

**Chapter 1 : The Social Affairs Unit - Publications List: Neoconservatism: Why We Need It**

*Neoconservatism: Why We Need It is a book by Douglas Murray, in which the author argues that neoconservatism offers a coherent platform from which to tackle.*

Neoconservatism NeoCon is short for NeoConservative, one of a group of largely Jewish pater merchants pushing a particular philosophy which is totally Zionist. They have been highly influential and run the White House in all but name. George Bush is the President of America and their puppet. How they control him is one question. How they influence America is another. A stranglehold on the media is a large part of it. Infiltration of higher education is another. Politicians are controlled by money. They need lots of it to run their election campaigns. He who pays the piper calls the tune and the tune is Zionist, the tune of Israeli supremacism. Neoconservatism was in the news in a big way when the Neocons were pushing for war. They wanted America to invade Iraq. They had their way. It meant controlling George Bush, the president. They had to have Congress and the Senate in hand too. It meant bribery, blackmail, lies about Saddam Hussein, about Weapons of mass destruction. What it took was what it got. They killed thousands of Americans, many thousands of Iraqis, destroyed billions, cost trillions. So we should ask what, who, why, how. The Wikipedia is seriously misleading in its write up, but then it is one of the players, a propaganda machine with an axe to grind. This makes it that much more important to find out, to know. Various perpetrators are named at Neocons They are evil. Neoconservatism ex Wiki QUOTE Neoconservatism is a variant of the political ideology of conservatism which combines features of traditional conservatism with political individualism and a qualified endorsement of free markets. Dionne, [9] The term neoconservative, which originally was used by a socialist to criticize the politics of Social Democrats, USA, [10] has since been used as a criticism against proponents of American modern liberalism who had "moved to the right". Bush, [12] [13] with particular focus on a perceived neoconservative influence on American foreign policy, as part of the Bush Doctrine. Bush Wikinews has related news: Vanity Fair editor Craig Unger on the Bush family feud, neoconservatives and the Christian right The Bush campaign and the early Bush administration did not exhibit strong support for neoconservative principles. As a presidential candidate, Bush had argued for a restrained foreign policy, stating his opposition to the idea of nation-building [47] and an early foreign policy confrontation with China was handled without the vociferousness suggested by some neoconservatives. Bush laid out his vision of the future in his State of the Union speech in January, following the September 11, attacks. The speech named Iraq, Iran, and North Korea as states that "constitute an axis of evil" and "pose a grave and growing danger". Bush suggested the possibility of preemptive war: I will not stand by, as peril draws closer and closer. Our Next Chapter wrote: I believe it was the triumph of the so-called neo-conservative ideology, as well as Bush administration arrogance and incompetence that took America into this war of choice. They obviously made a convincing case to a president with very limited national security and foreign policy experience, who keenly felt the burden of leading the nation in the wake of the deadliest terrorist attack ever on American soil. The United States will, if necessary, act preemptively. We have to go out and stop the terrorists overseas. We have to play the role of the global policeman. But I also argue that we ought to go further. John McCain, who was the Republican candidate for the United States Presidential election, supported continuing the Iraq War, "the issue that is most clearly identified with the neoconservatives". The New York Times further reported that his foreign policy views combined elements of neoconservative and the main competing view in conservative circles, pragmatism, also called realism: He gave the impression he would reverse such policies. Yet by, U.

Chapter 2 : Neoconservatism : why we need it | Search Results | IUCAT

*Neoconservatism: Why We Need It and millions of other books are available for Amazon Kindle. Learn more Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App.*

