



Caroline Beshenich

Jagiellonian University, Cracow (Poland)

ORCID: 0000-0003-4607-1202

People, Government Legitimacy, and the Risk for Abuse: a Discussion

Ludzie, władza, legitymizacja a ryzyko nadużycia: dyskusja

Abstract

The article seeks to understand the relationship between government legitimacy and the citizens of a state. Specifically, it looks how the person's ability to build a family and fulfill their purpose can be enabled or inhibited by their government's actions. The article proposes building a framework based on the Personalism found in John Paul II's work *Love and Responsibility*, as the basis for an approach that governments can look towards in the effort to take citizen-based actions internationally and domestically. This will ensure the State's people are respected and their dignity upheld. Without considering the person in these processes, it is possible to overlook them in politics, and so put them at risk for abuse.

Key words: *Cold War, Constructivism, John Paul II, legitimacy, freedom.*

Abstrakt

Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie relacji między władzą a obywatelami. Autorka stara się odpowiedzieć na pytanie, w jaki sposób państwo wspiera osoby, które zakładają rodziny, w realizacji ich celów życiowych.

Artykuł odnosi się do personalizmu chrześcijańskiego Jana Pana II ujętego w książce *Miłość i odpowiedzialność*, która może być wskazówką dla rządzących

w zakresie dążenia do partycypacji obywateli w procesach decyzyjnych realizowanych na poziomie krajowym i międzynarodowym. Czynny udział obywateli w tychże procesach jest bowiem podstawą rozwiniętego oraz aktywnego społeczeństwa i wpływa na jakość systemu demokratycznego.

Słowa kluczowe: *zimna wojna, konstruktywizm, Jan Paweł II, legitymizacja, wolność.*

Introduction

The construction of a State emerges from the complex relationship between its government and the governed people. The citizen's recognition of the State's legitimacy lends this body the authority needed to effectively rule. Both sides of the relationship ideally balance each other, creating a state system (in theory) where the State's international and national affairs keep the security of its citizens in mind when acting domestically and internationally. Conversely, the citizens of a healthy state understand the need to abide by its rules and promote its stability through their actions. Together, they create a symbiosis.

This article proposes to answer the question of how a state's efforts to better support the individual's ability to love and create a family can enforce its legitimacy. This query will be developed by hypothesizing that a state which makes decisions using a framework based on Karol Wojtyła's personalist norm will support the individual's ability to love and create a family, consequentially reinforcing its legitimacy by assuring its "social contract". By demonstrating the relationship between the individual and the state and explaining how the state's support of individuals enables its own health, this article will demonstrate that the individual's ability to realize the freedom to live, pursue a loving relationship, and create a family is a fundamental part of a state's health.

Constructivism as a Method of Analysis

During the 20th century, international relations utilized the school of neorealism to interpret the post-war international structure. This was devised around two main powers – the United States and the Soviet Union. The political, military, economic, security, informational, and infrastructural realms were impacted by the interactions between these two powers. When the

power distribution changed, however, neorealism became obsolete. The Cold War lasted only as long as the bipolar structure functioned, and "...ended only when the bipolar structure of the world disappeared." (Waltz, 2000, p. 39) One of the primary neorealist thinkers, Hans Morgenthau, developed neorealism as he looked for a way to make sense of facts – i.e., "...concepts as 'national interest' and 'interest defined as power' ". (Waltz, 1990, p. 21-37) It worked for the time those facts existed – i.e., for the span of the Cold War. The theory of neorealism was applicable insofar as what it was being applied to fit within its scope. Its fallacies centered around Morgenthau's belief that the "...international political domain cannot be marked off from others for the purpose of constructing a theory." (Waltz, 1990, p. 26) In the wake of the Cold War's conclusion, the International Relations theory of Constructivism rose to prominence.

Constructivism examines the identities and interests of people and states and looks at the relations within and between society and politics. (Checkel, 1988) States and their people are the foundations for further, more complex constructions, and these go on to link the two entities together. Understanding a state's politics then requires deconstructing its political approach to understanding how what it wants (both at home and abroad) relates to the state and the people. These bases support the two underlying beliefs of Constructivism, which propose that states act within social and material structures, and these structures are the understanding of state interests. (Checkel, 1988)

