



Conservative **Book Club**

## **SPECIAL REPORT**

# **10 BOOKS THAT SCREWED UP THE WORLD**

by Benjamin Wiker

*(Excerpted from Mr. Wiker's book by the same title,  
Regnery Publishing, 2008)*

## INTRODUCTION

Common sense and a little logic tell us that if ideas have consequences, then it follows that bad ideas have bad consequences. And even more obvious, if bad ideas are written down in books, they are far more durable, infecting generation after generation and increasing the world's wretchedness.

I submit, then, that the world would be a demonstrably better place today if the books we're about to discuss had never been written. It was possible half a century ago (and even 25 years ago, among the academic elite) to maintain that Marxism was a positive force in history. But since the protective cover has blown off the Soviet Union—and China's has at least been torn—no one can look at the tens of millions killed and conclude anything other than this: if *The Communist Manifesto* had never been written, a great deal of misery would have been avoided. The same is true of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and the other books on the list, even when the carnage is sometimes of a more subtle and different sort.

What then? Shall we have a book burning? Indeed not! As I learned long ago, the best cure—the only cure, once the really harmful books have multiplied like viruses through endless editions—is to *read* them. Know them forward and backward. Seize each one by its malignant heart and expose it to the light of day. That is just what I propose to do in the following pages.

## #1

**THE MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY****By Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels**

Never have so few pages done so much damage. The damage has for the most part already been accomplished, and Marxism itself (outside China) mainly stirs papers at academic conferences. But communism offered one heck of a lesson. On body count alone, *The Communist Manifesto* could win the award for the most malicious book ever written. Now that we have more accurate calculations of corpses—perhaps upwards of 100,000,000—even the tenured Marxists are a bit squeamish about tooting the *Manifesto* as a horn of plenty.

But as it has obviously failed so miserably, we must ask why it succeeded so magnificently. What is it about Marx's grand vision that inspired his disciples to clamber up the pile of corpses to have a better look?

Marx didn't invent communism, nor was he the only one agitating for revolutionary changes at the midpoint of the nineteenth century. But he was, as Engels himself admitted, a dictator of any organization of which he was a part, and so he put his stamp down hard on the subsequent development of communism in Europe.

Marx's sidekick, Friedrich Engels, who was about two years younger than Marx, wrote the first draft of the *Manifesto*, but Marx put his decisive impress on communism's most famous document. The central ill of the *Manifesto* is its assumption of what came to be called historical materialism, which is linked to Marxism's atheism. Both Marx and Engels were atheists, and atheists don't like bothersome spiritual things. Therefore, they disallow them from existing and count on everything being purely material. That makes things very simple. Simplicity of a sort can be a kind of virtue. But the simplicity of Marxist reductionist materialism is a dreadful vice precisely because it ignores the complexity of the very things it professes to explain: human beings and human history.

Let us begin with its most famous statement: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle." We should be wary of such a generalization if for no other reason than that the existence of different classes in any particular society has a host of complex

causes. The intellectual aspects of culture, for example, seem to have little to do with the existence of, or struggle between, social classes.

This very kind of ideological illogic—some capitalists are womanizers, therefore, all capitalists as capitalists are tending toward the state of absolute womanizing, which represents the entire historical destruction of marriage—drives the engine of Marx’s revolution.

We find this same kind of specious reasoning on every level. Some or many capitalists at this time abuse their laborers, treating them like human machines; therefore, all capitalists (i.e., anyone who owns a business and employs laborers) are irretrievably and irremediably tending toward the state of absolute oppression of laborers, a point where laborers will have nothing to lose but their chains.

What lesson to draw from all this? If Marxism proves anything, other than that the road to savagery is too often paved with gullibility as well as good intentions, it is the Christian doctrine of sin. To put it another way, if you really want to test whether there is an original and indelible fault that warps the human soul and is impossible to erase without divine intervention, then put power into the hands of those who, rejecting the existence of God as well as sin, wish to bring heaven to earth.