The book has been described as "a vigorous defence of the most controversial political philosophy of our age", [1] while Christopher Hitchens called it "a very cool but devastating analysis". Please help improve the article by editing it to take facts from excessively quoted material and rewrite them as sourced original prose. Consider transferring direct quotations to Wikiquote. It is a deeply rooted and relevant philosophy which only seems to be out of kilter with modern thought because there is so little modern thought. In Melanie Phillips Why this person? February This article contains too many or too-lengthy quotations for an encyclopedic entry. February This article needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. February Script error This article uses material from the Wikipedia article Neoconservatism: Why We Need It" The book revived a largely favourable reception in the media. In his final chapter, Murray sets out what a British, neoconservative landscape would look like, including slashed taxes, elite universities and an end to dealings with the European Courts or European Conventions on Human Rights. In his native England, the debate that Americans have been having about "the war on terrorism" is in many ways conducted in reverse. A good bit of the Left, whether pro-Blair or otherwise, is strongly in favor of removing the Taliban and Saddam Hussein and relying on both military and moral force to do so. While on the Right, a significant part of the old Establishment has given vent to long-buried anti-American instincts, and even blames Blair for attracting or motivating Islamist killers. This tension offers a huge opportunity for anyone who is capable of thinking for himself. Of course, the most flagrant offenders against morality and common sense are still the nihilistic pseudo-leftists, who claim to see no real difference between Western democracy and those who desire to murder its voters at random. Murray selects a fairly renowned academic literary theorist named Terry Eagleton, who wrote that there was no real difference between suicide bombers and those who leaped to their death in flames from the upper floors of the World Trade Center. Neither group, you see, had any real "choice". First, what lessons from the neoconservative critique of social engineering at home can be applied to the program for promoting liberty and democracy abroad? And second, what steps can be taken to minimize the tensions involved in seeking to conserve liberal democracy, a doctrine and way of life whose guiding principleâ€”individual freedomâ€”constantly struggles against the constraints of tradition, custom, and authority?

*Neococonservatism has ratings and 17 reviews. Jim said: I have never written a review on this site before, but I was moved to do so in this instance be.*

Jan 31, Chad rated it liked it British pundit Douglas Murray first caught my eye as someone with a very bright future when the international debate over the impact and fate of political Islam and secularism was gaining steam. The discussion was mismatched from the beginning, alth British pundit Douglas Murray first caught my eye as someone with a very bright future when the international debate over the impact and fate of political Islam and secularism was gaining steam. The discussion was mismatched from the beginning, although the man arguing in the affirmative “ British commentator Maajid Nawaz “ has since developed as an audible, civilized voice for a tolerant and pluralistic vision of Islam. But there is a majestic moment in the debate, right around the 1: By saying a small minority of fanatics were holding the vast majority of Muslim believers hostages to fear in Pakistan, they Nawaz and partner themselves were condemning Islam as something non-peaceful. The performance prompted me to keep at least one eye on Murray as he appeared on TV and published various articles. I rarely found anything to disagree with in what he said or wrote. Eventually, last week, I decided to shell out for a Kindle copy of his book, Neoconservatism: I was in for a shock. What would happen if a president of the United States said to us tomorrow: Human beings have fought ever since the beginning of time, and human beings as we know them will not cease fighting. I will give you a world in which we will try to avoid war; if we get into war, we will try to limit the war; and if we get deeply into war, we will try to win the war. But I can not promise you a world without war. Yet, everything that is said in that imaginary speech is true. Not only is it true, it is the only truth to be said about war in this world. The very notion of a world without war is fantastic. The lion shall lie down with the lamb, but not until the Second Coming. And Murray definitely wants a fight. The ghastly regime of Saddam Hussein was destabilizing the Middle East, and the tyrant had provided sanctuary to people like Abu Nidal and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who infamously made videotaped beheadings of innocent hostages popular among the Islamist haters of the West. Toppling it seemed an obvious solution to many, and clearly Murray was among them. There has been a lot of fatuous nonsense about how the situation today is in every way worse than before. At the same time, nothing of the scale of has occurred, whether or not toppling Saddam Hussein can be credited. I remember sitting in the International Relations Committee room of the House of Representatives on Capitol Hill when hearings were taking place to decide whether to approve the Iraq War Resolution in October and experiencing severe anxiety about what the intervention which was sure to drag out over several years would do to American society. This genuinely alarmed me, as I thought it was all moving far too quickly. I got very angry about it. It was a hunch, albeit inescapable, that America would rapidly become an unpleasant place as a result of the new war policy, designed to commit the country to indefinite conflict precisely because we would never be able to prove that the non-state enemy “ al-Qaeda “ had been destroyed. In , the opponents of war lost, Murray won. Everyone loves a winner. Again, I lost; Murray won. The rest is history. Needless to say, Buchanan also opposed the war. Lindbergh did not view the Third Reich as a global threat and thus a threat to the United States and in fact had stated that if forced to choose between Communism and Nazism taking over Europe, he would opt for Nazism. He was awarded a very prestigious medal in the name of Adolf Hitler on visiting Nazi Germany to marvel at its industry. It is as difficult to argue with Buchanan about US foreign policy as it would be to take on Douglas Murray in a televised debate about the social effects of Islamism. Bush before Congress in late was really analogous. Has he been proven wrong? And it has to be said that, at least as a writer, Buchanan is at the moment better than Murray, whose treatise is jarring and disturbing in tone, so much that one has to take a break from reading - often. If only such a domestic policy could be combined with Blairist interventionism, thinks Murray, Britain would be truly golden. I doubt that very much indeed. There is no question Murray is sound on domestic social issues. He exhibits no illusions or inconsistencies in his view of the way things would be if only Britain would stop feeling ashamed of itself and educating a generation of people to hate their own country. Britain is not only a great country but also a great civilization to which