IR theorist and Constructivist writer Alexander Wendt believed that the national level's perspective of international power may be reduced to a few main concepts, namely "the pursuit of power, wealth and security by the state, the anarchy of the international community, self-interest and a rational sector, acceptance of the rule of conclusions, and adoption of the view of relativism as a basis for ontology." (Wendt, 1995, pp. 71-81) These elements formulate a government's domestic and international policies and motivate it to adopt certain modes of behavior to realize these interests. In pursuit of achieving these basic elements, citizens form states and these form security collectives. The conglomeration of state bodies was suggested by Wendt when he posed the idea that "interdependence among nations contributes to the shaping of collective identity". (Wendt, 1999, p. 347) This interdependence is exactly what distinguishes Constructivism amongst other theories. As opposed to Realism and Neorealism's perspective of politics being situated amongst state actors and agents, Constructivism looks at these actors and beyond to understand what lies below the apparent interests of governments and learn how they can be connected. (Checkel, 1998, p. 326)

The Construction of a State

When one says the word “state”, they understand this word to be “charged” with meaning. Behind the word state, and behind the state itself, there are various layers that together “construct” the state. To say, for example, “the British Government”, does not only implicate Queen Elizabeth II. Rather, one’s considerations include the Queen, the Prime Minister, the Parliament, and the Electorate. Attached to each of these is a series of people and offices supporting the term’s function. Along with the names and workers, there is another perspective. For the purposes of this article, this perspective will simply be referred to as “the construction”.

The construction is formed by a plethora of factors. These can be summarized as the norms, identities, and cultures within the state. (Das, 2009, p. 966-970) The interactions which occur because of these factors then formulate a state’s national and international policies, as they contribute to its security agenda. This connotes a continuing connection. The state’s national interests are derived from its people, and together with the state, they construct the state’s international perspective. The constructions are composed of the state and people’s systemic and internal factors – security, politics, society, cultures, etc. (Wendt, 1994, pp. 385-390) The construction can be as simple or as complicated as the state and its people are.

In the case of a state which works to promote itself and its population – and so, works for the collective health and prosperity of itself and its population – the relationship between the state and its people will be reflected in its national and international decision-making. The state considers its people, who in turn consider the state and its laws in their day-to-day activities. They promote each other, as by doing so, they promote themselves. If one obeys the law and refrains from breaking into shops and stealing, they promote the law by upholding it. At the same time, they also promote an atmosphere of lawfulness, which supports the state’s function. A government that does not have to devote extra resources to preventing petty thievery can invest those resources (such as policemen, public funds, and time to devise legislation) into other venues that will increase the public’s happiness. Such venues might be gymnasiums for elementary schools, health-care services, or infrastructure (i.e., public transportation). Human security is derived from the cooperation people make together, conscientiously, to elevate themselves from “the state of nature”. They can do so thanks to the common values or interests which they share, and which become a collective identity. (Tadjbakhsh, 2007, pp. 4-6) The collective, effectively, becomes a society.

The relationship between the society and its government then entails the need for an agreement on how their interactions will be patterned. This leads to the next topic – the social contract theory.

Marriage, Politics, and Connections between the Two

The collective that forms from the common interests and values of individual persons is a society. It elevates a group of people from the lawlessness that exists in “the state of nature”. In John Locke’s rather idyllic notion, the pre-law society is one where man is completely and wholly at liberty to do as he wishes. His goods are completely his own, and he disposes of them as he so chooses. This notion of complete freedom is darkened when one realizes that a life without laws *does* mean a life without taxes on one’s goods – but also a life without protection surrounding one’s being and one’s goods. To that end, there is nothing to stop one person from confiscating the goods of their neighbor, ending their neighbor’s life, and combining their territories to amass power. The need for security of one’s goods and self necessitates the state. This state cannot be haphazardly formed, as has already been indicated. It must relate to the people it represents. It also must demonstrate that it is worth their respect and fidelity. This introduces the notion of the social contract, which is based on legitimacy. Citizens invest their assent to be ruled within a legitimate government – not a random collection of self-appointed leaders.

By assenting to a government, citizens express their trust that this government will protect their pursuit of the “good life”. Marriage enters the picture here, as it is a choice of two individuals to commit to each other and enter into a union – according to the law. By legally allowing marriage, the state promotes the development of families. Individuals marry when they fall in love or form a connection, but also when they feel they *can*. When they believe it is safe to do so and they will be able to provide for the other spouse. Similarly, people prefer to procreate when they believe it is safe to do so. A healthy state environment allows for happiness and leads to life. When people can enjoy such an environment, they will be more likely to recognize and support the government that has enabled such a life to take root. The government fulfilled its part of the contract, and the people reciprocate by following its laws, paying its taxes, and refraining from lawlessness.