## #2

**UTILITARIANISM****By John Stuart Mill**

There are more ways to destroy the human race than reducing it to a pile of smoldering corpses, and John Stuart Mill championed one of the most drab, utilitarianism. Mill did not actually invent utilitarianism. That dubious honor belongs to Jeremy Bentham, a friend of his father's.

Bentham, another atheist, gave the world the notion that morality didn't need God; it needed only a good ledger to balance out pleasures and pains. Morality was merely a matter of calculating the greatest possible happiness for the greatest possible number. If we scratch down far enough in his argument, it becomes apparent that Mill's real belief was not in the principle of utility, but in himself and in his own direction of the moral life of human beings to achieve what he considered the greatest good for the greatest number. In modern politics we call this liberalism: the politicians and bureaucrats in Washington acting in the role of John Stuart Mill telling everyone else what to do. We can also call it playing God.

Playing God as a social reformer of humanity would seem to be a daunting task, unless (being an atheist) you are blissfully unfamiliar with original sin—as Mill clearly was.

The problem is that Mill, being an atheist, did not see how deep evil runs. He believed his declaration of war on merely natural evils was enough to rid the world of all evil. Preventing heart attacks is all well and good, but there is more that ails the human heart. Mill, however, was too short-sighted to see it. He could not envision, for example, the most likely outcome of utilitarianism: that it would lead to a society addicted to ever more intense, barbaric, and self-destructive pleasures, and that its members would be gibbering cowards in the face of even the smallest pains. Nor did he imagine that there might exist souls in a utilitarian society who long for something greater, something more noble, something truly more god-like than spending their days maximizing the physical pleasures of the multitude. Such a soul would soon boil over in contempt and vicious rebellion.

## #3

**THE DESCENT OF MAN****By Charles Darwin**

Reading Charles Darwin's *The Descent of Man* forces one to face an unpleasant truth: that if everything he said in his more famous *Origin of Species* is true, then it quite logically follows that human beings ought to ensure that the fit breed with abandon and that the unfit are weeded out. Attempts to disengage Darwin from the eugenics movement date from a bit after World War II, when Hitler gave a bad name to survival of the fittest as applied to human beings. But it is impossible to distance Darwin from eugenics: it's a straight logical shot from his evolutionary arguments.

Eugenic thinking was not something tacked on to Darwin by thuggish brownshirts in 1930s Germany. Rather, it was and is a direct implication drawn from Darwin's account of evolution, one that Darwin himself drew quite vividly in his *Descent of Man*. Furthermore, in the latter half of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century eugenics was popular not just in Germany but all over Europe and America. It was understood to be a legitimate inference from Darwin, because Darwin himself made the deduction, and so it was written into biology textbooks—even in America.

Darwin believed that morality was neither natural nor God-given, but was itself the result of natural selection. Whatever actions, attitudes, or passions happened to contribute to the survival of an individual or group were naturally selected. The virtue of courage, for example, was naturally selected because in the struggle for existence the cowardly are wiped out right quick and the manly types live on to breed happily with the appreciative maidens.

The same goes for sympathy. Because people who stick together can usually pummel natural loners, the "social instinct" is naturally selected, and the anti-social are cast out of the gene pool. Within the social instinct is a sub-trait, "sympathy." Sympathy makes us feel sad or uncomfortable at someone else's suffering or extermination. That's what keeps us from acting like savages. Somehow, somewhere sympathy contributed more to survival than savagery, and according to the great law of natural selection, "those communities, which

included the greatest number of the most sympathetic members, would [therefore] flourish best and rear the greatest number of offspring.” So it was that sympathy spread, and won out over savagery. That’s what makes it hard for the civilized folk to savagely eliminate the weak, even if natural selection would appear to call for it.

