constitutional restraint, and civic virtue. When those collapse, the fall is only a matter of time—and the bigger the nation, the heavier the crash.

Is it impossible to change?
No. But it is impossible to change anything lasting without truth, discipline, and sacrifice. Change that is real—not performative, not partisan, not cosmetic—begins with moral

Jeff Pierson

clarity and the courage to speak it. The reason things feel unchangeable is not because tyranny is stronger than liberty, but because too few are willing to resist early, speak plainly, or act when it costs them something.

This framework exists precisely because change is still possible—but only if it begins with conscience and moves outward through lawful protest, principled resistance, and public courage. The institutions may be corrupt, but the people are not powerless. The culture may be hostile, but truth has not been dethroned. The Constitution may be ignored, but it is not yet revoked.

Change is not impossible. But delay makes it harder, and cowardice makes it irrelevant. Ordered Liberty does not promise quick success. It promises that reform is still worth fighting for—and still possible—if we are willing to govern ourselves first.

Won't we just end up with riots and violence?

Not if we act with principle. The fear of violence is real—but the cause of violence is not protest. It is injustice unanswered, truth suppressed, and conscience criminalized. When lawful redress is denied and moral speech is silenced, people do not stop speaking—they erupt. That eruption is not caused by protest. It is caused by those who refused to listen until the shouting began.

The Ordered Liberty Framework exists to prevent that outcome—not to accelerate it. It provides moral thresholds and civic standards that restrain both the state and the citizen. It insists that protest be disciplined, that resistance be rare and justified, and that redress always be sought before confrontation. It teaches self-government to avoid mob rule, and constitutional duty to restrain authoritarianism.

Riots happen when moral people feel unheard. Violence spreads when law becomes a mask for ideology. We don't prevent chaos by forbidding protest—we prevent it by restoring justice before rage fills the vacuum.

Shouldn't we just let it burn and start over?

No. That is the language of despair masquerading as courage. Starting over sounds bold until you realize what is lost: the rule of law, the moral foundation of the Constitution, centuries of hard-won liberty, and the fragile inheritance of a free people. Revolutions rarely rebuild what they destroy. They clear the ground for tyrants, opportunists, and ideologues who rise from the ashes with fewer restraints than those who fell.

Jeff Pierson

Letting it burn is not justice—it is surrender to chaos. It abandons not only the guilty, but also the innocent. It punishes our children for the failures of our leaders. Ordered Liberty demands something harder: to rebuild without collapsing, to reform without razing, to restore without forgetting who we are.

The American system is damaged, not dead. The structure still stands. Its principles still hold. But they require defenders who will not trade frustration for fire or peace for apathy. We don't need to burn it down. We need to remember how to build again.

What is wrong with letting go of the past and evolving?

Nothing—if by *evolving* you mean improving in truth. Everything—if you mean abandoning the foundations that made liberty possible. Letting go of the past sounds enlightened, but it often means letting go of restraint, duty, and memory. Cultures that discard their history in the name of progress do not evolve—they disintegrate.

The Ordered Liberty Framework is not anti-growth. It affirms that justice must be applied to new challenges, that law must remain accountable, and that conscience must always guide policy. But it insists that real evolution is rooted, not rootless. You cannot preserve liberty by severing it from the natural law, the Constitution, or the lessons of those who paid for your freedom in blood, ink, and chains.

To evolve without reference to first principles is not growth—it is drift. And a nation that drifts without anchor always ends up in the hands of those most willing to seize the wheel. We honor the past not because it was perfect, but because it gave us the tools to correct what's broken—without destroying what is good.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Explaining the Doctrine

Public Preface: Why Ordered Liberty Matters Now

Ordered Liberty means freedom with responsibility, justice with limits, and government bound by moral law. It is the American tradition that says liberty is not the absence of restraint, but the presence of rightful authority guided by conscience, truth, and the Constitution.

Today, that balance is under pressure. We face populist violence, growing institutional control, and the disruptive influence of foreign and domestic provocateurs who thrive on division. These threats come from across the spectrum and seek to turn Americans against one another, against their laws, and against their own founding principles.

The result is distrust, disorder, and fear. But liberty cannot survive without order, and order cannot be trusted without liberty. We must resist lawlessness from below and oppression from above—not through rage, but through disciplined protest, lawful resistance, and moral clarity.

This framework defends neither the state nor the mob. It calls for a return to truth, justice, and civic responsibility. Protest must be peaceful. Authority must be accountable. Obedience must be voluntary and rooted in conscience—not fear or coercion.

We do not need a new revolution. We need a return to Ordered Liberty

1000 Word Summaries

A. General Public

Ordered Liberty and You: Why It Matters Now More Than Ever

In a time of growing division, political instability, and mistrust of institutions, Americans are searching for something solid—something that can restore hope and fairness without sacrificing freedom. That something is Ordered Liberty.

