

The Rothbard-Rockwell Report

TRIPLE R

A DEATH BLOW TO FEMINISM

Michael Levin

Occasionally the very publication of a book, its critical reception, and the attendant fuss signal an event of larger cultural significance. *The Bell Curve* was the last such phenomenon, and now we have our next one: *The Rules*, by Ellen Fein and Sherrie Schneider.

In case you haven't heard of it (or read it over lunch; it is that short), *The Rules* is a manual addressed to women on how to make a man propose. And not just propose, but find her "a creature like no other" who will remain devoted always. Nor is it a one-sided Baedeker for women wishing to acquire an eager slave; its instructions are meant to insure long-run happiness for both husband and wife.

As self-help books go *The Rules* is a good one, with a depth of psychological insight belied by its breezy, advice-column style. However, what has made it a literary event, a mini-milestone, is its implicit yet thorough repudiation of feminism. It says the feminists were wrong about everything concerning men and women—and this means everything—while grandma was right. And this revanchist work is selling like hot cakes.

The catchy format of *The Rules* is a list of 35 highly specific do's and don'ts about female behavior in a variety of dating and mating situations. For instance. Rule #12 tells "the Rules girl" to "Stop Dating Him if He Doesn't Buy You a Romantic Gift for Your Birthday or Valentine's Day." This sounds manipulative, but the quite sound idea here is that if a man loves a woman, he thinks with "his heart, not his head."

The basic message of the book, though, is that women must play hard to get, or, as they used to say before feminists censorship made all truthful jesting about romance taboo, "the man chases the woman until she catches him." Let him telephone you, don't talk too long on the telephone, end the conversation first, never accept a date for Saturday after Wednesday, don't tell a man your secret thoughts until you've known him a while, never initiate an approach to a man. Thus *The Rules*: Always leave 'em hungry for more.

The authors base this advice on frank recognition of what critics of feminism have been urging for decades: there are biological differences between the sexes that extend to the psyche. "We trust in the

natural order of things," Fein and Schneider write, "namely that man pursues woman." The man must take the lead. If you refuse to accept that men and women are different romantically, you will behave like men and drive them away." They are emphatic about the importance of this asymmetry for sex (of which more anon): "Biologically, the man must pursue the woman. If you bring up sex all the time, you will emasculate him." Instead, the *Rules* girl flirts; "this will turn him into a tiger."

Fein and Schneider often allude to what is "meant to happen," advising that if nothing happens between a man and a *Rules*-following woman, "it wasn't supposed to happen." They are not talking about Kismet, but the biological script for successful mating. Love occurs a certain way between the sexes (he pursues her until...), so if it doesn't happen that way, if she cannot induce him to pursue her, it is not going to happen at all. Really, this is just what women instinctively knew until feminists talked them out of it.

continued on page 5

INSIDE

Intelligence Briefing.....	2
Where the Right Goes Wrong.....	7
HANS-HERMANN HOPPE	
Hoppe and the Freeman.....	14
PAUL GOTTFRIED	

INTELLIGENCE BRIEFING

◆ **Inside the Pornway:** John Stagliano, owner of "Evil Angel Video," is "the nation's leading director of hard-core videos." Stagliano also "performs" in his pornographic films and is "a major contributor to the Cato Institute, a well-known think tank in Washington, D.C., where he regularly discusses policy issues with its economists" (*U.S. News and World Report*, Feb. 10, 1997).

◆ **Did Stagliano dream up Cato's Social Security "privatization"?** It requires a 20 percent tax increase and \$7.5 trillion in new government borrowing. Or maybe it was his idea to spend \$30 billion per annum on federal private-school subsidies for the "poor." Query: Does anyone know how the porn industry fared under the Cato-promoted Nafta and Gatt?

◆ **Will central banks dump gold?** In Adrian Day's view (*Investment Analyst*, Feb. 1997), central banks are terrified of a world without any gold as a backup. Could confidence be maintained? The "stage is set for a powerful up move" in gold "when the negative factors," real or imagined, "run out of steam." His best gold-stock buys: Newmont and Euro Nevada. His top-quality juniors: Eldorado, Miramar, Bema Gold, Trillion, and Pangea Goldfields. He is selling all global mutual funds.