The central feature of Darwin’s *Descent of Man*: the assumption that human beings are just one more animal on the evolutionary spectrum. If we are just one more animal, and so-called “moral” traits are ultimately no more moral than any other evolved traits, then we obviously are not morally distinct from any other animal. Indeed, as Darwin argues in a number of passages, other animals have something like moral traits too, differing in degree, not in kind.

## #4

**BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL****By Friedrich Nietzsche**

The only thing most people know about the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche is that he proclaimed “God is dead.” While many know that Nietzsche said “God is dead,” very, very few know what he meant. It was not a cry of triumph, but of despair uttered against an ever more trivial and dwindling civilization that Nietzsche thought was sapping humanity of all greatness, producing something just barely above the animal: the last man.

But for Nietzsche, the greatest possible crimes are the very things needed to lift humanity out of its increasingly degraded state and into something grand and glorious. That is why he cries out that we—or more accurately, a few brave and singular souls—must go beyond good and evil. Nietzsche’s present-day disciples miss precisely this sharpest of points: to go beyond belief in God is to go beyond good and evil. If one has not gone beyond good and evil, then one has not gone beyond belief in God.

“We should reconsider cruelty and open our eyes,” chides Nietzsche. “Almost everything we call ‘higher culture’ is based on the spiritualization of cruelty, on its becoming more profound: this is my proposition.” Breaking the four-minute mile demanded the superior abilities of Roger Bannister coupled with intense, painful training. Endless hours of excruciating self-denial went into Michelangelo’s adornment of the Sistine Chapel. The glories of the pyramids were made possible by the relentless cruelty of slave labor. Such is the cost of all human greatness. It pays in the coin of pain, and hence greatness itself would be destroyed by maximizing pleasure and comfort and treating pain itself as simply evil. If we keep all this in mind, we can better understand Nietzsche’s *Beyond Good and Evil*. But we cannot get to the raging heart of it if we do not emphasize one thing more, something that has emerged in the above quotations: a deep, aristocratic contempt for mediocrity.

Nietzsche’s view was that the utilitarians made mediocrity into a morality, a mediocrity aimed at the most animal-like, herd-like type of existence, a kind of “slave” morality that cared only for comfort and trivial pleasures and shrank from every harsh demand.



The cure for all this, trumpets Nietzsche, is a return to natural aristocracy. Slave morality calls everything that is noble, harsh, and demanding “evil.” Natural aristocracy, like Darwinian nature itself, is pitiless and cruel in its demand for greatness and its contempt for the slave-like desire for mere physical pleasure and comfort. To keep Europe from its ultimate degeneration we must go beyond the slave distinction between good and evil and replace it with the aristocratic distinction between noble and contemptible, strong and weak.

## #5

**THE STATE AND REVOLUTION****By Vladimir Ilyich Lenin**

Lenin was not a member of the proletariat. He was a privileged aristocrat who received the very best of educations and who never had to earn a living. Like Marx, he was far more interested in abstract theory than flesh-and-blood individuals, and so had very little contact with the working masses he was allegedly carrying to the communist promised land. That, perhaps, is why he had so little difficulty having them shot by the thousands when they balked at boarding the revolutionary express (or merely turned up late for work).

Lenin seemed to savor the notion of violence. There could be no compromise with capitalism or capitalists. The bourgeoisie, the oppressive capitalist class, must be ferociously annihilated by the workers they oppressed, and a new revolutionary government built on the corpses. The revolutionary class is thereby given “the opportunity to crush, to smash to atoms, to wipe off the face of the earth the bourgeois, even the republican bourgeois, state machine, the standing army, the police and bureaucracy,” and then “to substitute for all this a *more* democratic, but still a state machine in the shape of the armed masses of workers who become transformed into a universal people’s militia.” To say it more simply, the revolutionaries must kill the capitalists, seize their property, and set up a “dictatorship of the proletariat.”

This proletarian dictatorship is democratic in this sense only. When the capitalists were in charge they ruled by the majority—the majority of the bourgeoisie, that is. When the proletariat smash the capitalistic form of democracy, they will replace it with the rule of the majority of the proletariat class. But here, majority rule will be absolute rule. The proletarian must iron out every capitalist wrinkle left in the social fabric. Hence, it will be a democratic dictatorship.