Ordered Liberty is not a political slogan or a legal technicality. It's the principle that made the American experiment possible. It says that liberty is not chaos and that law is not tyranny. Instead, real freedom comes from living in a society where both people and government are restrained by justice, truth, and moral responsibility. It's a framework that balances rights with duties, protest with discipline, and freedom with fairness.

Jeff Pierson

Ordered Liberty begins at the personal level. It means that you govern yourself—not just legally, but morally. It's what makes a community function: when people tell the truth, take responsibility for their actions, respect others' property, and resolve conflict without violence. But it also means government must stay in its lane, respecting natural rights and operating only within the powers granted by the Constitution.

Liberty without structure becomes license. Order without limits becomes tyranny. Ordered Liberty is the middle path that protects the innocent, restrains the powerful, and defends justice for all.

It affirms protest when just, resists power when necessary, and calls every citizen to moral responsibility. This is not a fantasy or a relic. It is a moral blueprint for a free and just society.

B. Religious

Ordered Liberty: Where Conscience Meets Justice

Ordered Liberty is a covenant rooted in natural law and moral duty. It affirms that liberty and justice must walk hand in hand. For the church, it provides a prophetic call to speak truth to power—not just to resist oppression, but to model self-governance, peace, and moral clarity.

In a culture of polarization, Ordered Liberty protects the vulnerable without fueling violence. It blesses protest, but condemns chaos. It sees conscience as sacred, even when unpopular. Christ called us to love our neighbor and resist evil without becoming evil. Ordered Liberty provides the civic framework for that calling.

It affirms disciplined protest, just law, and government that serves rather than controls. When law demands what God forbids or forbids what God commands, Ordered Liberty defends the believer. It demands that the church speak truth in love, protest in peace, and lead by example in conscience.

The gospel of grace demands justice. Ordered Liberty ensures that justice remains grounded in truth, not vengeance.

C. Legislative

Ordered Liberty: The Moral Limit of Lawmaking

Jeff Pierson

In a republic governed by law, power must be restrained by principle. Ordered Liberty reminds legislators that their oath is not to control, but to protect. It means lawmaking exists to defend rights, not redefine them; to restrain power, not expand it.

Ordered Liberty teaches that:

- Natural rights are pre-political and must be preserved.
- Constitutional authority is limited and cannot be assumed.
- Justice must be equal and impartial, not ideological.

Consent of the governed is sacred, but only when it is informed by truth and guided by conscience. Legislators must ask: Does this law protect the innocent? Does it punish belief? Does it honor restraint? Ordered Liberty makes clear: just governance is moral stewardship, not political control.

To preserve the republic, lawmakers must legislate with humility, protect liberty through discipline, and never forget that the rule of law must serve the people—not rule them.

D. Legal

Ordered Liberty: The Judicial Mandate for Constitutional Justice

Judges are not moral arbiters but civic stewards. Ordered Liberty calls the judiciary back to its foundational role: to interpret law faithfully, restrain power constitutionally, and safeguard liberty impartially.

Ordered Liberty teaches that:

- Legality without legitimacy is corruption.
- Judicial rulings must reflect not just procedure but principle.
- Courts must defend conscience, due process, and equal protection.

Judges are the final guardians of the civic covenant. When law becomes unjust, when courts enforce power over principle, liberty is betrayed. Ordered Liberty does not ask courts to take sides—it asks them to uphold the standards that give law moral authority.

You are the final threshold. If Ordered Liberty fails in the courtroom, it fails altogether. The robe is not power. It is responsibility. Ordered Liberty is how you wear it well.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Ordered Liberty Glossary

Accountability
The duty of individuals and institutions to answer for their actions within a moral and constitutional framework. Accountability ensures that liberty remains protected and power remains restrained.
See: Rightful Authority, Constitutional Covenant, Public Conscience

Active Obstruction of Injustice
Peaceful but assertive interference with unjust actions. Justified only when defensive, provably lawful in intent, and respectful of others' rights and access.
See: Civil Disobedience, Threshold of Force, Protest

Adverse Possession
A legal doctrine that allows someone to gain ownership of land after continuous and open occupation without the owner's consent for a legally specified period. While it may create legal title, it does not provide moral justification under natural rights theory.
See: Property, Natural Rights, Trespass

Administrative State
The complex of federal agencies that exercise legislative, executive, and judicial power without direct electoral accountability. Seen by reformers as unconstitutional and corrosive to the separation of powers.
See: Bureaucratic Capture, Deep State, Chevron Deference

