Journal of Markets & Morality
Volume 25, Number 2: 275–287
Copyright © 2022

Vocation, Virtue, and the COVID-19 Virus

Brent Waters
Emeritus Jerre and Mary Joy Professor of Christian Social Ethics,
Emeritus Director of the Jerre L. and Mary Joy Stead Center for Ethics and Values
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary

Vocation plays a crucial role in promoting human flourishing. Vocational practices, however, are weakened when markets or the state intrude too extensively in the daily lives of people. Consequently, inordinately invasive markets and governments diminish human flourishing. This article explains why this is the case and suggests some ways to prevent unwarranted intrusions, using social response to the COVID-19 pandemic as an application and arguing on this basis that the virus must now be treated as endemic.

Introduction

I am testing a hunch in this article, namely, that vocation is an important component of human flourishing. Vocation is weakened when markets or the state intrude too extensively in the daily lives of people. An extensive literature has been written examining how separately vocation, markets, and the state promote human flourishing, but little has been produced linking the three together. Inordinately invasive markets and governments weaken vocational initiatives, in turn diminishing human flourishing. In what follows, I define vocation and explain why it promotes human flourishing, explore how markets and governments best promote vocational initiatives, and identify some challenges posed by the economic, social, and political ordering of a post-pandemic world.

Brent Waters

Vocation and Human Flourishing

What is vocation? Most succinctly, it is a way of fulfilling the command and calling to love our neighbors. As command, it is not a suggestion but a requirement. Every person is obligated to serve their neighbors, whether they are friends or foes, intimates or strangers, nearby or far away. As calling, neighbor love draws us out from ourselves, highlighting the inherent sociality of being human. To be a person is not predicated upon autonomy but requires interactions with others, as Adam Smith's self-interested butcher, baker, and brewer remind us.[1] They also remind us that loving one's neighbor is not divorced from self-love.

Love is not sentimentality. Rather, love acknowledges that we encounter an array of neighbors with a variety of needs. Neighbors are whole persons with complex material, emotional, and spiritual needs that cannot be met through chance meetings. The checkout counter at the supermarket, for instance, is not a good place to unburden my emotional distress upon a captive salesclerk. But it is a good place to meet my need for sustenance that this neighbor helps me fulfill. We encounter a wide range of neighbors that cannot be loved generically. We do not love strangers in the same way that we love our families. Parents do not love and care for children in general but particular daughters and sons. Moreover, people have multiple and overlapping vocations. I am, for example, a husband, father, and professor.

Strangers are the neighbors we encounter most frequently and most often in markets. These encounters are so numerous and transitory that we fail to notice them. Returning to the supermarket salesclerk, my interactions are usually not memorable, though indispensable if I am to eat. Additionally, there are countless people who produce, deliver, and display the products I purchased. Are these commonplace interactions acts of neighbor love? Yes. As Smith insists, marketplace participants are driven by self-interest. The producers and sellers of groceries are motivated by a paycheck, and consumers want to satisfy their gastronomic desires. Yet pursuing their respective self-interests contributes to each other's well-being. Smith insists that self-love is naturally inseparable from love of neighbor.[2] Consequently, market exchanges are acts of neighbor love, albethey often unrecognized. More pertinently, exercising one's multiple vocations depends upon these exchanges. My roles as husband, father, and professor are diminished if I cannot rely on neighbors to produce and sell the food I need.

Following Martin Luther, vocation, while closely associated with work, is more precisely a tangible expression of neighbor love as a joyful and obedient response to Christ. "Here faith is truly active through love [Gal. 5:6], that is, it finds expression in works of the freest service, cheerfully and lovingly done,

with which a man willingly serves another."[3] In and through our vocations, we serve our neighbors and in doing so become Christ to each other—all vocations are relational. One cannot be a pastor without parishioners, a magistrate without citizens, a parent without a child, or a merchant without customers.

Why does vocational work promote human flourishing? First and foremost, it promotes freedom. Freedom is neither autonomy nor the absence of external constraints against the will. It is instead the ability to act out our vocations, simultaneously releasing and constraining us. Luther captures this paradox nicely: "A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all."[4] To be free requires both affirmation and negation. Pursuing a vocation entails saying "no" to this in order to say "yes" to that. Marriage, for example, requires one to stop being single. I cannot be free to be a good husband until I forsake the ways of singleness. Vocation simultaneously liberates and binds—not a conundrum but a complementary relationship. Free individuals are bound to one another.