G. K. Chesterton once said that communism eliminates the pickpocket by eliminating the pocket. That was far too generous. In Lenin’s view, the man who owns the pants must be shot for having pockets, the pickpocket must be made the executioner, and all those watching the spectacle must be forced to make pocketless pants or else they too will be shot.

Such is communism's brutal insanity. Under Lenin, somewhere between six to eight million people were slaughtered. Under Stalin, who inherited the "efficiently operating machinery for the mass destruction of political and social opponents," twenty to twenty-five million people were killed. This nearly unimaginable butchery, perpetrated upon the very people it claimed to be benefiting, was not merely the result of Lenin's establishment of a dictatorship invested with the power to destroy all opposition. It was also caused by abolishing any qualms of conscience about using any means to achieve a merely political goal, a very Machiavellian idea indeed. (Lenin was a great admirer of Machiavelli.)

## #6

**THE PIVOT OF CIVILIZATION****By Margaret Sanger**

Sanger was a red-hot eugenicist, publishing her great eugenic work, *The Pivot of Civilization*, three years before Adolf Hitler wrote his own eugenic masterpiece, *Mein Kampf*.

*The Pivot of Civilization* addresses “the greatest present menace to civilization”: the “lack of balance between the birth-rate of the ‘unfit’ and the ‘fit,’” a menace precisely because of the “fertility of the feeble-minded, the mentally defective, [and] the poverty-stricken.” Sanger believed that “the most urgent problem of to-day is how to limit and discourage the over-fertility of the mentally and physically defective.” This scourge calls for hard-knuckled action, and indeed “possibly drastic and Spartan methods may be forced upon American society if it continues complacently to encourage the chance and chaotic breeding that has resulted from our stupid, cruel sentimentalism.”

Sanger was obviously a good Darwinian, putting all this together in a nice eugenic package. Instead of focusing on race, however, she (both following and leading other eugenicists of her day) emphasized relative intelligence. That makes the problem of immorality, of evil, very simple. Evil is not caused by sin. There is no such thing as an evil genius. The original sin that causes all our ills, passed from generation to overabundant generation, is low IQ. In order to fix once and for all the nasty ills that have beset every society—but especially societies that allow the feeble-minded to breed indiscriminately—we need only to stop the stupid from breeding.

But lest she be misunderstood, Sanger’s fundamental problem with feeble-mindedness was not that those affected are the cause of every possible evil and crime. The “menace of feeble-mindedness to the race” is that they exist at all.

However many there are, and however difficult it would be to detect them, Sanger felt one thing for certain. The “debauch of sentimentalism,” the “cruelty of charity” that only makes the problem worse must be avoided. Also taboo was the Christian notion of charity based on the sanctity of human life, which sees each human being as made in the image of God. Such

charity “encourages the healthier and more normal sections of the world to shoulder the burden of unthinking and indiscriminate fecundity of others; which brings with it, as I think the reader must agree, a dead weight of human waste. Instead of decreasing and aiming to eliminate the stocks that are most detrimental to the future of the race and the world, it tends to render them to a menacing degree dominant.”

Furthermore, if any problem seems eugenically fixable, then every problem will soon seem eugenically curable. We need not look any further than Sanger to see how sordid this could become. If crime, pauperism, alcoholism, and general feeble-mindedness (however defined) are *thought to be* the result of genetic imperfections, then the eugenist will want to get rid of those genes by getting rid of the gene carriers. All that it takes to construct a devouring eugenic juggernaut is the suspicion that there is some connection between particular genes and particular imperfections. In Sanger’s deranged mind, a low or even moderate IQ was linked inextricably to nearly every social ill. It doesn’t matter that she was wrong, what matters is if enough other people think she’s right, and pseudo-science becomes well-funded public policy.