Aggression
The act of imposing force, control, or presence without consent. In this framework, aggression includes non-physical violations such as trespass, coercion, and boundary invasion.
See: Coercion, Trespass, Violence

Ambition Must Counteract Ambition
A principle from Federalist No. 51, expressing the idea that each branch of government should be structured to check the others. Critics argue this balance has collapsed under partisanship and bureaucratic cooperation.
See: Separation of Powers, Federalism, Anti-Federalists

American Liberty Tradition
The philosophical and historical foundation upon which the Concord Principle of Resistance, Ordered Liberty, and Civic Anti-Authoritarianism is built. This tradition includes the natural rights doctrines of Locke, the Declaration of Independence, the Federalist

Jeff Pierson

vision of limited government, and the recognition that lawful resistance is a moral safeguard, not sedition. Unlike abstract or universalist human rights frameworks, the American Liberty Tradition defines freedom as ordered, earned, and bound to constitutional constraint. It treats self-defense—personal or civic—as an expression of civic duty, not ideological license.
See: Civic Anti-Authoritarianism, Natural Rights, Concord Principle of Resistance, Ordered Liberty

Anti-Federalists
Critics of the Constitution who feared centralized power, loss of state sovereignty, and judicial overreach. Their writings—especially Brutus, Federal Farmer, and Cato—form the intellectual foundation for modern constitutional skepticism.
See: Federal Farmer, Constitutional Covenant, Popular Sovereignty

Appendix of Protest Standards
The structured outline of protest, disobedience, and resistance defined by moral clarity and escalating thresholds. Used to distinguish between lawful civic action and disorder.
See: Protest, Threshold of Force, Conditions for Resistance

Assassination (as categorically rejected)
CPoR uniquely and explicitly rejects assassination as unjustifiable violence, regardless of motive. It violates multiple core standards (especially Proportionality, Reasonableness, and Avoidance) and is never considered "defensive" under this framework.
See: CPoR, Five Core Standards, Violence

Authority
The lawful and moral power to govern, legitimate only when restrained by truth, bound to justice, and accountable to constitutional limits. Authority that violates these boundaries becomes oppression.
See: Rightful Authority, Ordered Liberty, Just Law

Autonomy
The ethical principle that individuals have the right to self-governance and control over their own bodies, decisions, and spaces. Violations of autonomy are considered ethical violence.
See: Consent, Liberty, Trespass

Avoidance
One of the five core CPoR standards. It requires that all lawful and peaceful alternatives be exhausted before force is used. If nonviolent legal remedies remain, violent resistance is

Jeff Pierson

not morally justified.
See: Conditions for Resistance, Threshold of Force, Redress of Grievances

Bill of Rights
The first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution, added to secure individual liberties and satisfy Anti-Federalist concerns. Includes protections for speech, religion, arms, due process, and federalism.
See: Natural Rights, Constitutional Covenant, Consent of the Governed

Boundary Violation
An unauthorized crossing of personal or property lines—physical, legal, or moral. Boundary violations undermine the right to exclusive possession and respect for autonomy.
See: Trespass, Intrusion, Encroachment

Breach of Ordered Liberty
A civic breach occurs when a government official, institution, or collective authority acts in a way that violates the moral, legal, or constitutional conditions of just governance.
See: Ordered Liberty Violation Standard, Constitutional Covenant, Limits of Obedience, Rightful Authority, Restoration

Bureaucratic Capture
A process by which regulatory agencies become dominated by the interests they are supposed to regulate, or by partisan ideology.
See: Administrative State, Deep State, Chevron Deference

Civic Anti-Authoritarianism (CAA)
A framework for understanding liberty as the default and demanding justification for power. It affirms the right to resist unlawful coercion and restore moral limits on government.
See: Concord Principle of Resistance, Ordered Liberty, Natural Rights

Civic Conscience
The collective moral judgment of a society, shaped by shared values and rooted in truth. A key standard by which protest and resistance appeal for legitimacy.
See: Public Conscience, Ordered Liberty, Protest

Civic Jealousy
A virtue praised by the Anti-Federalists: the righteous suspicion of power. Not cynicism, but vigilance as a form of moral loyalty to liberty over government.
See: Anti-Federalists, Public Conscience, Rule of Law

Civic Trespass
The unlawful or unauthorized presence in a political or communal space, particularly when

Jeff Pierson

imposed against the will of the governing community or sovereign authority.
See: Trespass, Intrusion, Consent

Civic Virtue
The personal moral character necessary for citizens to responsibly exercise liberty. Without virtue, freedom cannot survive.
See: Self-Government, Ordered Liberty, Natural Rights

Civil Disobedience
A nonviolent, public, and disciplined refusal to comply with a specific law or directive, practiced to highlight injustice and appeal to moral law. Must accept lawful consequences and reject violence.
See: Protest, Redress, Conditions for Resistance