America owes its existence. The only question is: Yet neocon elder Norman Podhoretz, former editor of *Commentary*, has come on board, as have other neocons of note. But Trump so far seems to represent a new anti-interventionism, and British Prime Minister Theresa May made a point during her recent visit to the US that both her country and America had an incentive to resist being dragged into costly foreign wars. How does Murray feel about that in light of his book? Maybe he will develop his own strand of neoconservatism in the Trump era, as he diverges from the likes of Kristol and Frum. Finally, Murray was very sensible about Brexit, and was in fact one of the leading lights on the Leave side. I suppose that, just as Murray has seen fit to cherry-pick from Blairism and conservatism in forming his own brand of neoconservatism, I and other conservatives should feel at liberty to cherry-pick from neoconservatism in deciding on the right course for America, Britain and other countries we hold in high regard.

Chapter 4 : ConservativeHome's Books blog: Neoconservatism: why we need it

*Neoconservatism: Why We Need It* is a book written by Douglas Murray. The book's main aim is to describe how neoconservatism offers a coherent platform from which to tackle genocide, dictatorships and human rights abuses in the modern world.

And as that gleeful cry arose, *deja vu* returned. Such allegations of decline are one of the constants that neoconservatives live by. In *Foreign Policy* magazine the conservative writer Jay Winik wrote: Some neocons even eulogised themselves. It was "a generational phenomenon", suggested Irving Kristol in *Neoconservatism* is not what people think it is. It is not a party or a group. Many people popularly seen as neocons - Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld - are no such thing. Most neoconservatives reject the term. But the fundamental beliefs of what is called "neoconservatism" are important, and are held by many who have never read Plato or Leo Strauss. They include scorn for relativism, disdain for anti-democratic movements, and the belief that freedom in the state, from the state, is the prerequisite for individual happiness. As an instinct or tendency rather than a manifesto, neoconservatism is both idealist and realist. Now, it is being alleged, this much-misrepresented instinct is foundering on the rock of Iraq. Not only is this untrue - it is the fate of the rock that is at stake. The liberation of Iraq was supported, but not run, by neocons. These did not originate because we "kicked the door in" in That door had been kicked in for years. Many UN resolutions had condemned Saddam Hussein. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was already there. Nevertheless, once we climbed over the kicked-in door we were accused of killing hundreds of thousands of people. But we should at least look at who is really doing the killing. Even the activist *Lancet* has acknowledged that the vast majority of deaths in Iraq have been caused not by our military, but by "unknowns" and "others" - what those of us less keen on euphemism call terrorists, fundamentalists, sadists and fascists. For a conservative realist, the presence of all those jihadists in one place, with thousands of our troops there too, presents an opportunity to cut the number of terrorists a bit. This is where the enemies of neoconservatism veer from the kooky into the wicked. They actually want the neocons to fail more than they want Iraq to succeed. If Iraq fails it will be Iraq that suffers. Neoconservatism will survive the bad wishes. *Why We Need It*.