Legitimacy comes from the citizens of a state. By the assent of the citizens, the government is invested with “a right they [the government] would not otherwise have.” (Plamenatz, 1963, p. 227) This right is the right to rule. When

the majority of those who are qualified to give their assent, the government in question is imbued with legitimacy. Accordingly, "...every man, that hath a Possession, or Enjoyment, of any part of the Dominions of any government, doth thereby give his tacit consent, and is as far forth obliged to obedience to the Laws of that Government..." (Locke, 2004, p. 70) By giving their assent, the people are then bound to the rule of this government.

Social contract theory is visible in the election process – when a government comes into power by the demand of the citizens. Their casting of votes is their assent to the political structure. The leader(s) who results from these elections must act in some degree of accord with the will of the people – to include those who voted for the alternative. To do otherwise, i.e., "going rogue", would devalue the leader(s) of their legitimacy, as they would no longer be accurately representing the people they govern. In such a situation, the "failed state" is saddled with a government that is "...incapable of projecting power and asserting authority within their own borders, leaving their territories governmentally empty." (Rotberg, 2002, p. 128)

When a government loses legitimacy, the political problem then grows and eventually leaves the boundaries of the "political" sphere. Turmoil spreads into the society and continues to escalate. Without the ability to command obedience from its politicians, the government also loses its people's obedience. Crime rises. The economy loses stability. The state is threatened. The problem does not stay minute, however. A government that cannot control chaos within its borders also cannot *contain* it. In this situation, the international level is threatened. The festering of insecurity allows the failed state to become the "...breeding grounds of instability, mass migration, and murder...as well as reservoirs and exports of terror." (Rotberg, 2002, p. 128) The political process then develops into a delicate balance between state needs and society's needs/values. The state that takes both into account and extracts decisions from the balance is one, then, that is imbued with legitimacy, as it is acting for its people – on account of the attitudes they indicated in the social contract.

Government Legitimacy: Allowing Freedom and Acknowledging Personhood

The next element in the "construction" of this discussion, which is necessary for supporting the investigation, will be "freedom". Freedom looks different in every country, every society. It is encoded into the rights people enjoy. "Fundamental" human rights are those rights that have been

formally recognized and belong to every person. They were explicitly named by the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights”, which came into force at the United Nation’s 1948 General Assembly. This introduced Resolution 217 A (III), which set the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as the most common standard of rights for people and their nations, and officially implemented universal protection of human rights. (*Human Rights...*)

Fundamental human rights may be distinguished between two types of rights. Absolute rights are those held without restrictions, whereas qualified rights may be subject to certain restrictions under varying circumstances. (*Migration and Home Affairs...*) Qualified rights are connected with the issue of freedom, as they may be limited in circumstances where the rights of one person potentially threaten the rights of another. This could be (for example) the right to property. A person has a right to their property, but if a person uses their property to do something illegal (such as to hide/store drugs), then their right is subject to restrictions.

The concept of limiting freedom is an important discussion in contemporary politics, as it seeks a balance between individual freedoms and the freedoms of the collective. Human rights are at the heart of society, as a government that protects individual human rights allows for the freedom of society. When these rights are taken, the society’s freedom is limited. In turn, those who experience the freedom to function are those enabled by the government. One’s ability to love, create a family, and pursue the common good is limited in favour of the opposing government’s pursuit of power. The transition from the group’s freedom (i.e., the *society’s*) to the individual’s is the *gestalt switch* that allows widespread sexual abuse at the hands of government agents to happen.

Freedom and Governments

Freedom is a complicated question in terms of governments, human rights, and people. To be free, a person must be able to act without restraints. Yet, to protect this freedom, it often happens that some framework of legal restraints is ultimately necessary to prevent the freedom of one citizen from impinging on the freedom of another. Governments are tasked with realizing such an oxymoronic idea – ensuring people are free via legislation that constrains them. The freedom allotted by human rights must be legislated in such a way as to create a balance between individual and group rights so that one side does not profit unreasonably from the other. Imbalance causes the social contract to be suspended, as the state is “...only a product of the delegation of power from its

citizens, called upon to serve them and satisfy their needs.” (Diec, 2022, p. 132) The government that performs these duties remains legitimate and ensures the citizens enjoy the conditions needed to flourish.

As a universally applicable principle, human rights form a fallible concept insofar as it is utilized by *people*, a collective term for the citizens of different countries. Each country bears a different culture, is ruled by different norms, and its people live according to different ethical values. Considering there are nearly two hundred legally recognized countries, it is apparent that defining one human rights framework that is applicable to all of these countries and must be extended to all of their citizens is a daunting task. This could be projected as one of the reasons that humanitarian crises occur – one country’s failure to observe the human rights of its citizens impacts their freedom in such a way the international scene deems intervention necessary. When human rights are not observed, individuals cannot live as they choose and cannot pursue “the good life”.