Coercion
The imposition of one's will on another without consent. Coercion includes actions that violate autonomy, including unlawful entry, control, or pressure.
See: Aggression, Trespass, Constructive Violence

Command vs. Conscience
A core tension in Ordered Liberty: legitimate obedience ends where moral conscience is coerced. No law or order is valid if it compels a citizen to violate truth.
See: Unjust Orders, Limits of Obedience, Just Law

Conditions for Resistance
The moral and constitutional thresholds that must be met before citizens may lawfully and justly oppose governing authority through civil disobedience, obstruction, or defensive force.
See: Five Core Standards, CPoR, Threshold of Force

Concord Principle of Resistance (CPoR)
A moral and civic doctrine outlining the conditions under which defensive resistance to governing authorities becomes justified. Must meet all five core standards.
See: Five Core Standards, Ordered Liberty, Threshold of Force

Conditional Constitution
A civic diagnosis describing how powerholders apply the Constitution selectively, according to ideology or convenience, rather than as a fixed legal covenant.
See: Constitutional Decay, Self-Justifying Governance

Conditional Republic
A warning that a constitutional system survives only through active virtue and vigilance—

Jeff Pierson

not form alone. Once its moral conditions are abandoned, the republic degrades.
See: Moral Clarity, Ordered Liberty, Institutional Decay

Consent
Voluntary agreement to allow someone into one's space or to engage in relationship. Consent must be ongoing and revocable.
See: Autonomy, Trespass, Scriptural Consent Theology

Consent of the Governed
The foundational moral and legal basis for legitimate authority. Government is just only when it operates by the true consent of the people—not through coercion or manipulation.
See: Rightful Authority, Constitutional Covenant, Popular Sovereignty

Constitutional Covenant
The binding moral relationship between the people and their government. It assumes mutual restraint, moral law, and shared obligation—not mere proceduralism.
See: Consent of the Governed, Ordered Liberty, Rule of Law

Constitutional Decay
A condition in which the Constitution still exists in form but is hollowed of meaning, selectively applied, or overridden by ideological or bureaucratic powers.
See: Conditional Constitution, Ordered Liberty, Self-Justifying Governance

Constitutional Morality
The belief that law must be rooted not only in process but in moral truth, natural rights, and the principles of just governance.
See: Natural Law, Just Law, Rightful Authority

Constructive Violence
Non-physical acts of coercion that violate moral or legal rights—such as unlawful occupation, surveillance, or suppression of conscience.
See: Coercion, Trespass, Aggression

Cultural Majoritarianism
A condition where dominant ideological factions use culture and media to enforce compliance without law—through shame, fear, or exclusion.
See: Ideological Bureaucracy, Deep State, Administrative State

Defensive Liberty
The idea that liberty is preserved not by expansion or conquest, but by moral self-defense. Resistance must restore order, not destroy it.
See: Ordered Liberty, CPoR, Restoration

Jeff Pierson

Defensive Preparation
The lawful right to prepare for just resistance—through education, training, or equipment—without threatening peace or planning unlawful action.
See: Threshold of Force, Defensive Liberty

Defensive Self-Protection
The physical defense of self, others, or property when facing direct, unlawful, and imminent harm. Must remain proportionate, lawful, and necessary.
See: Threshold of Force, Self-Defense, Conditions for Resistance

Deep State
A term for unelected institutional actors who exercise political or ideological control without public accountability.
See: Bureaucratic Capture, Cultural Majoritarianism

Defiant Consent
The moral stance of obeying a law outwardly while inwardly contesting its legitimacy or asserting a higher truth. Used when outward resistance would be unlawful or harmful.
See: Civil Disobedience, Voluntary Obedience, Just Law

Direct Democracy
A system where the people vote directly on laws and policies rather than through representatives. Criticized for bypassing constitutional checks and encouraging populist excess.
See: Seventeenth Amendment, Republicanism, Federalism

Dominion
The rightful control over one's person, property, or decisions. A key principle of Ordered Liberty and property rights.
See: Possession, Sovereignty (Private), Trespass

Encroachment
A gradual or physical intrusion into another's rights, property, or authority. Often legal in form but unjust in practice.
See: Boundary Violation, Trespass, Nuisance

Equality Under Law
The foundational principle that no one is above or below justice. Ordered Liberty demands universal application of moral and legal standards.
See: Rule of Law, Just Law, Civic Virtue

Jeff Pierson

Exclusive Possession
The legal and moral right to control who may enter or remain on one's property. Loss of this right constitutes coercion.
See: Dominion, Trespass