**Chapter 5 : Neoconservatism: Why We Need it: calendrierdelascience.com: Douglas Murray: Books**

*Neoconservatism: Why We Need It is a book written by Douglas calendrierdelascience.com book's main aim is to describe how neoconservatism offers a coherent platform from which to tackle genocide, dictatorships and human rights abuses in the modern world.*

Use the buttons below to change the style and font size of our site. Screen version Print version: A Biography of Lord Alfred Douglas - was published to critical acclaim. Why We Need It. Today he addressed a lunch at the Manhattan Institute in New York on the subject of his forthcoming book. On the last day I was here, I visited a friend at her office on the top-most floors of the World Trade Center and looked out in awe over this great city. The assault on those towers proved the first in a now long line of attacks leveled against the free world. From Bali to Istanbul, from Madrid to my home city of London, the last four years have woken the West to a monumental threat to us and our future. At least they woke some of us up. Because we have a two-pronged problem here. One prong obviously enough to my mind is the creed of Islamic fascism - a malignant fundamentalism, woken from the dark ages to assault us here and now. Thankfully we have, in Britain and America, professional and highly-trained armies who can wage a war which has so far, in Iraq and Afghanistan, lost us not a single face-to face exchange with the enemy. And it has made a calculation. What it knows is that if it is to win, it will win not on the field of battle, but on the field of ideas, within our cities, inside our culture. And this is our problem. The thought has gone so bad that in vast swathes of the West, in much of Europe, and to a lesser though growing extent in this country, there are people who are losing us this war. They are the product of a uniquely destructive strand of Western thought: In his homily to the College of Cardinals before being elected Pope, Cardinal Ratzinger fingered this rot at the core of western thought when he identified what he termed the "dictatorship of relativism", a theory and a mode of thought which as he said: The West is now swamped by this notion. In our domestic politics it is epitomised by the nightmares of moral equivalence and political correctness. It is also of course at the root of the barren and - as thinkers as diverse as Fukuyama and Huntington have put it - innately anti-Western creed of multiculturalism. The good cannot be equated or judged equal to the bad, nor should the sublime be leveled alongside, or tarred by, the ridiculous. Because of course if everything is equal then everything is right: I said earlier that much of this bad thought is committed and permitted by perfectly pleasant people. The impetus to follow relativistic arguments is perfectly understandable. In Europe we are afraid that to note difference is to make moral judgement, and Europeans are still wary enough of their recent past to fear the consequences of asserting any moral or cultural right. America too suffers this creeping distrust of natural right, and the elevation of nihilistic philosophies into permissible and comparable moral choices. So what people do when they accumulate this mode of thought, is to think that they are doing the good, being nice, or tending toward the generous. We know, I trust, where this element leads. It leads, that is, to a tolerance of totalitarianism, and benevolence towards the malignant. Which if we faced no external threat, might not be a problem. But it is a problem because we now face a profound and targeted threat to our way of life. Defeat in Iraq or anywhere else is impossible if we have the will. And the number of people who will help that come about is striking. Nor is the worst problem the demagogic and fascistic Galloway-like figures who always prop up dictators and save their venom for democracies. In other words, our central problem comes from those whose good instincts are ridden over and used against them by people who wish them monumental ill. For in both domestic and foreign policy, neoconservatism centres on natural right, moral clarity and the defense of - and exporting of - what is good in our culture. Neoconservatives have been famously described by their godfather, Irving Kristol, as: I would say therefore, that though we are classically liberal-minded, we look at the world through realist spectacles, seeing the world as it is, but all the time acting in the world to fashion it as we would like it to be. The ideal neoconservative moments are therefore those moments when our moral desires coincide with our realpolitik needs. Which is of course what makes Iraq the perfect neoconservative cause: Europe is hostile to a degree beyond description not only to American foreign policy, but to any remotely conservative ideals. But tangible ideals, ideals which require more than verbal support - such as security, democracy or freedom. Europe has