Human rights may be traced to common law, which is developed by the legal decisions made by courts, rather than “judicial statutes” that have been passed. (Legal Information Institute) These rights develop from a system, and the people associated with this system – upon the determination of their specific rights – observe the laws that have been set to allow for the existence of their rights. A society’s regard for human rights is constructed from these people, whose recognition of certain points as being the rights of every human is rooted in their values and interests. A society that values economic development, therefore, will be more likely to have a greater emphasis on the right of a person (who pays taxes and abides by legal regulations) to work without being molested by mafia characters and losing sales. This idea is supported by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe’s Article VIII, which declares “...by virtue of the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference and to pursue (as they wish) their political, economic, social and cultural development.” (*Helsinki final act.*. OSCE. 1975)

From this excerpt of Article VIII, one might focus on the specific idea that *all peoples* have the *right* to live according to *their wishes*. Upon the basis of this expressed wish, they may live according to their *political, economic, social, and cultural preferences*. Critically, preferences will differ according to the country and society. Each society bears a different culture, which encompasses different interests and values. By adhering to this idea, Article VIII denotes a norm that declares all people should be able to live according to

their wishes. It does not indicate a universal idea of what these wishes should be – thereby leaving the character of these wishes to each country and its people. The norm’s only prescription is that, upon designating these wishes, individuals and their societies should be permitted to fulfill them. So, the issue then moves to designating human rights, which connotes delineating the individual and their society’s access to freedom. A society’s construction allows access to the individual’s human rights. The construction depends on the people and the values and interests which they – individually and collectively – hold dear.

Individual freedom is exactly that – the freedom of the individual person to do what they want. Among the many versions of political philosophy developed around the world, this idea of the individual’s rights and freedoms can be traced to the West. Such a distinction must be made, as some schools of thought may find the Western perspective to atomize the person and separate them from their society. (Diec, 2022, p. 11) This Western visualization of freedom is one of isolation. Essentially, one emphasizes the person and the person alone above their society. They are separated from and placed above it as the actors of predominant importance. Society is seen as existing for the individual – to promote the individual and the fulfillment of their good, rather than a balance between the individual and their society. Such an attitude becomes problematic when society is prostrated to the individual, and the freedom of others is taken in favor of the lone actor.

In contemporary times, one might consider the idea of societal attitudes towards types of expression which are perceived as offensive by individuals. The freedom of the group to enjoy a comedic dialogue is restricted by the individual present whose mentality is divergent from the group. In dialogue against the idea of individual-centered freedom, Russian conservative thinker Konstantin Pobedonostev’s writings are thought-provoking, as he saw that “...the unrestrained possibility of exercising the right to pursue happiness could effectively turn against human freedom.” (Diec, 2022, p. 118)

To phrase it another way, the Western practice of placing the lone individual above their society could backfire. By allowing the multitude of individuals who reside in a country to set *their* specific desires as the main focal point for *their* action, society breaks apart. Rather than moving together with a “common good” envisioned as the end goal, each person works against the other. One may then consider the Soviet party-line of the 20th century, which saw “..., the real intention behind the rhetoric of pluralism was in fact to introduce an internal division in the eastern camp.” (Diec, 2022, p. 119) As the person’s focus on their society is lost, society itself be-

comes divided. With the loss of unity, a state lacks the cohesion necessary to move toward its economic and security-related goals. The West's imposition of individualist attitudes on other societies has been, in many cases, "successful" inasmuch as it injected these ideas into the collective. Yet, as societies experience fragmentation and conflict from opposing attitudes, one might ask themselves just how successful these notions are in the long run.

It is exactly those goals (focusing on security and economy) that are so important to recognize as differing amongst countries. Whereas for countries like the United States, the idea is going after and catching life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, for others one might consider Lev Gumilev's notion of "anthill imperatives". In such thinking, humanity is composed of "ethnoses" (i.e. ethne). Each "ethnosis" (i.e. ethnos) is a specific grouping of a nation and various ethnic groups who have their own unique energy that propels them, as a community towards the fulfillment of group-specific instincts to "expansion and greatness". The instincts are fulfilled via the group's achievement of its "anthill imperatives" which serve to motivate the community *as a group* to fulfill these instincts – and so realize its potential. (Diec, 2022, p. 120)

To attain this greatness, to achieve their goal, the individuals must all work *together*, as two horses going in opposite directions will not bring a carriage to its destination (even if they are hitched together). When it comes to the fulfillment of *purpose*, the individual's needs – and the rights supporting those, are fulfilled as a *result* of the group's realization of its goals. The individual who refrains from robbing a store to satisfy their needs promotes the store's ability to conduct sales. Sales generate taxable income. The taxes ideally support the development of public infrastructure. The individual who respects the limits of their freedom (even if there are penalties later, a person can still commit a robbery and must choose not to) puts the good of society above themselves, and so allows societal freedom to perpetuate.