Federal Farmer
An Anti-Federalist pen name—possibly Richard Henry Lee—who warned that centralized power would destroy liberty and state sovereignty.
See: Anti-Federalists, Popular Sovereignty, Republicanism

Federalism
A system dividing power between the federal and state governments to protect liberty. Presumes both vertical (federal–state) and horizontal (legislative–executive–judicial) limits.
See: Tenth Amendment, Separation of Powers, Republicanism

Fidelity to Truth
The moral obligation to remain anchored in truth regardless of pressure, convenience, or ideology. Central to protest and resistance.
See: Moral Clarity, Just Law, Ordered Liberty

Five Core Standards
The five tests for justified defensive resistance: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness.
See: CPoR, Threshold of Force, Conditions for Resistance

Freedom Within Moral Order
The belief that liberty without moral limits becomes license. True freedom is the opportunity to do what is right, not whatever one pleases.
See: Ordered Liberty, Civic Virtue

Government as Servant
A foundational view that government exists to protect rights, not create them. When it ceases to serve the people, its legitimacy erodes.
See: Consent of the Governed, Rule of Law, Rightful Authority

Guardrails of Liberty
The structural and moral limits placed on power to prevent its abuse. Includes constitutional checks, civic virtue, and public accountability.
See: Separation of Powers, Rule of Law

Home Invasion
The unauthorized and often forceful entry into a private dwelling. Recognized in law and

Jeff Pierson

Ordered Liberty as one of the gravest personal violations.
See: Trespass, Defensive Self-Protection

Hospitality
The act of granting access to one's home or domain. Becomes coercive when consent is withdrawn but presence continues.
See: Consent, Dominion, Trespass

Ideological Bureaucracy
Administrative systems that enforce political ideology under the guise of neutrality or regulation.
See: Deep State, Cultural Majoritarianism

Imminence
A CPoR criterion requiring that a threat be immediate, unavoidable, and real—not hypothetical or speculative.
See: Five Core Standards, Threshold of Force

Innocence
Another CPoR requirement: the resister must not have provoked or escalated the conflict.
See: Five Core Standards, Just Law

Institutional Decay
When a governing institution fails to uphold its constitutional purpose and instead serves ideology, self-interest, or power retention.
See: Ordered Liberty, Conditional Republic

Institutional Humility
The principle that no institution is immune from error or above the law. Legitimacy comes from restraint, not prestige.
See: Rightful Authority, Institutional Immunity

Institutional Immunity
Legal or de facto protection from consequences. Criticized as a corrupting force that undermines accountability.
See: Institutional Decay, Rightful Authority

Intrusion
Any unauthorized presence or pressure—physical, psychological, or institutional—into another's space.
See: Trespass, Boundary Violation

Jeff Pierson

Judicial Supremacy
The belief that Supreme Court rulings are the final word on constitutional meaning. Critiqued as undermining the balance of powers.
See: Separation of Powers, Constitutional Morality

Just Law
A law rooted in truth, natural rights, and moral legitimacy. Unjust laws lose moral binding even if procedurally valid.
See: Natural Law, Rightful Authority

Lawful Power, Unrestrained
Power that conforms to the letter of the law but violates its moral purpose. Examples include ideological enforcement and retaliatory regulation.
See: Self-Justifying Governance, Tyranny by Sediment

Liberty
The right to live free from coercion, within moral and constitutional limits. Ordered Liberty affirms that liberty is a duty as much as a right.
See: Natural Rights, Consent, Ordered Liberty

Limits of Obedience
The outer boundary beyond which compliance becomes complicity. Conscience and natural law define where submission must end.
See: Just Law, Conditions for Resistance

Moral Clarity
The ability to discern right from wrong and act accordingly. Vital to protest, redress, and justified resistance.
See: Reasonableness, Restoration

Moral Personhood
The recognition that each individual possesses inherent dignity and responsibility.
See: Natural Rights, Consent, Trespass

Moral Relativism
The belief that right and wrong are subjective. Rejected by Ordered Liberty in favor of fixed moral truths.
See: Natural Law, Just Law

Natural Law
The belief that moral truth is objective, discoverable through reason, and prior to

Jeff Pierson

government. It is the foundation for natural rights and just governance.
See: Just Law, Constitutional Morality, Natural Rights

Natural Rights
Inalienable rights given by God and grounded in natural law—life, liberty, property, and conscience—existing before and above government authority.
See: Liberty, Ordered Liberty, Consent of the Governed

Nonviolent Protest
Public dissent expressed without harm, coercion, or destruction. Must be disciplined, truthful, and ordered.
See: Civil Disobedience, Protest, Redress

Nuisance
An act or condition that substantially interferes with the enjoyment of one's property. A violation even without entry.
See: Trespass, Boundary Violation, Encroachment