used up its peace dividend. It also has security issues, not least those associated with its unameliorated populations and its increasingly inefficient armies. And then there are the democratic issues centered around the European Union which, in spite of the populace, every European government supports which is dedicated to keeping decisions from the people, removing the tiresome populace from the complexities of governance. In Britain we have a conservative party which seems incapable of standing up for conservatism, and a left-wing party of government which pretends to be conservative even whilst systematically undermining every imaginable conservative cause. At home the people of Britain and Europe need freeing from their restrictive and ever-increasing tax-burden. The idea of the inevitable rise of taxes in Europe is that the government knows best how to spend your money. In my opinion, government is almost uniquely bad at this task, and I for one would rather hand my money to a child with attention deficit disorder than a European government with good intentions. The benefits system which costs us so much requires a degree in bureaucracy from the poor who are actually in need of its benefits, whilst people who desire or deserve no boon are given hand-outs from the state which they paid for in the first-place, and which have been returned to them only in the most diminishing of senses. As I see it, there are two opposing stands which exist in our culture with fundamentally opposing visions of the human spirit. Our instincts as an electorate are suppressed by ruling elites who distrust what the voice of the people might say if ever asked something. On the other hand are those of us who believe that the human story and the human heart dictate their own eternally messy and divergent course and need guidance in this course. We recognize that we are less than kings, yet more than conquerors, and that the call of our time, as much as it was for our forefathers, is to allow others both here and abroad to begin treading the same ever-imperfect path. Freedom without security certainly makes tyranny and demagoguery appealing. This has always been the case. Neoconservatism at least favours the placing of our imperfect natures onto the right track. And this project which is only partially underway is not an experiment, and certainly not a frivolous experiment. We believe that the human spirit is called to freedom like a magnet drawn towards its home. Our culture is being assailed at the very point at which it is expressing itself at its weakest. It is the job of neoconservatives to fight new and perhaps even more bitter culture wars than those which they have fought before. But with knowledge of what we have behind us, we will not lose. The people who will lose this war are those who think the West should be defended not on the good, but on the crass - on cultural waste, and nihilistic detritus. MTV and rap music" - then we should not expect to have our message listened to. Our message should be listened to because what we have to offer to our own people in the West and to those on other shores is a message of liberation. As such, our message should be adapted and expressed with greater confidence and forcefulness than it has so far been. For we must accept and express the fact that democracy is the means by which the soul is freed, but only the beginning of the means by which the soul can be fulfilled. In Britain and Europe, our political position is at such a low ebb that the only way is up. In America you have, I believe for the first time in political philosophy, shown the way to the continent from which you hail. They say that prophets are not recognised in their own land. That may be true to an extent with neoconservatives in America, though I guess they can deal with that. Douglas Murray is a bestselling author and freelance journalist. His book - Neoconservatism:

*In addition to explaining what neoconservatism is and where it came from, he said that this American-born response to the failed policies of the s is the best approach to foreign affairs not.*