Non-Western attitudes towards freedom may differ considerably. The former USSR did not embrace individualist freedoms – such as the right to freedom of speech. Their attitude rubbed against the Western perspective, which sought to impose its societal regard for these aspects of freedom onto the Soviet state. For the Soviets, the group was the focal point, and the individual was fulfilled by the group, whereas the liberal West demanded the representation of the individual and their rights. When discussed and applied, human rights must be understood in the context of the individual and the collective group. These rights must be applicable to the interests and values of *both* the individual and collective, as it is these two groups that will bear the responsibility of observing those rights. (Diec, 2022, p. 130) If

the responsibility is one that is recognized as being important and as something that reflects what the individual and group hold dear, they *will* honor, respect, and uphold the connected human rights. One might envision two individuals holding a scarf over a puddle. If both sides do not keep their side of the scarf suspended, it will ultimately become wet and no longer function as effectively as it did previously.

There are numerous perspectives on human rights – the West’s perception is just one that may be implicated. (Diec, 2022, p. 131) Each country holds an approach that comes from its people and their worldview – it indicates what is important for them in the short and long term. What remains constant is the need for the individual’s freedom and the state’s sovereignty to be balanced. One can risk the theoretical supposition that if the balance is lost, the rights of one side will be increased to the detriment of the other. As the balance is thrown off, conflict is now primed to begin, and definitions of human rights will no longer be regarded or protected. Once a government is no longer concerned with its citizens, it is no longer concerned with their happiness. Its good no longer includes them – rather, only its goals and final purpose. The citizens become a means to achieving the government’s good, which may or may not positively impact them. It no longer matters at this point, as the final goal only consists of the government’s aims.

The transition from societal to individual freedom may be illustrated as moving from a (what will introduced next) Wojtylian Personalism-tinged government – where the person and their interests, values, and freedoms are protected and allowed to flourish – to a totalitarian-tinged government. In such a situation, the individual and society become sub-ordinate to the state. Rather than see the pursuit of their values and interests enabled by the state, the individual’s life is prostrated before and made to service that entity. Personal good is lost for the state’s good. Here, however, that good does not form a social contract as it is not concerned with its citizens beyond what they have to offer the state for its proliferation. The will of a concentrated few overcomes the societal good, and the individuals within that society lose their self-determination. Their ability to love, form families, and fulfill their purpose rests on the whims and dictates of the few individuals who rule the country. In this way, the individual’s ability to live and love may be seen as a fundamental part of a state’s health.

Love and Responsibility: an Unlikely Political Idea

Having established the understanding of why a legitimate government is necessary for the functioning of a state, this article will progress to elaborating on how a legitimate government may be connected with the personal lives of its citizens. This connection takes place via the manner in which a State regards its citizens. The perspective proposed is the personalist ethics of Karol Wojtyła – the late Pope John Paul II. Most widely known as the head of the Catholic Church, he was a vocal figure in terms of criticizing regimes guilty of human rights offenses. Wojtyła was also a renowned author – one who prolifically wrote on theology, philosophy, and ethics. Although his bibliography is extensive, this article focuses on one very specific work – *Love and Responsibility*.

The book provides insight into the formation of a relationship between a man and a woman. It allows the reader to understand what needs to be put into the foundation of a good relationship. In like turn, it also indicates what may be predicated as an underlying problem in relationships that collapse. The book's teachings stem from the inherent dignity of each person and the "personalistic norm" that Wojtyła proposed to use as an approach towards relationships. In *Love and Responsibility*, Wojtyła's discussion centered around people and their relations. He traced the concept of dignity back to natural law, which is part of every person. (Wojtyła, 2002, p. 318) This article proposes to develop a particular concept from his idea that will construct a picture of how the relationship between people and their state should look: the state that supports the individual's ability to pursue the good life and develop their own "community of persons" is a state that is healthy. Such a state is the opposite of the *totalitarian state*, which subjugates the individual to its own needs. In this opposing construct, the community, rather than supporting individuals together, is forced to support the state. The proposed "healthy" state is an echo of Wojtyła's writings, as it means the functioning state is one that respects its citizens – the *people* it rules. Consequentially, the state who regards the person as "...a kind of good to which only love constitutes the proper and fully mature relation," is one that respects the person. (Wojtyła, 2002, p. 25)