Oath of Office
The solemn constitutional and moral promise sworn by public officials to uphold the Constitution and serve under its limits.
See: Ordered Liberty Violation Standard, Rightful Authority

Obedience to Conscience
The belief that moral fidelity may require defying unjust laws or orders, so long as the resistance is disciplined and truthful.
See: Civil Disobedience, Just Law, Limits of Obedience

Oppression
The use of lawful power for unlawful ends—typically involving coercion, silencing, or the targeting of conscience and dissent.
See: Lawful Power, Unrestrained, Tyranny, Unjust Orders

Ordered Liberty
A civic condition where liberty and justice are sustained through moral self-government, limited authority, and fidelity to truth. It is both personal discipline and constitutional structure.
See: Just Law, Constitutional Covenant, Moral Clarity

Ordered Liberty Violation Standard
A framework identifying when officials violate their duty by aiding, ignoring, or protecting

Jeff Pierson

unjust conduct or unlawful power.
See: Breach of Ordered Liberty, Rightful Authority

Participatory Legitimacy
The condition in which political power is valid only when tied to meaningful consent and transparency.
See: Consent of the Governed, Rule of Law, Constitutional Morality

Peace Through Justice
A foundational goal of Ordered Liberty: that social peace is sustainable only when built upon lawful accountability, not enforced silence or power.
See: Just Law, Protest, Restoration

Political Obstruction
The use of political or institutional power to block justice, protect lawlessness, or prevent redress of legitimate grievances.
See: Breach of Ordered Liberty, Self-Justifying Governance

Possession (Right of)
The right to control, occupy, and exclude others from one's property. Denial of this right constitutes trespass.
See: Dominion, Sovereignty (Private), Trespass

Power Without Conscience
A recurring warning of the Founders: that unchecked power, even when legal, will destroy liberty unless morally restrained.
See: Lawful Power, Unrestrained, Tyranny by Sediment

Preemptive Violence
The use of force before a threat becomes imminent. Categorically rejected under Ordered Liberty and CPoR.
See: Threshold of Force, Proportionality, Innocence

Private Sovereignty
The principle that each individual governs their own body, home, and beliefs unless lawfully restrained for public safety.
See: Consent, Possession, Moral Personhood

Proportionality
The CPoR standard that force used in defense must match the threat—no more, no less.
See: Five Core Standards, Reasonableness

Jeff Pierson

Protest
A civic appeal to moral law, constitutional fidelity, or justice in the face of wrongdoing. Must remain orderly, truthful, and nonviolent.
See: Civil Disobedience, Redress, Moral Clarity

Public Accountability
The obligation of government actors to justify their actions publicly, face lawful scrutiny, and correct unlawful or unethical conduct.
See: Rightful Authority, Rule of Law

Realists
Those who believe America is in a post-constitutional era, requiring not just reform but moral and philosophical renewal.
See: Restoration, Constitutional Decay

Reasonableness
The CPoR requirement that any act of resistance must be objectively moral and understandable to a neutral observer.
See: Five Core Standards, Just Law

Reciprocity of Governance
The two-way duty between citizens and rulers: obedience in exchange for justice, and trust only when law is upheld.
See: Consent of the Governed, Rightful Authority

Redress
The peaceful seeking of remedy for injustice—via courts, protest, or lawful dissent. It is the first obligation before resistance.
See: Protest, Conditions for Resistance, Restoration

Reformers
Constitutionalists who believe the system can be restored through legal and cultural means, without collapse or secession.
See: Reconstitutionalization, Realists

Relational Structure
The belief that civic liberty is maintained through relationships—between citizens and each other, and between citizen and state—each bound by duty and law.
See: Ordered Liberty, Consent, Constitutional Covenant

Resistance
A morally grounded, lawful refusal to obey unjust orders or participate in unlawful acts.

Jeff Pierson

Must be disciplined, defensive, and proportional.
See: CPoR, Civil Disobedience, Threshold of Force

Restoration
The act of repairing civic and moral order after injustice or government abuse—aimed at returning to liberty, not overthrowing structure.
See: Protest, Ordered Liberty, Realists

Rightful Authority
Power that is exercised in accordance with moral law, constitutional limits, and the public trust. All other power is illegitimate.
See: Just Law, Consent of the Governed

Rule of Law
The principle that all power must be bound by law and no individual or institution is above it.
See: Just Law, Ordered Liberty

Sacred Protest
The view that protest becomes not just lawful but morally required when justice is denied and law becomes a weapon against liberty.
See: Civil Disobedience, Redress, Ordered Liberty

Scriptural Consent Theology
A biblical principle emphasizing that God relates to humanity through covenants based on voluntary agreement, not coercion. Provides the moral model for political consent.
See: Consent, Moral Law, Sovereignty (Private)