January 1, Jim Hartley I have never written a review on this site before, but I was moved to do so in this instance because this book was utter nonsense. It is an unreflective and uncritical hagiography of neoconservative "luminaries" and an attempt at historical, philosophical, and political commentary by one who either does not know anything about history, philosophy, or political theory, or does but cannot be bothered doing the hard work to properly set out the theoretical underpinning of the position he espouses. T I have never written a review on this site before, but I was moved to do so in this instance because this book was utter nonsense. The argument never rises above nationalist populism and demagoguery that assumes the correctness of its own position. Its trick is in the first 10 or so pages of the introduction, wherein Murray defines "liberals" as being the same thing as "socialists", which in turn is the same thing as "left-wingers," which is the same thing as "people who like big government. Mr Murray then proceeds to ignore the subject of the size of government until the fourth chapter of his book the perturbingly totalitarian "Neoconservatism for America. Therein, he utters banalities completely devoid of any argumentative rigour and without theoretical or empirical underpinning e. What is their factual or theoretical underpinning? We are left to wonder. They are simply stated as though they are self-evident truths when, in reality, they are not: Moreover, it is poorly written. Murray has clearly modelled his style on Christopher Hitchens but does not have the knowledge or the talent to express himself as did Hitchens. Where Hitchens at his best is biting, incisive, and witty, Murray is polemical, impotent, and what is worst in my mind , imprecise. Take the following few sentences from pages of the hardback edition: Neoconservatives have absolutely no issue with gay rights. But they would say that gay rights do not include, and do not stretch to, rights that heterosexuals do not possess, or practices that would be criticized in heterosexuals. Is there any credible feminist who argues that sexual equality entails only, or most-importantly, the freedom to "ape male thugs"? What does that even mean? More idiotic is the next passage. I will re-quote Murray, using an ellipsis to illustrate my point: I suspect that he does not mean it, and that this is just poor phrasing on his part. But one cannot know. This kind of imprecision and lack of intellectual and argumentative rigour is rife. Returning to chapters 2 and 3 "Neoconservatism in practice"; "Relativism and the Iraq War", I do not think I am doing Murray a disservice to say that the main thrust of his argument is that moral relativism is a bad thing, responsible for or unresponsive to much of the evil in the world, and that liberals are relativists and neoconservatives are not. There is nothing necessarily "liberal" about relativism, nor is there anything necessarily relativist in liberalism. Further, it is possible to conceive of a relativist conservative. Because of his unwillingness or inability to properly define terms to begin with, Murray is able to construct his argument thus: Even if one accepts the first premise, the second is absolute rot, or is at best -- at very best -- a gross over-simplification. Thus, the conclusion is unsound. Murray is the beneficiary of this kind of linguistic and definitional prestidigitation because he can define "liberalism" and "neo-conservatism" however he wants and still sound at least prima facie credible. On closer scrutiny, he is not credible. This book is not to be taken seriously. I will note in passing only that the alliance between neo-conservatism and neo-liberal Freidmanite economics is completely glossed over. If you are a neo-conservative and want to feel good about yourself without really engaging your mind, read this book. If you are neo-conservative and want something a bit more rigorous, save yourself the uncritical middleman and read Leo Strauss instead. If you want a more serious treatment of ne0-conservatism from a critical perspective, read Claus Offe, "Democracy against the Welfare State: Structural Foundations of Neoconservative Political Opportunities," 15 4 Political Theory , and that will point you in the right direction. In sum, this book is not worth the time or the money. January 1, Chad British pundit Douglas Murray first caught my eye as someone with a very bright future when the international debate over the impact and fate of political Islam and secularism was gaining steam. The discussion was mismatched from the beginning, alth British pundit Douglas Murray first caught my eye as someone with a very bright future when the international debate over