Vocation enables people to flourish because human nature is social as opposed to atomistic or collectivist. Humans act and are related to one another in (at least) three overlapping spheres, and their subsequent flourishing depends upon how these spheres are ordered both internally and to each other. These three spheres may be characterized, respectively, as exchange, coercion, and communication.[5]

Exchange. Survival requires humans to provide for their material well-being. At a minimum this means procuring sustenance, shelter, clothing, and healthcare. No one can meet all of his or her needs, and they are met overwhelmingly through exchange. Exchange is a swap, something for something. What is yours becomes mine; what is mine becomes yours. Most exchanges occur in commercial, financial, and labor markets. We work, borrow, and invest to put food on the tables, a roof over our heads, clothes on our backs, and visit the doctor. Exchange efficiently maintains one's material well-being, a self-interested exercise that also promotes the well-being of other market participants.

Coercion. Individuals need secure locales to satisfy their needs. This security is provided by governments through laws, regulatory agencies, social services, policing, military, and the like. Coercion underlies this provision. Recourse to overt force is often unnecessary, for its threat incentivizes compliance. For example, the prospect of fines or incarceration deters people from committing fraud. On occasion, however, violence is required in such instances as apprehending criminals or waging war against invaders. Political association is based on an exchange of sorts. Taxes are paid in exchange for maintaining public safety. But it is compelled rather than voluntary. In commercial exchanges, for instance,

consumers choose what goods and services they want, which merchants, and how much they are willing to pay. In contrast, one cannot go shopping for a government; a summons is not an invitation; and a tax bill is not a request for a donation. People benefit from the rule of law, but law compels.

Communication. Unlike the previous two spheres, communication is not centered on either voluntary or coerced exchange. "Communication" is derived from the Greek *koinonia* that can also be translated as "communion" or "community." To communicate is essentially sharing: what is yours and what is mine becomes "ours." What is communicated can be material or immaterial, for example, property and affection can be shared. Communication occurs predominantly in voluntary associations, such as families, neighborhood organizations, churches, clubs, and so forth.[6]

This spherical differentiation matters for two reasons.[7] First, human flourishing occurs within the distinct but overlapping spheres of exchange, coercion, and communication. The spheres are dedicated to differing purposes. Exchange enables the production and consumption of goods and services; coercion enforces the rule of law; communication helps people meet their affiliative. Yet they overlap in a number of mutually dependent and supportive ways. Communicative associations and governments are weakened if the material well-being of individuals suffer. Markets and communicative associations are destabilized if the state does not maintain a reliable and just rule of law.

Second, individuals pursue multiple vocations within the distinct and overlapping spheres of exchange, coercion, and communication. A person, for instance, may be a banker or a police officer in addition to being a spouse, parent, and church member. Each of these vocations are distinct, and mischief results if their respective roles are confused. Bankers and police officers should not act as if they are parents, and conversely, parents are not household bankers and police officers. But these vocations are also interdependent: bankers need customers, police officers need supportive citizens, and parents depend on bankers and police.

Balancing the distinctiveness and interrelatedness of these multiple vocations presents a moral challenge. Lack of vocational clarity may encourage unwarranted spherical intrusions; exchange, coercion, and communication take on formative roles they are ill-equipped to perform. Families, for instance, should not be governed as if they are small corporations or tiny states, and conversely corporations and states should not act as families writ large.

Pursuing multiple vocations inspires free action in serving one's neighbors, what may be called *vocational initiative*. Neighbor love is not rote. Although people share many common needs, meeting them entails variability. One must

understand the particular needs of the neighbor, prompting a fitting response.[8] As a practical way of demonstrating neighbor love, vocation involves acknowledging variability and responding accordingly. Within the sphere of exchange, for instance, vocational initiative may be exemplified by entrepreneurs. Their disruption of markets creates employment, investment opportunities, and more affordable goods and services that improve the material well-being of individuals and their communicative associations. Discouraging or prohibiting the vocational initiatives of entrepreneurs diminishes human flourishing by impeding the material well-being of people who would benefit from more competitive markets.[9] Within the sphere of coercion, vocational initiative is exercised by promoting free and broad-based participation in markets and communicative associations. This is accomplished through legislation and regulatory oversight in which discretion is the norm instead of an exhaustive promulgation and meticulous enforcement of rules and procedures. The state should protect and promote the freedom to engage in commerce and to associate.[10]