◆ **James Grant sees any gold-selling by central banks as bullish**

(Grant's, Jan. 17, 1997). He theorizes that when dollar demand is as sky-high as it is today, it has no where to go but down, and investors will have nowhere to go but commodities when the Fed overreacts. "We happen now to be very bullish on gold, first and foremost because the situation is so evidently hopeless." So tight are credit spreads, so devout is faith in central bankers, and so low are interest rates that "something could upset the equilibrium." The "gold market is priced for the ideal outcome."

◆ **Lord Rees-Mogg predicts a stock-market crash,** probably this autumn (*Strategic Investment*, Jan. 21, 1997). "I expect the fall in the panic stage, if that occurs, to be not less than 20%, and perhaps as high as 40%, or between 1,300 and 2,600 off the Dow-Jones."

◆ **Ron Paul was blackballed by a foreign government.** He had been assured of appointment to the foreign affairs committee by the Republican leadership, since it is not considered a plum assignment (too few opportunities for legal graft). But within an hour of his faxing his official request to Newt, foreign lobbyists were swarming the Capitol's corridors to block him. It seems they were threatened by a man who stands for the foreign-policy principles of the framers, and is therefore anti-foreign aid, anti-foreign meddling, and anti-foreign war.

◆ **Were blacks involved in the slave trade?** Of course, but Americans will

be protected from that unpalatable truth. Britain's Sir Peter Hall is making a tv program on the African slave trade, and an American network had promised to help finance it. There was only one condition: "none of the slave traders was to be black" (*Spectator*, Jan. 11, 1997). But, said Hall, "black slave barons sold other blacks to the white merchants." He told the American television executive that the black slave trader must remain black. The U.S. executive said, no dollars then."

◆ **Do we have to read the *National Enquirer* to find out the truth?** The national media may prate about "journalistic ethics," which are in the same laugh-category as "Congressional ethics," but the *Enquirer* actually informs us. For example, the Feb. 11, 1997, issue tells us that LA police think Ennis Cosby was gunned down by a drug dealer. If that's true, it was no random killing "by a white man," in one of the few racial identifications of a criminal you've ever heard. The police are also calling his white girlfriend, who may have witnessed the murder, "unreliable," meaning they think she's lying

◆ **Death and taxes:** last year, Russian tax protesters killed 26 agents, wounded 74, kidnapped six, and burned down the houses of 41, according to the Itar-Tass news agency (Jan. 27, 1997). Also, they blew up 18 tax offices with bombs.

◆ **"Clinton had an affair with my wife,"** says former Clinton partner

in crime Jim McDougal. That's why Susan McDougal refuses to talk about her crooked business dealings with the prez (London Times, Feb. 11, 1997).

◆ **A peek into the heart of power:** among the materials Newt turned over to the ethics committee were large drawings he made as speech illustrations. In them, he portrayed himself as a glowing sun god, surrounded by staff, Congress, special interest groups, the media, and—furthest out—the people. In one handwritten statement of his “primary mission,” Gingrich refers to himself as the “definer” of “civilization,” the “arouser of those who form civilization,” and the “teacher of the rules of civilization” (Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1997).

◆ **Ron Paul is “so strict” in opposing redistribution,** reports Roll Call, that he refused to “allow his five children to accept federal student loans for college or medical school,” and he wouldn't “accept Medicare or Medicaid payments” in his medical practice.

◆ **Did the CIA ship drugs into Miami?** Sure, says the U.S. attorney in that city, who is prosecuting the former head of a CIA-funded “anti-drug” agency in Venezuela. General Ramon Guillen is charged with smuggling 22 tons of cocaine into the U.S. from 1981-1991. U.S. officials say that “one—maybe two—of these shipments, totaling more than a ton, were approved by the CIA as part of a ‘sting’ operation,” but not the rest (London Times, Jan. 16, 1997).

◆ **Shameless is one word that comes to mind when describing Jack Kemp.** This self-aggrandizing,

welfare-promoting, illegal-immigrant-loving, self-righteous political failure is now testing the waters for 2000. He's enlisted liberal consultant John Sears, and is putting together a PAC to loot anybody stupid enough to give him any money. True conservatives are appalled by the prospect of President Kemp. But if neocons need any shoring up against him, let them never forget—and never forgive—his praise of Louis Farrakhan.