the impact and fate of political Islam and secularism was gaining steam. The discussion was mismatched from the beginning, although the man arguing in the affirmative “ British commentator Maajid Nawaz ” has since developed as an audible, civilized voice for a tolerant and pluralistic vision of Islam. But there is a majestic moment in the debate, right around the 1: By saying a small minority of fanatics were holding the vast majority of Muslim believers hostages to fear in Pakistan, they Nawaz and partner themselves were condemning Islam as something non-peaceful. The performance prompted me to keep at least one eye on Murray as he appeared on TV and published various articles. I rarely found anything to disagree with in what he said or wrote. Eventually, last week, I decided to shell out for a Kindle copy of his book, *Neoconservatism*: I was in for a shock. What would happen if a president of the United States said to us tomorrow: Human beings have fought ever since the beginning of time, and human beings as we know them will not cease fighting. I will give you a world in which we will try to avoid war; if we get into war, we will try to limit the war; and if we get deeply into war, we will try to win the war. But I can not promise you a world without war. Yet, everything that is said in that imaginary speech is true. Not only is it true, it is the only truth to be said about war in this world. The very notion of a world without war is fantastic. The lion shall lie down with the lamb, but not until the Second Coming. And Murray definitely wants a fight. The ghastly regime of Saddam Hussein was destabilizing the Middle East, and the tyrant had provided sanctuary to people like Abu Nidal and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who infamously made videotaped beheadings of innocent hostages popular among the Islamist haters of the West. Toppling it seemed an obvious solution to many, and clearly Murray was among them. There has been a lot of fatuous nonsense about how the situation today is in every way worse than before. At the same time, nothing of the scale of has occurred, whether or not toppling Saddam Hussein can be credited. I remember sitting in the International Relations Committee room of the House of Representatives on Capitol Hill when hearings were taking place to decide whether to approve the Iraq War Resolution in October and experiencing severe anxiety about what the intervention which was sure to drag out over several years would do to American society. This genuinely alarmed me, as I thought it was all moving far too quickly. I got very angry about it. It was a hunch, albeit inescapable, that America would rapidly become an unpleasant place as a result of the new war policy, designed to commit the country to indefinite conflict precisely because we would never be able to prove that the non-state enemy “ al-Qaeda ” had been destroyed. In , the opponents of war lost, Murray won. Everyone loves a winner. Again, I lost; Murray won. The rest is history. Needless to say, Buchanan also opposed the war. Lindbergh did not view the Third Reich as a global threat and thus a threat to the United States and in fact had stated that if forced to choose between Communism and Nazism taking over Europe, he would opt for Nazism. He was awarded a very prestigious medal in the name of Adolf Hitler on visiting Nazi Germany to marvel at its industry. It is as difficult to argue with Buchanan about US foreign policy as it would be to take on Douglas Murray in a televised debate about the social effects of Islamism. Bush before Congress in late was really analogous. Has he been proven wrong? And it has to be said that, at least as a writer, Buchanan is at the moment better than Murray, whose treatise is jarring and disturbing in tone, so much that one has to take a break from reading - often. If only such a domestic policy could be combined with Blairist interventionism, thinks Murray, Britain would be truly golden. I doubt that very much indeed. There is no question Murray is sound on domestic social issues. He exhibits no illusions or inconsistencies in his view of the way things would be if only Britain would stop feeling ashamed of itself and educating a generation of people to hate their own country. Britain is not only a great country but also a great civilization to which America owes its existence. The only question is: Yet neocon elder Norman Podhoretz, former editor of *Commentary*, has come on board, as have other neocons of note. But Trump so far seems to represent a new anti-interventionism, and British Prime Minister Theresa May made a point during her recent visit to the US that both her country and America had an incentive to resist being dragged into costly foreign wars. How does Murray feel about that in light of his book? Maybe he will develop his own strand of neoconservatism in the Trump era, as he diverges from the likes of Kristol and Frum. Finally, Murray was very sensible about Brexit, and was in fact one of the leading lights on the Leave side. I suppose that, just as Murray has seen fit to cherry-pick from Blairism and conservatism in forming his own brand of neoconservatism, I and other conservatives should feel at liberty to cherry-pick from neoconservatism in

deciding on the right course for America, Britain and other countries we hold in high regard. January 1, Arvind 3. For an Indian like me, it was difficult to understand the context despite having a decent knowledge of world affairs. Freedom-of-speech, blasphemy, secularism r deeply embedded in India since ancient times in most of Indians today too and r universal values not Western ones. All values r not equal; they r merely equally proposable, debatable and rejectable. January 1, Justin Dell Conservatism has been a rear-guard reaction since ; neoconservatism is an attempt to take the revolutionary dynamism away from the political Left. Indeed, few would really like to return to the era of child labour, mass ill Conservatism has been a rear-guard reaction since ; neoconservatism is an attempt to take the revolutionary dynamism away from the political Left. Indeed, few would really like to return to the era of child labour, mass illiteracy or racial segregation, to name but a few of the social ailments that accompanied the decades conservatives look back upon with wistful gazes. Neoconservatives, with a careful awareness of the problems that have beset the past and have thankfully been overcome, are also eager to retain or recapture the strengths of the years gone by, which they see as imperative for the endurance of progress and the perpetuation of Western Civilization. Liberals, on the other hand, in their unquestioning belief that change is always desirable, inevitable, and results in improvement over what comes before it, risk undoing the progress of Western Civilization as their wonton progressivism threatens to subvert the very institutions that made progress possible in the first place. Among those institutions liberal progressivism threatens to destroy are the European peoples themselves, the family, Christianity and intellectual freedom, not to mention others. Perhaps the biggest threat to liberty and democracy represented by liberalism today is the mental malaise of relativism.