Although people pursue multiple and overlapping vocations, the priority of vocations should mirror and reinforce the hierarchical relationship among the spheres of exchange, coercion, and communication. Communication is the apex of social ordering. It is within communicative associations that human flourishing occurs most readily because they encapsulate sharing both the broadest and deepest goods, simultaneously liberating and binding people together in bonds of mutual affection. In the commonplace routines of communicative associations, dependent upon but also sequestered from the necessities of exchange and coercion, neighbor love is most directly focused.[11] A good economic and political order serves and promotes a robust civil society. Conversely, a bad economic and political order serves and promotes the priority of exchange or coercion over communication. Consequently, the vocations originating in the spheres of exchange and coercion are instrumental. Bankers and police officers, for example, are not called to be served but to support (most often indirectly) the communication of more expansive goods unconfined to exchange or coercion. Yet how should markets and states foster and protect communicative associations?

Goldilocks and Human Flourishing

In encouraging human flourishing, markets and governments are at their best when they avoid doing too little or too much, instead doing what is just right. This is the Goldilocks principle, and though admittedly simplistic, that does not necessarily make it wrong—drawing on Aristotle's notion of virtue gives it some heft. Per Aristotle,[12] a virtue is a condition of excellence (the mean) that exists

between two defects (vices): excess and deficiency. The virtue of courage, for instance, can be corrupted by either the vice of rashness (excess) or cowardice (deficiency). Courageous warriors neither charge nor flee at the first sign of an impending battle.

Aristotle's teaching on the virtues applies to the formation and practice of vocations. Exchange is preferable for promoting material well-being. Requisite exchanges occur predominantly in markets where people obtain the goods and services, capital, and employment they require. Efficiently satisfying these needs gives individuals the wherewithal to participate more fully in communicative associations. The instrumental vocations oriented to exchange thereby support the vocations oriented to communication. Practically, communicative associations thrive when their members have ready access to free markets.

Markets can become excessive or deficient. Exchange is excessive when perceived as the dominant or exclusive way that people interact, that is, that every form of human association entails swapping and little else is of any value. Such a perception distorts communicative associations into marketplaces. A family, from this perspective, is where spouses, parents, and offspring barter to satisfy their respective affective needs. Such distortion also drives a corresponding transposition of vocational priorities, reversing the instrumentality of multiple and overlapping vocations. One's calling to be a banker becomes overriding, taking time and attention away from being a spouse or parent. Communicative associations and vocations are bent into serving exchange. The Scripture (cf. Deut. 8:3) is twisted into the aphorism that we live by bread alone, and the more the better.

Exchange is deficient when access to commercial, financial, and employment markets is restricted or prohibited. People suffer material deprivation. Unreliable access may result from a lack of applicable skills, inadequate infrastructure, shortages of goods and services, inflated prices, monopolies, insufficient regulations, or governmentally imposed restrictions. Under these circumstances, markets fail to match effectively supply and demand for goods and services, capital, and employment. Moreover, when exchange opportunities are degraded, vocational initiative is weakened, adversely affecting dependent communicative associations. To borrow from Scripture again, communication is a reminder that we do not live by bread alone, but do not know that until we have more than enough bread to eat.

Coercion can also prove excessive or deficient. The state is excessive when it asserts extensive control over the daily lives of its citizens. In such a state, communicative associations are regarded at best as superfluous, and at worst seditious, distracting individuals from giving the state their full devotion. The state displaces the communicative sphere by providing an array of services, effectively

requiring people to rely on government rather than one another in meeting their respective needs. This shift has an acidic effect on the vocations grounded in the communicative sphere. Parents, for example, are rendered incompetent to raise their children, tasks being subsequently divided among medical, educational, and social service agencies.[13] The state effectively becomes the parent of all children within its jurisdiction.[14] The expansion of the coercive sphere does not promote human flourishing, because it imposes an ineffectual means of communicating the basic goods that help people thrive. The state fails, as Luther recognized, when it tries to be a shepherd rather than a competent executioner.[15]

The coercive power of the state is deficient when it fails to protect people so they may conduct their affairs safely. Humans flourish when they exchange and communicate with relative ease and trust.[16] When the state fails to protect that condition, citizens suffer. Insufficient regulations may prompt the production and consumption of unsafe goods or fraudulent services. Policing and law enforcement must deter or punish the perpetrators of theft and violent crime. The state must also assist individuals in acquiring the necessary skills to participate in competitive markets. People cannot flourish if they are precluded from pursuing the multiple vocations enabling their flourishing. An individual cannot be a banker and a parent without the requisite skills and opportunities to pursue her vocations. To return to Luther's imagery, the state is not a shepherd, but that does not mean it should do nothing to protect flocks from menacing wolves.