◆ **Will Clinton start a war?** “It's hard,” he told the New York Times (Feb. 11, 1997), “when you're not threatened by a foreign enemy to whip people up to a fever pitch of common, intense, sustained, disciplined endeavor.” And there we have the great ambition of the modern presidency in a nutshell. Keep people hysterical. Make them cling to you out of fear.

◆ **On the other hand,** who's got the better plan for education, Bill Clinton or the supposed libertarian writer Charles Murray? Clinton wants to spend \$51 billion over the next five years. Murray wants to spend \$150 billion (\$150 billion!) this year and every year after, and such other sums as may be necessary, to nationalize the private-school industry in the service of the central state and its clients. See pages pp. 37, 90, 97, etc. of *What It Means To Be a Libertarian: A Personal Interpretation*.

◆ **What's the evidence for the idea that the framers wanted a “citizen legislature”?** There is nothing wrong, and everything right, with some men specializing in statesmanship, as Charley Reese has pointed out in another context (on why certain third parties won't ever go anywhere). The framers were statesmen for liberty.

They didn't live off the taxpayers, of course, but men like Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and George Mason were no amateurs.

◆ **The voucher movement is becoming even more openly pro-welfare.** According to black nationalist leader Polly Williams, the grand dame of educational welfare, “This program is about black parents and other low-income parents having the right to choose the kind of education they want for their children and not being penalized for having no money.”

◆ **Janet Reno and the Justice Department have sworn to destroy the states rights movement.** Congratulations to the Individual Rights Foundation in Los Angeles, which is suing the feds over this conspiracy to violate the right of citizens to organize politically. The foundation has unearthed the notes of a meeting between a U.S. attorney and officials from the so-called Justice Department in which they vowed to “stop the states' rights movement.” This, say the notes, “has been made a priority issue for the U.S. Attorney's Office as well as the Department of Justice” (Washington Times, Oct. 17, 1997).

◆ **Nothing is more maddening** for a customer than having to put up with employees speaking a foreign language in your presence. It's quite possibly the rudest act imaginable outside of threatening physical violence. But now, it turns out, the courts and the federal government have made it impossible to fire someone for this, much less to impose English-only rules. This would create a “hostile environment,” which violates civil rights laws (WSJ, Jan. 23, 1997).

◆ **Americans have an “obsession” with conspiracy theories, according to the *New York Times*** (Dec. 31, 1996). “Many people, for example, bought former ABC correspondent Pierre Salinger’s claim that a Navy missile blew up TWA Flight 800.” Other crazy views from average Americans: that Vince Foster was murdered, that a world government is coming, and that the CIA sells drugs. Of course, the *Times* notes, “in the Soviet bloc, you had to be crazy *not* to be paranoid about a Government whose officials published election results in advance and lied about the weather.” We know *our* government would never, for example, dream up scary weather stories like global warming to accumulate more money and power.

◆ **The civil rights reign of terror** has been stepped up, with the number of federal class-action lawsuits doubling in the last four years. The reason: George Bush’s 1991 amendment to the Civil Rights Act, which increases the payoff and makes discrimination easier to prove. Not a quota bill, right George? After the outrageous Texaco fiasco, pending class action cases still include Home Depot, Publix Super Markets, Glorious Foods, Motel 6, Dun & Bradstreet, and Smith Barney. The chief legal culprit is the Oakland law firm of Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller—the killer-firm that brought down Shoney’s and Denny’s.

◆ **The last page of the *Weekly Standard* features a political parody** of some sort, sometimes funny, sometimes not. This time (Feb. 17, 1997) the ad next to the parody was the funniest of all. “Give the Children Hope,” read the headline above photographs of black and Hispanic kids. The “Christian Coalition’s Samaritan

Project is a bold and compassionate plan to combat poverty and restore hope.” And how? Among other big ideas, “We call for vigorous enforcement of existing civil rights laws.” Well, that should make the liberals love the Christian Coalition. *Not*.

◆ **Get ready for Ralph Reed’s further lurch to the left** with the Congress on Racial Justice and Reconciliation, a much-hyped meeting on May 3 in Baltimore, modeled on the Promise Keepers cult. Reed will demand that the federal government step up welfare spending to rescue “at-risk” youth and federal education vouchers for the poor to attend the private school you scrimp and save to send your children to in order to avoid excessive exposure to “at-risk” youth. “For too long,” says Reed, “our movement” has been primarily “white,” with its “center of gravity in the cloistered safety of the suburbs” (*Washington Times*, Jan. 31, 1997). Right: and Ralph should lead the way by moving to Harlem.