**Chapter 7 : Neoconservatism: Why We Need It | Revolv**

*Neoconservatism. Why We Need It. By Douglas Murray. Neo Conservatism: Why We Need It is a defense of the most controversial political philosophy of our era. Douglas.*

And, yet, here we have one of the rising stars of British conservatism offering a whole book to propose precisely such a product. But what is neo-conservatism and in what way does it differ from the traditional conservative world view that has dominated British politics for much of the past years? The blurring of the distinction between Right and Left, however, has not been entirely positive. For, it has also promoted a moral relativism, itself a child of multiculturalism, in which the very notions of good and evil are frowned upon as medieval relics. Murray believes that good and evil do exist as distinct categories and could be readily identified by anyone in possession of a system of values. Thus the principal task of politics becomes the identification of good and evil as a prelude to the promotion of the former and the combating of the latter. Neo-conservatism, far from being a conspiracy by extremist right-wingers who wish to conquer and reshape the world, is a political vision based on a hierarchy of values. It was in gestation long before George W Bush entered the White House in and, as Murray asserts, will be a key player in the international politics long after he has retired. Murray starts with an exciting survey of the works of the key thinkers who initiated the neo-conservative school in the second half of the last century. We then meet Allan Bloom who first warned against the dangers of relativism in which the worst despotic systems are assigned the same respect as the most advanced democracies- all in the name of multiculturalism. Next we meet Irving Kristol who, perhaps more than anyone else, was responsible for turning neo-conservatism from a philosophical approach into a practical political programme. As might be expected Murray is a passionate defender of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. But one thing would be certain: Murray shows that neo-conservatism does not limit itself to issues of foreign policy. In domestic politics, neo-conservatism seeks a return to the fundamental principles of capitalism, the only system in history that has produced long-lasting wealth, both individual and collective, in scores of culturally diverse societies. Murray asks why has neo-conservatism aroused so much anger and hatred around the world? Some of that anger and hatred has come from despotic rulers and their hangers-on who feel targeted by the idea of regime change. They blame the early neo-conservatives under President Ronald Reagan for policies that made it impossible for the USSR to continue its existence at any level. The vast majority of those who oppose neo-conservatism, however, are liberals in the West who sincerely believe that it is no business of the Western powers to save other nations from their despotic rulers. These liberals argue that different nations have different cultures that are all equally worthy of respect. And since the West has no means of knowing whether or not the people of, say Burma, really wish to be freed from their military regime there is no moral justification for regime change. Murray says that as far as foreign policy is concerned it is the Labour party in Britain that has adopted much of the neo-conservative world outlook. It is inconceivable that the Labour party would adopt neoconservative principles on domestic policy, such as lower taxation, reduced state interference and more successful social justice measures. But he warns that opponents of neo-conservative ideas will continue to fight against it for as long as they can.

**Chapter 8 : Neoconservatism: Why We Need It eBook: Douglas Murray: calendrierdelascience.com: Kindle**

*pdf download fileneoconservatism: why we need it by douglas murrayneoconservatism why we need it download pdf fileneoconservatism why we need it - calendrierdelascience.comconservatism why we need it - [pdf] neoconservatism: why we need it popular online.*

**Chapter 9 : Neoconservatism: Why We Need It - Douglas Murray - Google Books**

*Douglas Murray talked about his book Neoconservatism: Why We Need It, published by Encounter calendrierdelascience.comh commentator Murray talked about the movement that replaced Great-Society liberalism.*