Self-Defense
The act of using proportionate force to repel an immediate and unlawful threat to life, liberty, or property. Valid only under the Five Core Standards.
See: Defensive Self-Protection, Threshold of Force

Self-Government
The practice of internal moral discipline and personal responsibility as the foundation of liberty. Required of citizens before it can be required of rulers.
See: Civic Virtue, Ordered Liberty

Self-Justifying Governance
A condition where rulers declare their power legitimate solely by holding office, regardless of law or morality.
See: Lawful Power, Unrestrained, Tyranny by Sediment

Jeff Pierson

Separation of Powers
A constitutional doctrine that assigns legislative, executive, and judicial powers to different branches to prevent tyranny.
See: Ambition Must Counteract Ambition, Federalism

Seventeenth Amendment
Ratified in 1913, it shifted Senate elections from state legislatures to direct popular vote, weakening federalism.
See: Federalism, Progressivism

Sovereignty (Private)
The individual's moral and legal right to govern their own body, conscience, and space. Violation of this is trespass.
See: Consent, Possession

Stages of Protest
A framework in the Ordered Liberty model that identifies lawful stages of civic protest: expression, disobedience, obstruction, and defensive resistance.
See: Protest, Threshold of Force, Civil Disobedience

Stewardship
The moral duty of officials to act not as owners of power, but as caretakers on behalf of the people.
See: Rightful Authority, Institutional Humility

Systemic Aggression
A recurring or sustained pattern of institutional coercion, control, or boundary violation that collectively destroys liberty.
See: Trespass, Tyranny by Sediment

Tenth Amendment
Reserves powers not delegated to the federal government to the states or people. It anchors the principle of limited national authority.
See: Federalism, Bill of Rights

Threshold of Force (Non-Military Context)
The moral and legal boundary at which citizens, acting individually or collectively, may use limited, defensive physical force in response to direct, imminent, and unlawful harm when all peaceful redress has been denied. In the *Ordered Liberty* model, this threshold is crossed only when the Five Core Standards are met: *Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness*. Crossing the threshold is not an act of

Jeff Pierson

rebellion but a last-resort defense of life, liberty, or property under moral and constitutional duress.

See: CPoR, Conditions for Resistance

Trespass
Any unlawful or unwanted entry into private property or domain, physical or relational.
See: Consent, Boundary Violation, Possession

Tyranny
The exercise of power without moral legitimacy—unjust, unaccountable, and opposed to liberty.
See: Rightful Authority, Protest, Ordered Liberty

Tyranny by Sediment
The slow accumulation of minor intrusions, regulations, and violations that bury liberty beneath a crust of legality.
See: Self-Justifying Governance, Systemic Aggression

Unjust Orders
Commands issued under color of law that violate natural rights, conscience, or constitutional limits. Must be resisted.
See: Just Law, Limits of Obedience

Violence
Coercive action that causes harm or imposes will outside of just self-defense. Includes physical and psychological harm.
See: Aggression, Constructive Violence

Violence (Non-Physical)
Acts of coercion, invasion, or manipulation that violate autonomy without physical force.
See: Moral Personhood, Coercion

Violent Defensive Resistance
Force used as a last resort to repel imminent, unlawful harm when all lawful redress has failed. Governed by the Five Core Standards.
See: CPoR, Threshold of Force

Virtue
The moral integrity of a citizen or official. Without virtue, liberty collapses into license or tyranny.
See: Civic Virtue, Self-Government, Ordered Liberty

Jeff Pierson

Jeff Pierson

Bibliography - Citations

- Adams, J. (1787). *A defense of the constitutions of government of the United States of America*. London: C. Dilly.
- Declaration of Independence. (1776). *The Declaration of Independence of the United States of America*. https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript
- Hamilton, A. (1788, June 21). *Speech to the New York Ratifying Convention*. In J. C. Hamilton (Ed.), *The Works of Alexander Hamilton* (Vol. 2, pp. 437–444). New York: C.S. Francis & Co.
- Jefferson, T. (1774). *A summary view of the rights of British America*.
- Jefferson, T. (1816, July 12). *Letter to Samuel Kercheval*.
- Jefferson, T. (1816, June 7). *Letter to Francis Gilmer*. In *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Vol. 10, pp. 32–35).
- Madison, J. (1785). *Memorial and remonstrance against religious assessments*. https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/01-08-02-0163
- Madison, J. (1788). *Federalist No. 49*. In A. Hamilton, J. Madison, & J. Jay, *The Federalist Papers*.
- Madison, J. (1788). *Speech in the Virginia Constitutional Convention*.
- Otis, J. (1764). *The rights of the British colonies asserted and proved*. Boston: Edes and Gill.
- U.S. Const. art. I–III. U.S. Const. art. II, § 3. U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2–3. U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V.
- 5 U.S.C. § 3331. (n.d.). Oath of office.
- 18 U.S.C. § 242. (n.d.). Deprivation of rights under color of law.
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (n.d.). Civil action for deprivation of rights.
- *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958).
- *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).
- *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898 (1997).
- *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Metadata - Publishing