◆ **The feds will lose the Oklahoma bombing case**, they are strongly hinting via the big media (*NYT*, Jan. 31, 1997). If you know something about the way the FBI infiltrates political movements, you’ve long suspected that the government’s fingerprints were somewhere on this operation. But that’s not why it will lose the case. The big excuse is that the FBI handled the evidence poorly. The man who supervised evidence collection is known to have changed dictated evidence reports to make them seem to support the government’s and the prosecutor’s version of events. In short, Timothy McVeigh will be let off on a technicality so that the government can avoid a deeper investigation into its infiltration

practices and its habit of goading dissenters into breaking the law.

◆ **You have to read English papers to find out the truth on the Oklahoma case.** “The only conclusion one can draw,” says Ambrose Evans-Pritchard in the *Sunday Telegraph* (Feb. 2, 1997), “is that the Justice Department is protecting a federal informant who had penetrated the bombing conspiracy—probably [Andreas] Strassmeir, but possibly also [Michael] Brescia—and is trying to cover up a bungled sting. McVeigh’s defense lawyer, Stephen Jones, says that the American people will never be able to think of their government in the same way once they learn the full truth about the Oklahoma bombing.”

◆ **One of the many crimes of the Republican Party** in the 104th Congress was to authorize a pilot program in which the IRS contracts out to private law firms to do its dirty work. The echoes are of 18th-century-style tax farming, the catalyst for the French revolution. But it gets worse. Faced with ever-falling audit rates and constantly failing computers, the IRS has floated the idea of contracting out the entire paper-return processing system. The new Congress likes the idea because it is sure to bring in more revenue. The major resistance comes from the IRS employees themselves, who fear they will be displaced. Who would have thought it: IRS civil servants and the *Triple R* on the same side of an issue.

◆ **We’re “Fighting Back!” against abuse**, says the solicitation from *Free Inquiry*, the hate-filled quarterly of the Council for Secular Humanism. They offer a new report to “turn the tide for free-thinking individuals who

are tired of the abuses and indignities hurled at them." And what are these abuses? People who say "God Bless You, When You Sneeze" or ask you, "Did You Have a Merry Christmas?" Also: "Invitations to Weddings and Other Functions That Include Religious Ceremonies"; "The Dinner Host Who Suggests Saying Grace"; and, inevitably, when "You or a Loved One Are Physically Blocked from Entering an Abortion Clinic."

◆ Ron Paul has the right ideas, and the right photos (*Insight*, Feb. 10, 1997): "A visit to his office makes it clear that Paul does not plan to be a quiet congressman. On his wall are framed pictures of libertarian economic theorists Ludwig von Mises, Murray Rothbard, and Henry Hazlitt. His staff's shelves are lined with libertarian classics including Rothbard's *For a New Liberty*."

◆ Whatever happened to courageous governors who would say no to the federal leviathan? Good news: Alabama Governor Fob James, Jr., called a press conference after a federal judge—in a typical ACLU-driven usurpation—claimed that the Ten Commandments on an Alabama courthouse wall is illegal according to the first amendment. James said he would call up the National Guard before he would allow the commandments to be censored.

◆ Check out Ron Paul's Congressional Web-site: www.house.gov/paul/mainpage.htm. [RRR]



↪ **A DEATH BLOW TO FEMINISM**
continued from page 1

On sex *The Rules* is audaciously retrograde. "Forget all the 'free love' theories from the swinging sixties," Fein and Schneider declare. Rule #22 runs "Don't Live with a Man" and #15 runs "Don't Rush Into Sex."

Actually, they are uncharacteristically equivocal about premarital sex, saying "We [*Rules*] girls wait until we're sure," without precisely specifying of what. I suspect they would have liked to turn the clock back even farther—no sex until marriage is decided on—but thought that the zeitgeist can be flouted only up to a point. In any case their reasons for advising marriage-minded women to say no are psychologically sound. "Why risk having him call you easy (and think of you that way) when he's talking to his buddies in the locker room the next day?" Men are happy to have sex with easy women, but they don't fall in love with them.

Remember the feminist complaint that men divide women into whores and Madonnas? Well, men do think that way, and the path of wisdom recommended by *The Rules* is that women act accordingly (as, in fact, they always have).