With these extremes in mind, we can better examine the golden mean of markets and states. Ideally, markets should be free and focused. By "free," markets should be open to all comers possessing the vocational initiative and attendant skills enabling them to compete. Markets are not like clubs where admission is controlled by members posing as cronies and monopolies. By "focused," markets need to be regulated in ways that maintain their instrumental value.

Concomitantly, the state should be limited and focused. This limitation is not one of size but function. State actions are predicated on coercion. This is not menacing if the state is constrained by its instrumental value to safeguard people pursuing their interests in the spheres of exchange and communication. The state should only intrude to the minimum extent required to achieve its purpose justly. Consequently, the state should use its power to maximize the freedom of people to participate in markets and communicative associations.

These threadbare accounts of markets and states hinge on their instrumental function of promoting freedom best achieved through market accessibility and governmental restraint by limiting the function of the coercive sphere. This creates a space in which individuals may exercise their vocational initiatives in

the spheres of exchange and communication. This multifaceted promotion of vocational initiative enacts freedom and the flourishing it emboldens.

Freedom is effective only if people are permitted to fail. To be free entails risk, which involves the possibility of failing. In exercising our freedom, we may choose badly, suffer bad luck, or events may work against us. There are only two ways to have "risk free" freedom. We can be protected from making bad choices by relying on experts to make them for us. Presumably our lives are better off when directed by those who know better. Or we can be insured against wrong choices, bad luck, or capricious events by extensive safety nets.

Attempting to eliminate risk eviscerates freedom by exchanging it for a purported security. Invariably this security is underwritten by the coercive power of the state through an expanding array of intrusive regulations, surveillance, and mandates. I am not objecting to consulting experts or purchasing insurance policies, but there is a difference between making prudential judgments and evading risk altogether. In practicing prudence, risk is assessed for its potential benefits rather than its avoidance, because avoiding risk may diminish rather than enhance human flourishing. We are again dealing with a mean to counter the vices caused by deficiency or excess. To meekly follow expertise is to inspire the vice of trepidation, while compensating any and all loss promotes the vice of recklessness through moral hazard. The more the consequences of risk are eliminated, the more freedom is diminished. The risk of failing cannot be eliminated if freedom is to have any substantive content.

More expansively, we cannot love our neighbors unless we are willing to face potential failure. Love and vulnerability cannot be separated. According to C. S. Lewis, "To love at all is to be vulnerable. Love anything, and your heart will certainly be wrung and possibly broken."[17] Only in hell is one safe from love. Within the Christian tradition, love inevitably comprises suffering, because to love another person is to privilege freedom over control. Humans are social creatures, drawn to one another, and in the ensuing bonds of neighbor love, humans flourish. But these bonds are fragile, requiring mutual care and attentiveness. Over time these may fray and unravel, unleashing pain and heartbreak, yet in consenting to this risk we find our freedom. It is in communicating the promise and peril of love that humans flourish, and the opposing corollary is the more we prefer the ostensible security of a risk-free haven, the more our flourishing is stunted and love suppressed.

Challenges

The following is a brief, suggestive description of the crisis at hand and a few proposed remedies: Our present crisis is *not* the pandemic, but the reactions to it in the private and public sectors that were, at best, mixed. This is a useful clarification to keep in mind, for human mischief is easier to correct in comparison to mutating viruses with voracious appetites for new hosts. We can learn to live with COVID-19, but we will suffer more if we allow the damage inflicted by bungled reactions to fester.

The erosion of neighbor love is most troubling. Most neighbors, especially strangers, were regarded as sources of contagion best avoided, and numerous policies and executive orders ensconced this wariness. For a time, the state forbid congregation for entertainment, conventions, weddings, and worship.[18] Reminders were ubiquitous to practice (un)social distancing, to stay away from each other. At its most extreme it meant—at least for those who could—working remotely, online schooling, and confining shopping to the internet. Venues of exchange were reduced to screens and deliveries. On those rare occasions when one was forced to leave home, masks were a must-have article of clothing. For months what remained of the public square was populated by faceless beings.

