
his review of White. Rather, he confines himself to an evaluation of White's historical claims.

One further example of questionable argument will have to suffice. In "Beyond Equilibrium Economics," Boettke, Horowitz, and Prychitko suggest that equilibrium analysis is highly questionable. But much of their argument against equilibrium consists simply of the repeated declaration that the concept is a "mechanical metaphor" (p. 65). Rather than rigorous argument, they offer slogans. I suppose then that one must at least give them credit for a consistent approach to both philosophy and economics.

Not all the articles in this book are bad. Quite the contrary, several raise issues eminently worth pursuing. But the meritorious pieces (which I shall not single out for mention) are in bad company. Boettke, Horowitz, and Prychitko state about the market process group, "No one is denying objective reality or truth" (p. 71, n. 1). As the Duke of Wellington once said, if you can believe that, you can believe anything. ♦

**Subscription: \$16 for
four issues.**

Big Money, Small Thinkers

**"WHY INTELLECTUAL
CONSERVATISM DIED"**

Michael Lind

Dissent, Winter, 1995, pp. 42-47

Michael Lind maintains that intellectual conservatism collapsed over the past decade. Before the collapse, the two main varieties of mainstream conservatism "from the founding of *National Review* in 1955 to the disastrous Houston Convention of 1992" were "Buckley-style fusionism" and neoconservatism, the former mainly Catholic and the latter Jewish (p. 43). William Buckley and his allies "effectively wiped out the major rival for the leadership of conservative white Protestant Americans" through a campaign against the John Birch Society (p. 43).

Alas, Protestant fundamentalists did not accept tutelage from those whom Lind deems their intellectual betters. With the onset of the Christian Coalition in 1988, the "institutions and the leaders of the older Catholic and Jewish conservatives suddenly became superfluous" (p. 43). In response, the

intellectual Right surrendered. Its members have sold out to the fundamentalists, abandoning the path of reason. Instead they act as “image consultants for Protestant fundamentalists” (p. 44). Standards have been abandoned, as intellectuals such as William Bennett and William Kristol become “middlemen between the uncouth fire-and-brimstone Protestant evangelicals and the world of serious journalism, policy, and scholarship” (p. 44).

Lind’s analysis contains much of value, but the biased terms in which he encases it need to be pared away. Lind is clearly on target when he notes that the *National Review* crowd and neoconservatives no longer dominate the Right. But why is this a mark of intellectual decline? Lind obviously holds certain views in contempt; only a “pointy-head” would dare to criticize Darwin, for instance.

But the intellectual stature of a group ought not to be rated by whether its opinions meet with Lind’s approval. The academic credentials of the paleos easily outweigh those of the neos. Nor

The uniformity of opinion Lind notices hovers around a right-tinged social democratic outlook.

is the rightwing movement confined to Protestant fundamentalists. And Pat Robertson hardly seems the central figure Lind makes him out to be.

If one ignores Lind’s value-loaded descriptions, a striking point emerges. He has correctly

seen that most American conservatives are fed up with the leadership that has been foisted on them. “The complaint of ‘paleo-conservatives’ that their movement was being taken over by opportunistic (and in many cases weird) foreigners was not completely without foundation” (p. 47).

Lind also notes another vital point. “One by one, every leading conservative publication or think-tank over the past decades has come to depend on money from a few foundations—Olin, Smith-Richardson, Bradley, Scaife” (p. 46). Lind errs in thinking that these foundations have promoted a movement *toward* the so-called far right. The uniformity of opinion Lind notices hovers around a right-tinged social democratic outlook, a view far less principled than mainstream conservatism of the 1950s. ♦

David Gordon, who writes the *Mises Review*, is a senior fellow at the Ludwig von Mises Institute. He was educated at UCLA, where he earned his PhD in intellectual history, and is the author of *Resurrecting Marx: The Analytical Marxist on Exploitation, Freedom, and Justice*; *The Philosophical Foundations of Austrian Economics*; and *Critics of Marx*. He is also co-editor of H.B. Acorn's *Morals of Markets and Other Essays* and a contributor to such journals as *Analysis*, the *International Philosophic Quarterly*, the *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, and the *Review of Austrian Economics*.

----- ✂ ----- PLEASE PRINT ----- ✂ -----

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

Phone _____

I enclose a check for \$_____ (\$16 for 4 issues) or please charge my credit card: ☐ Visa ☐ MasterCard ☐ Discover

Card No.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Signature: _____ Exp.: Mo/Yr

--	--

--	--

Ludwig von Mises Institute, Auburn, Alabama 36849-5301
(334) 844-2500; fax (334) 844-2583; lvmises@mail.auburn.edu

THE MISES REVIEW
Ludwig von Mises Institute.
Auburn, Alabama 36849-5301

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Ludwig von Mises Institute