This personalistic approach does not connote states adopting such verbiage as "love", rather, they can turn to another idea of Wojtyła and regard their citizens with respect. A state that assumes the attitude of respecting the humanity and dignity of its citizens will act internationally and domestically in such a way – through its policies and activities – to ensure that its citizens enjoy the security and economic prosperity needed to make the cho-

ice, as individuals, to live, love, and pursue the common good. It neither exerts force nor takes the person's autonomy. Wojtyla taught that relationships should support individuals and unite them. If one projects this idea to the national stage, based on the personalistic norm, they subsequently place the social contract theory into an interesting position. The relationship between the state and its people should be one that promotes the mutual support of the other. The state supports its *citizens*, the citizens support their *state*. The decisions they make, and the actions resorting from them, facilitate each other's well-being.

To place this into context, one might imagine a local convenience store. The type of store that sells beverages, snacks, lottery tickets, periodicals, etc. The store pays taxes and legally declares its sales. In turn, it expects local crime to be monitored in such a way that it can operate its business unmolested. If the law-enforcement representatives of the state fulfill their duties to the state and citizens, the store will not be troubled by robbers or arsonists. If it is, they will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law, by the law. The owner of the store therefore supports the state and its good, and the state supports the citizen and his good. They are united by their common drive toward the good.

Personalism, the philosophy at the root of Wojtyla's teachings, is based on three beliefs, which were specified by Jonas Mortenson in his work "The Common Good: an Introduction to Personalism":

- "Humans are relational and in need of a close and engaged interplay with other humans in larger or smaller communities, in order to thrive and develop our potential."
- humans are beings that engage, i.e., beings that freely take responsibility for our own lives, but also for our fellow humans and for the community at large
- a person possesses "an inherent dignity that can never be relativized or diminished, and which our fellow humans and society have no right to suppress or violate." (Mortenson, 2019, p. 22)

From these statements, three conclusions may be drawn. Mortenson's points support the relationship between the state and the person, and also serve as a reminder of how the person – the citizen – should be treated. The first belief emphasizes that humans are not solitary beings. They function within a community context. Due to this community, they hold responsibility for each other. Each person has their own good which they strive for. Collectively, however, they also work towards the common good. The second belief reemphasizes the first. As members of a community, we are responsible for each other.

We propel one another to achieving the “common good” and fulfilling our individual purposes. Finally, the last point of personalism is that the person deserves respect because they are a person. As a human being, the person is endowed with a consciousness that elevates them above other creatures on earth. Their ability to discern, feel, and reflect imbues them with dignity, and by virtue of that dignity, they are owed respect. Violating their natural respect and dignity is a violation of their human rights. For one person to do so to another is heinous enough. For a state to do so is for it to undermine one of the tenets of the social contract on which society is built – security.

To conclude this section, the main takeaway is citizens enable the State, and the State enables citizens. When security and stability exist, citizens enjoy the conditions necessary to pursue their happiness and promote the community’s “common good”. In the atmosphere of stability, a man and woman can pursue the creation of a family – the product of their love. The family becomes their personal community, within which they experience love and can pursue the fulfillment of their goals. Without safety, people may not be as willing to purposefully set out to make a family. (Kearney, et. al., 2002)

The state and the citizen need each other for their mutual good and continuance. The state ensures stability, the family ensures the continuity of society. And together, they form a community. In reflection, the community that promotes the common good is one which recognizes the natural dignity of each person, and acknowledges the natural rights owed to them as a result of their dignity. The person enjoying the common good acknowledges the legitimacy of the State, its power to create laws, and its ability to protect and act in the name of its citizens.

Factoring out the Individual from Politics

A state that completely implements this Personalistic approach to its citizens does not exist. It may be thought of as a “utopian” concept. States may work to fulfill this goal – something that represents the idea that governments want to achieve. As a state continues to respect its citizens and continues to work for their interests in both national and international policy, it approaches the personalist ideal. Conversely, if a state progressively moves away from this “ground zero”, it will find itself moving progressively closer to totalitarianism. In the political sphere, one may perceive a connection between a government’s totalitarian mindset and government-permitted sexual abuse. Rather than viewing the person as a being for whom the state creates and upholds law (i.e., regarding the citizen as an “ends in themselves”), this inverted government se-

es the person as a means to achieving its agenda. Through abusive actions such as rape, a government finds it can rewrite the social contract to fit its needs – rather than accommodate both itself and the people.