This being 1997, one can expect to hear of men who lived happily ever after with women they slept with on the first date, of husbands unconcerned about and accepting of their wives' promiscuous pasts, and similar improving tales of liberation. I am skeptical (as Fein and Schneider are), although as far as I know no social scientist has dared

to examine the question. Here is a topic for some doctoral candidate in sociology.

The Rules knows it is scandalizing conventional (i.e., feminist) wisdom. "It's your girlfriends that will probably give you the hardest time," Fein and Schneider write. "Don't be surprised if they take your devotion to *The Rules* as anti-feminist." Their suggestion? "Just smile and change the subject." They might well have counterattacked, asking feminists to put up or shut up, and it is instructive to ask what advice feminists have for marriage-minded women. What sort of book would they have written?

One guesses that the main theme of a feminist *Anti-Rules* would be that women should not want to get married in the first place. Remember "A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle," Gloria Steinem's chief contribution to human wisdom?

A more sane feminist might allow under duress that most women, having internalized their oppression, do want to marry, but she will then angrily ask "What about the exceptions?" At this point we must gently remind her that we are not talking about the exceptions, but rather rules that work for the typical.

We might further caution her that taking the deviant as the norm is the tell-tale mark that gives liberal public policy such an evil name. Construction codes designed around accommodating cripples; school budgets that spend more per capita on the retarded than other students; and, most recently, air pollution standards geared to sufferers of respiratory

Remember the feminist complaint that men divide women into whores and Madonnas? Well, men do think that way.

disorders: surely marriage manuals for lesbians are equally grotesque.

Assuming she is still with us, the feminist will insist that, if we must have courtship and marriage, they should be a partnership between equals, with the women just as entitled as the man to seek her interests and demand her rights. The first feminist commandment, after all, is that There Shall Be No Double Standards.¹ This is what *The Rules* say is a big mistake.

Even if a woman is interested in a man, they say, she must have the discipline (the word they use) to let him approach her. "He might be flattered that you [sought him out] and he might even want to have sex with you that night, but he won't be crazy about you." Why? "You made it too easy." Men love a challenge, they say over and over. In fact, by making yourself a supreme challenge to a man, he will value you always because he put too much of his energy into getting you. (Incidentally, although Fein and Schneider seem unaware of it, this agrees with what evolutionary biologists call "parental investment theory.")

The Rules is particularly adamant about women not pressing equality in the bedroom: "Please wait a good amount of time before you begin holding lengthy seminars about your needs during sex or after sex. Don't be a drill sergeant. Being with you in bed should not be difficult or demanding." Many a weary male veteran of the wars of sexual

¹Except When Gender Quotas Are Needed to Make Up For Eons of Discrimination.

liberation remembers such seminars, always with a wince of pain.

The feminist response to the success of *The Rules* interests me as a professional logician, since I am intrigued by what people say when faced with a definitive refutation of their views. So far as I can tell, feminists have not denied the contention that men, while perfectly happy to have sex with liberated women eager to be their equals, fall in love with elusive women who let them take the initiative. Rather, unconsciously parodying Groucho Marx's line about not wanting to join any club that would have him as a member, feminists are saying that no right-minded woman would want a man they can catch with *The Rules*, or want to be the sort of women who catches him.

**The
feminist
response
to the
success of
The Rules
interests me
as a
professional
logician.**

Cynthia Heimel, whose vulgar nastiness passes for feminist wit, got right to the point in *The Village Voice* (an ultra-p.c. New York weekly that reliably anticipates the platform of the Democratic party). "It is true that this book will instruct you clearly and succinctly in how to get a guy," she writes, "And you will be wildly

successful at getting this guy. But it is also true that this guy will be stupid and boring."

She goes on to suggest that women would be better advised to read books on dog training because "Men, and I'm just guessing here, are at least as complicated as dogs." The accompanying illustration shows an unshaven, stupid-looking doofus with a double chin. Incidentally, could any publication express a comparable sentiment about women or blacks without being investigated for harassment by the Justice Department?

Tamara Jenkins, an "independent film maker," goes farther: women who live by the *Rules* are not actually alive. She draws some parallels between *The Rules* and the goings-on in Alfred Hitchcock's old thriller *Vertigo*, comparing the *Rules* girl to the seductive Kim Novak character, who once pretended to fall to her death and ends up actually doing so as paramour Jimmy Stewart looks on. "Sure I have my lonely moments," la Jenkins intones in triumph, "but I'd rather be a live woman's woman than a man's dead woman."