The lockdown was the principal weapon for fighting the viral invasion, continued sequestration the best way to avoid contagion. For our security, we became a society of safe havens linked together by information and communication technologies. We needed to hunker down for a while, maybe a long while. I do not know if the motivation originated in good intentions, hubris, ignorance, or narrow expertise, but it is all nonsense. A society communicating shared goods cannot be comprised of bunker dwellers. Mingling is required.

It is surprising how quickly and completely people turned to the coercive power of the state as their source of safety against the pandemic. Governments determined which businesses and workers were essential; stipulated what medical services were on offer; people were ordered to shelter in place and told when, where, why, and for how long they could wander from home; vaccines and testing were mandated, and in some jurisdictions, proof was required to hold a job or enter certain businesses. To compensate for the disruption, governments borrowed staggering sums of money and distributed it either directly to taxpayers or indirectly through assorted agencies. In response to COVID-19, the state grew dramatically, running roughshod over basic rights and freedoms.

Was this expansion by the coercive sphere successful or justified? It is impossible to answer this question precisely. It would go too far to write off the state's efforts as an unqualified failure. Perhaps some lives were saved, healthcare

facilities prevented from being overwhelmed, and individuals spared illness and suffering. Perhaps the coercive power of the state was needed to keep the pandemic manageable.

It would also go too far to claim that the state's response has been an unqualified success. Even if government has orchestrated some modest victories, the ensuing economic, social, and political costs are exorbitant. The economy does not inspire confidence given supply chain worries, inflation, shuttered businesses, and labor shortages. The authority of medicine is in tatters given its politicization, confusion, and lack of candor and accountability. People have grown weary of government with its petty jurisdictional infighting, contradictory policies, inefficient procedures, and preposterous rhetoric promising much and delivering little. More broadly, the social and intellectual development of children has been impeded; mental health problems are on the rise; and individuals withdraw more deeply into "safe" enclaves sequestered from a threatening public domain. All is not right.

What should be done? The proper balance among the spheres of exchange, coercion, and communication needs to be restored. The state has intruded too widely and deeply into markets and communicative associations. Using Luther's imagery, the state has become an overbearing and inept shepherd. In response to the pandemic, market efficiency has diminished in matching supply and demand in respect to goods and services, labor, and finance. The state derails markets when it determines winners and losers in the business sectors, unleashes torrents of money, and incentivizes unemployment. Additionally, goods cannot be communicated unless people associate in physical proximity. Despite the assurances of Silicon Valley, IT is an inadequate substitute, as exemplified by the dismal records of online education and worship. To be fair, governments needed to respond to the pandemic to protect public health. Failing to act would have been worse. But the ease to which the ordering of daily life was transferred to the coercive sphere is troubling. People jettisoned confidence in themselves and their neighbors, entrusting their lives to ambitious politicians, nameless bureaucrats, and unaccountable experts.

Reaffirming vocational initiative is a first step in realigning the balance among the three spheres. In the sphere of exchange, for example, individuals need access to markets rather than protection from their disruption. People should be free to produce and consume, encouraged to work, start businesses, take risks. Communities cannot thrive when their Main Streets are shuttered. This pandemic has demonstrated the value of political modesty. The proper tasks of government are limited. The fretful and often feckless responses to the pandemic illustrate that the state is ideally adept at safeguarding the integrity of markets

but inept at managing them. The same principle applies to the communicative sphere. Individuals should be free to exercise their vocations in conjunction with free associations. When the state attempts to regulate, impede, or prohibit free association, it diminishes the potential flourishing of citizens. Vocational initiative requires government to trust rather than distrust individuals pursuing multiple vocations.

Vocational initiative discloses neighbor love as the platform on which it operates. Obeying the second commandment to “love your neighbor as yourself” (Lev. 19:18; Matt. 22:39; Mark 12:31) is essential to restoring the balance among the three spheres. Practically, this love means freedom, especially the freedom to associate. For the sake of public health people are isolated from one another. As an emergency response it was perhaps justified, but if the trajectory continues it is worrisome. Over time it creates a vocational void. Relying on the state is a dangerous way to fill the void. As Hannah Arendt insists, quarantining individuals from one another is a favored tool of aspiring tyrants.[19] I am not claiming that the state’s response to the pandemic was tyrannical, but neither was it an affirmation of freedom.