As a state moves further away from the personalist ideal, the individual citizen's sexuality is placed at risk for weaponization. This fundamental part of the human being – which is also the key to their future – becomes a tool for actualizing the government's purposes. To this end, sexual abuse serves two purposes. Firstly, it creates fear in the person and society's *present* state. Secondly, it inherently affects the *future* of the abused society. As a means of violence, and as an action devoid of love, consent, and the hope of procreation, the sexual experience becomes rape. And when used as a weapon, rape is especially volatile due to its transcendence of the person. It targets the physical aspect of the person by objectifying the most private, sensitive areas of the person without their consent. It impacts the person's mind, as the trauma of the event and the chemical reactions of rape produce emotional effects which can be long-lasting and traumatic. Finally, rape targets a person's emotional capabilities, which allow them to form loving relationships. Here, it is critical to note that these relationships are not just romantic ones between intimate partners – but also those with family members and friends.

The weaponization of sex is the inversion of Wojtyła's concept of the relationship between a man and a woman. Contrary to the loving sexual experience which invokes respect for human dignity, it introduces the issue of "usage" – emphatically, this is the point where a person serves as a tool to achieving another's ends. Wojtyła defined usage as employing "...some object of action as a means to an end, namely to the end for which the acting subject strives." (Wojtyła, 2013, p. 7) Keeping this in mind, the political weaponization of rape is usage as it utilizes the sexual experience to intimidate and cower a population. A raped woman understands her protector (husband/father/etc.) cannot defend her from violence. The woman's protector (husband/father/etc.) understands he is powerless to protect his loved ones (his wife, children, and other family members). And the children of the family understand their parents can no longer protect them from danger. The entire family unit, then, which emerged from those initial feelings of stability and security, is now re-oriented to the new government and its goals. In order to survive, the person and their family must accept the new normal. And they must do as the agents of the government demand if they want to preserve their lives. They are forcibly adjusted so they can avoid (inasmuch as possible) violence and death. Through fear, the new government establishes its legitimacy and holds its authority. In place of dignity, the person's humiliation now stands.

Rape is an extension of “using” someone sexually, as “Sexual morality results from the fact that persons not only have a consciousness of the finality of sexual life, but also a *consciousness of being persons*. The whole *moral* problem of using as the opposite of loving is linked to this consciousness”. (Wojtyła, 2002, p. 17) Rape disregards the personhood of the victim by overlooking their consciousness. The government that weaponizes rape to achieve its goals, in this line of thinking, objectifies the population and uses their sexuality and personhood as a means of achieving end-state goals. Rape conducted by a military body during a war can be used for different purposes – to satisfy the natural needs of soldiers, ensure a supposed idea of “national security”, or “ethnically oppress” and “terrorize” a particular group. (Baaz, et. al., 2009, pp. 498-500) None of these purposes seek to preserve the dignity of the population. The point of the act is to humiliate the dignity of the person so to more easily subjugate them. By violating the women of society, who “...bear the ethno-national identity...” of the society, the very “fabric of society” is targeted for destruction. (Baas, et. al., 2009, p. 500).

Government-backed crimes against a population become possible when the “social contract” is suspended and one part of society – the people of the society – is targeted. For one reason or another, the government and its people no longer cooperate and so lose any sense of security. This creates the possibility to work toward the capitulation of one group to another. The purpose of this is to create a new social contract, crafted according to the desires of the winning group. In place of stability, in place of safety, one finds new dangers in society as the individual’s human rights are violated. Examples of such violations could be rape, enslavement, deportation, among other crimes against humanity. These crimes target the civilian population with the specific intention to discriminate against them, for whatever reason. (*Crimes against...*)

Rape during conflict targets the defenseless civilian population exactly because they are civilians and members of the society in question. It seeks to assign a sense of legitimacy towards a specific authority. Yet, rape and violence do not foster the development of loyalty from a patriotic or ethnic basis. Rather, these actions suppress a population to the point they are forced to recognize the government in question and obey it.

If the husband wants to protect his wife and children, if the wife wants to protect herself and her children, and if the children want to survive, they will do as they are now told. Regardless of how the new authority’s demands clash with their personal preferences, values, or societal understandings, they comply to preserve their lives and safety. Their dignity is lost as they are

objectified and utilized as tools to fulfill the ambitions of the new government. In conclusion, the abusive government finds that to rape a woman is to rewrite the future of a nation.