And yet, and yet... "I'm a woman over 30 living in Manhattan and I'm as single as a dollar bill. And now having read the thing, I'm depressed. Uneasy. *The Rules* have gotten under my skin like ringworm.

Dean of the Austrian School of economics, founder of modern libertarianism, and restorer of the Old Right, Murray N. Rothbard (1926-1995) was a one-man army of liberty. *The Triple R* is inspired by his spirit, and dedicated to his vision.



As my biological clock ticks my tough-mindedness softens." The woods—the city streets—are full of Tamara Jenkins, bright, accomplished, independent feminist-women. God help anybody or any institution that shows them insufficient deference. But nature, uninterested in such foibles as "sexual equality," knows only one test of the wisdom of a way of life, and that is successful reproduction. What do the young feminists I knew thirty years ago, now in their fifties and for the most part barren, think of how their lives turned out? Dare I say I told you so?

The Rules is far from perfect. Like many self-help treatises it confuses what is good when it happens with what can be pressured to happen by human will. The magic of attraction between men and women has to occur, and cannot be forced. But if anything is certain it is that aggressive, mannish women send men running for the exits. Feminism has failed nature's test, and *The Rules* has called its bluff. *The Rules* knows this, and feminists know *The Rules* knows this. That is why the literati are sputtering, and why it is a

Triple R (ISSN 1080-4420) is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Periodicals Postage paid at Burlingame, CA, and additional mailing offices. Postmasters: Send address changes to *Triple R*, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. Editor: Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. Contributing Editors: David Gordon, Paul Gottfried, Hans-Hermann Hoppe, Michael Levin, Justin Raimondo, and Jeffrey Tucker. Publisher: Burton S. Blumert. Managing Editor: Sybil Regan. Subscription: \$49 for 12 issues. Single issue: \$5. Copyright © 1997 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

significant step on the long road back towards sanity. **RRR**

WHERE THE RIGHT GOES WRONG

Hans-Hermann Hoppe

The American right is generally divided into three camps: the global hawks, the traditionalists, and the libertarians. Let's set aside the global hawks as hopeless allies of the imperial world state who look fondly upon international war and military government. It's not clear why they should be considered on the right at all. That leaves us the traditionalists or traditional conservatives, and the libertarians, who like free markets but most often want to toss out tradition in favor of a social and cultural free-for-all.

There are strong reasons why modern conservatism and modern libertarianism are not suitable ideological vehicles for the restoration of a civilized social order. In effect, if not by design, the conventional ideological taxonomy of the right leaves nowhere for the clear-headed lover of liberty and property, and hater of the welfare-warfare state, to turn. I'll explain why, and offer an alternative.

The Right and Wrong of Conservatism

What distinguishes conservatives from adherents of other political philosophies? Foremost, that they believe in a natural order. That order can be disturbed—by earth-

quakes and disease, by war and tyranny—but it can never be abolished. And no matter what the circumstances, the normal can always be distinguished from the abnormal.

In this tradition, conservatives see households based on private property—in cooperation with a community of other households—as the most fundamental, natural, ancient, and indispensable social units. They also see the household as a model of the social order. As a hierarchical order exists in a family, for example, so it exists within a community of families. Above all, conservatives have wanted to conserve the family and the social hierarchies based on kinship relations and layers of authority.

All of this is a good fit with traditional libertarian doctrine, which views natural order as flowing from natural liberty. But conservatism in our time has been deeply corrupted. It never recovered from the transformation of the U.S. and Europe into mass democracies from World War I onward. Instead of challenging democracy at its very root, it came to terms with it and the global wars the state conducted on its behalf. As a result, conservatism fell back on its pure moral doctrine, stripped of institutional context, and was gradually transformed into a movement in favor of one or another variety of democratic statism.

For example, today's conservatives worry, as they should, about divorce, illegitimacy, loss of parental and spiritual authority, multiculturalism, alternative lifestyles, promiscuity, and crime; all are deviations from the natural order. But the spokesmen for the conservative establishment do not recognize that their goal of restoring normalcy requires drastic anti-statist political and social changes.