For people to be free to pursue their multiple vocations, free to love their neighbors, then they must also be free to fail. Playing it safe is the denial of love. Loving one’s neighbor requires mutuality and vulnerability that may lead to disappointment and suffering. Making risk avoidance a paramount goal treats most neighbors with indifference, mistrust, or hostility, rejecting *philoxenia* (“hospitality”) in favor of xenophobia. Thus, the state’s response to the pandemic was misleading. Lockdowns and mandates were justified by the promise of eradicating the virus, but there was no mention that this required retreating into bunkers. Risky sociality was jettisoned for secure autonomy, diminishing human flourishing by reducing the range of exchange and communication.[20]

If human flourishing is derived from economic, social, and political ordering, then individuals need to be coaxed out of their bunkers to interact more freely with, and serve the needs of, their neighbors. Consequently, COVID-19 should be treated as endemic so the coercive sphere may recede, allowing the spheres of exchange and communication to function more freely and effectively. The coercive power of the state should not be a tool of political shepherding, but deployed prudently in support of people exercising their rights. In short, faithfully loving one’s neighbors requires maintaining a proper balance among the spheres of exchange, coercion, and communication, and in joyfully and obediently taking the risk of love, we are made free.

Notes

1. See Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1981), 25–27.
2. See Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982), 2.2.5.
3. See Martin Luther, *The Freedom of a Christian*, in *Luther's Works*, vol. 31: *Career of the Reformer* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1957), 365–68.
4. Luther, *Freedom of a Christian*, 344.
5. In partial payment of my intellectual debt, my depiction of these three spheres has been informed by the work of Johannes Althusius, *Politica* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1995); Herman Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture: Pagan, Secular, and Christian Options* (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979); Oliver O'Donovan, *The Ways of Judgment: The Bampton Lectures, 2003* (Grand Rapids; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2005); idem, *Entering into Rest: Ethics as Theology*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017).
6. There are admittedly involuntary aspects to these associations. For example, we usually do not choose to be associated with our parents or siblings. My point is that communicative associations are not formed to participate in market transactions or created by governmental dictate.
7. For a more expansive account of this differentiation, see Brent Waters, *Just Capitalism: A Christian Ethic of Economic Globalization* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), chaps. 6–8.
8. See Iris Murdoch, *The Sovereignty of Good* (London; New York: Routledge, 2001); H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Responsible Self: An Essay in Christian Moral Philosophy* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999).
9. "Market disruption" is, I believe, a sanitized version of Schumpeter's "creative destruction." See Joseph A. Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (New York; London: Harper Perennial, 2008), chap. 7. Furthermore, I think that market disruption ultimately benefits society at the macro level over the long term, and I have argued elsewhere that creative destruction is not unrelated to the work of the Holy Spirit. See Waters, *Just Capitalism*, chap. 3. But I recognize that the destruction wrought by market disruption is for some anything but creative.
10. This aspiration does not preclude the necessity for prohibiting certain actions that imperil the safety and security of a civil order. What constitutes such grave peril is, of course, contentious.

11. For a more expansive account of the priority of the mundane, see Brent Waters, *Common Callings and Ordinary Virtues: Ethics for Everyday Life* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2022).
12. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 2.
13. See Christopher Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged* (New York and London: Norton, 1995).
14. See, e.g., Bertrand Russell, *Marriage and Morals* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1929), esp. chap. 15.
15. See Martin Luther, *Temporal Authority*, in *Luther's Works*, vol. 45: The Christian in Society 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1999).
16. See Francis Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (New York; London: Free Press, 1995).
17. C. S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (New York; London: Harcourt Brace, 1988), 121.
18. Except for political rallies and protests supporting approved causes.
19. See Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (San Diego: Harvest Book, 1968). See also F. A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).
20. To clarify, risk is not license to act recklessly, nor should the misfortune of neighbors be ignored or disregarded. Neighbors taking risks and failing does not preclude charitable responses from both the public and private sector. Charity is also a hallmark of neighbor love. My point is to ground neighbor love—especially in response to neighbors in great need—in vocational pursuits rather than pawning it off and distorting it as a political entitlement.