Conclusion

The research question posed at the beginning of this article inquired how a state's efforts to better support the individual's ability to love and create a family can solidify its legitimacy. The answer lies in the individual, whose happiness and freedom allow them to form a family. The content individual whose life and dreams are enabled by the state's provision of security and economic stability is more likely to condone their state and facilitate the success of its activities. Aspects of a state's goals are promoted through its people's consent – which results from their recognition of the state's legitimacy.

The proposed person-based state framework – based on the personalist teachings of Pope John Paul II (Karol Wojtyła) – features a state that understands its citizens are at the base of its construction and works to actively preserve their human dignity. Their identities and interests determine their values and goals, which are ideally mirrored by the state in its own values and goals. This type of political order allows the state to reflect the people and their goals (and vice-versa). Such reflection creates a sense of balance between the people and the state and subsequently forms their social contract. With balance, both sides can pursue the “good life”. A citizen who lives in a state that reflects his/her values or goals can pursue a relationship, build a family, and fulfill their own purpose. They adhere to the law and are protected by it – thus promoting the state's good and their individual good. When the balance is lost, the person becomes an instrument for the state's success. Their ability to live as they choose is inhibited. And something as personal as their sexuality becomes just another weapon for the state to use against them in pursuit of its goals.

By invoking a personalist perspective (such as that of Karol Wojtyła) in its decision-making, a state maintains consideration of its people. It regards them as more than just citizens working for its good – they are people (individuals) also pursuing their own good. A state with such a perspective will not utilize its people and will not violate their human rights and dignity. Should it lose sight of the person, it runs the volatile risk of transgressing its people and seriously harming them and thus, itself. The country. The state. The society. The people. The person. It is a construction that forms a contract that builds a balance. Each part is necessary for the other. And together, they enable the pursuit of happiness, both at home and abroad.

Bibliography

- Baaz, M.E., Stern, M. (2009). "Why Do Soldiers Rape? Masculinity, Violence, and Sexuality in the Armed Forces in the Congo (DRC)". In: *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 53, no. 2.
- Checkel, J. (1998). "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory". In: *World Politics*, vol. 50, no. 2.
- Common law. www.law.cornell.edu/wex/common_law, 02.05.2023.
- Crimes against humanity – welcome to the United Nations*. www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/crimes-against-humanity.shtml, 02.05.2023.
- Diec, J. (2022). "The Understanding of Human Rights in the Neo-Eurasianist Doctrine". In: *Politeja*, vol. 18. no. 2 (71).
- Helsinki final act*. OSCE. (1975). www.osce.org/helsinki-final-act, 02.05.2023.
- Human Rights*. www.un.org/en/global-issues/human-rights, 02.05.2023.
- Kearney, M.S., Levine, P.B. (2022). *Half a million fewer children? the coming covid baby bust*. www.brookings.edu/research/half-a-million-fewer-children-the-coming-covid-baby-bust/, 02.05.2023.
- Locke, J. (2004). *Second treatise of government*. Barnes & Noble Books.
- Migration and Home Affairs*. www.ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/pages/glossary/fundamental-rights_en, 02.05.2023.
- Mortensen, N. J. (2017). *The common good: An introduction to personalism*. Vernon Press.
- Plamenatz, J. (1963). *Man and society*. Longman.
- Rotberg, R.I. (2002). "Failed states in a World of Terror". In: *Foreign Affairs*, no. 81(4).
- Runa, D. (2009). "Critical Social Constructivism: "Culturing" Identity, (In) Security, And the State in International Relations Theory". In: *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 70, no. 4.
- Sharhrbanou, T., Anuradha, Ch. (2007). *Human Security*. Taylor & Francis.
- Waltz, K. (1990). "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory". In: *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 44, no. 1.
- Waltz, K. (2000). "Structural Realism after the Cold War". In: *International Security*, no. 25(1).
- Wendt, A (1995). "Construction International Politics". In: *International Security*, vol. 20, no. 1.
- Wendt, A (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wendt, A. (1994). "Collective Identity Formation and the International State". In: *American Political Science Review*, vol. 88, no. 2.

Wojtyła, Karol. Paul, J. (2013). *Love and responsibility*. Pauline Books & Media.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Caroline Beshenich a Ph.D. student, working on an extra-mural basis, at the Jagiellonian University's Department of Political Philosophy in the Institute of Political Science and International Relations. She obtained her Master's in International Security in 2020 and a Master's in Philosophy from the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow (Poland), in 2022.

E-mail: caroline.beshenich@gmail.com