Executive Summary

Ordered Liberty Reclaimed – A Foundation for Liberty

By Jeff A. Pierson
Published: July 2025
Edition: v2.1

Description:
Ordered Liberty Reclaimed presents a powerful civic framework for restoring freedom, discipline, and moral clarity in an age of institutional decay and ideological extremism. Grounded in the natural law tradition and the moral logic of the American Founding, this document reclaims liberty not as unrestrained autonomy, but as the right to live within a structure of justice, truth, and constitutional restraint.

Through clear moral thresholds, historical precedent, and precise legal reasoning, author Jeff A. Pierson outlines how citizens and public institutions must relate to each other, when protest becomes duty, and when resistance becomes a last resort. This is not a call to revolt—it is a call to remember, restrain, and rebuild.

Core Themes:

- Liberty is preserved through conscience and constraint, not chaos or control.
- Protest is sacred when peaceful redress is denied—but it must remain morally disciplined.
- Institutional authority is only legitimate when it serves justice, not ideology.
- Obedience to law is honorable only when the law is just.
- Resistance must meet strict moral standards: innocence, imminence, proportionality, avoidance, and reasonableness.

Audience:
This work is intended for citizens, legislators, civic leaders, and grassroots advocates who believe in principled liberty, limited government, and moral responsibility. It is also part of a broader series—the *Ordered Liberty Framework*—which includes companion documents on public accountability, protest thresholds, and government restraint.

Description

Jeff Pierson

A Foundation for Liberty sets forth a civic doctrine for the preservation of freedom through moral restraint, constitutional duty, and relational peace. It affirms that liberty is not sustained by law alone, but by the virtue of a self-governing people and institutions restrained by higher law. Drawing from the American Founders, natural law, and historical precedent, this framework defends the moral conditions of a just society: personal responsibility, public trust, and lawful order.

Where liberty is threatened—whether by tyranny from above or civic decay from below—this framework outlines the disciplined standards by which truth must be upheld, conscience preserved, and justice restored. Protest and resistance are addressed only in their proper moral context: as last responses when every duty of peace and redress has been denied. The aim of this work is not disruption but restoration—not grievance, but moral clarity.

Keywords

Ordered Liberty , civic duty, peace, self-government, moral order, natural law, justice, constitutional responsibility, personal restraint, public trust, conscience, liberty and law, redress, restraint, legitimacy, unity, moral discipline, peaceful citizenship, American Founding principles, mutual obligation.

Academic Abstract

Abstract:
This work proposes a comprehensive framework for the preservation and reclamation of liberty under the concept of *Ordered Liberty*, defined as the relational and moral condition in which free individuals and governments are bound by natural law, constitutional authority, and mutual responsibility. Drawing from classical philosophy, the American Founding, and modern civic decay, *Ordered Liberty Reclaimed* establishes ethical thresholds for obedience, protest, and resistance, emphasizing the disciplined role of the individual in sustaining justice.

The framework introduces key innovations—including the *Five Core Standards* for resistance (Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, Reasonableness), the definition of *Tyranny by Sediment*, and the concept of the *Conditional Constitution* as a civic crisis. The work rejects both authoritarianism and mob rule, advocating instead for voluntary obedience, institutional humility, and legal accountability.

This document functions as a post-authoritarian civic doctrine, offering policy relevance, historical grounding, and moral clarity. It contributes uniquely to contemporary political

Jeff Pierson

theory by integrating legal structure, moral reasoning, and civic action into a single standard of peaceful reform and principled defiance.

Keywords:
Ordered liberty, protest ethics, constitutional resistance, natural law, civic responsibility, moral thresholds, public trust, limited government, political restraint, voluntary obedience, American Founding, institutional decay.

Functional Purpose:

1. To Equip Citizens with a clear moral compass for protest and obedience, grounded in natural law and constitutional design.
2. To Restrain Power by articulating when institutions violate their trust and how they must be held accountable—peacefully, lawfully, but unflinchingly.
3. To Reclaim Language around liberty, order, and resistance—rejecting both authoritarianism and anarchic populism.
4. To Define Thresholds for when protest escalates into justifiable resistance, using rigorous standards like Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness.
5. To Unify the Just and the Responsible across ideological lines under a higher law—where obedience is voluntary, protest is disciplined, and liberty is not manipulated into license.

Jeff Pierson