## #7

**MEIN KAMPF****By Adolf Hitler**

Many people have read books about Adolf Hitler, but all too few have read Hitler's own book, *Mein Kampf* (*My Struggle*), a book written prior to his coming to power while he was in jail for instigating revolution. The danger of only reading about Hitler is that one can easily get an entirely distorted view of him as an evil madman rather than an evil genius. A madman is driven by mania for a very particular idea; a genius is driven by a grand vision, a malignant worldview. This distinction is essential for understanding the apex of Hitler's evil: his apparent mania for exterminating the Jews. We might easily think that Hitler's genocidal ambitions were rooted entirely in his virulent anti-Semitism. But *Mein Kampf* helps to reveal that they were merely one malevolent effect of a far deeper, more profound and pervasive evil.

The Nazi regime murdered not only six million Jews but millions of other "undesirables": enemies of the Reich, from Slavs, Gypsies, and prisoners of war, to the handicapped, retarded, and even mildly "unfit." The Aktion T4 program, the Nazi eugenic plan-in-action, resulted in the state-ordered execution of around 200,000 people who were disabled, retarded, juvenile delinquents, mixed-race children, or even plagued with significant adolescent acne.

Given the epic scale of their inhumanity, we need to remember that the Nazi regime did not purport to do evil. It claimed to be scientific and progressive, to do what hard reason demanded for the ultimate benefit of the human race. The superhuman acts of inhumanity were carried out for the sake of humanity. Shouldn't we be concerned about the overall health of the race? Why shouldn't that be the highest good? Why shouldn't we ruthlessly root out the unfit who are a burden to themselves and others? Isn't it a good thing to seek medical advances, ways to save humanity from suffering?

To grasp the whole horror of Hitler's book, we must resist the temptation to reduce the full measure of his crimes to one repugnant aspect, the destruction of the Jews. Given the ghastliness of the Nazi atrocities against the Jews, such impatience at getting to Hitler's

corrupt heart is understandable. We should, however, read the entire book from cover to cover (or at the very least, Volume I). It will then reveal itself for what it is: a book, a monumentally wicked book of very practical, very insightful advice for rulers whose entire goal is defined by earthly glory, and who are willing to make effectiveness, no matter how ruthless, their first principle.

Great humanitarian goals; ruthless means to achieve them; going against humanity to help humanity. Hitler assures the reader that such means are necessary, because while the upper classes have a “sense of guilt” that they “permitted this tragedy of degradation,” this guilt paralyzes “every effort at making a serious and firm decision to act,” creating people who are “timid and half-hearted.” For the sake of curing the problems that ail society, there can be no half-hearted solutions. Guilt must be put aside: “When the individual is no longer burdened with his own consciousness of blame in this regard, then and only then will he have that inner tranquility and outer force to cut off drastically and ruthlessly all the parasite growth and root out the weeds.”

The Jews could be blamed for nearly every evil: from the humiliating defeat of the Second Reich in World War I and the postwar Bolshevik upheavals to the decadence of the Weimar Republic to the economic crisis of the Great Depression. The only thing to be done was create another Reich, another glorious empire, one in which the Jewish problem, as well as all other social problems, would be solved.

## #8

## THE FUTURE OF AN ILLUSION

By Sigmund Freud

*The Future of an Illusion* is a fundamental attack on religion, dismissing it as mere illusion, foolish wish-fulfillment by infantile minds. Rejecting the idea that religion exists because God exists and that human beings therefore have a natural propensity to worship, Freud believed that he had to give another explanation for religion. But even from an atheist's standpoint, Freud's explanation is bizarre. Freud's theory was that the origin of the religious cult (the origin of *culture*) was the killing and eating of a father by his sons. And why would sons want to murder their father? Because, naturally, they desired to have sex with their mother. In true primitive fashion, they believed that by eating their father they gained his strength and privileges. Nevertheless, they did feel guilt, which at first they repressed, but then expressed through sacred meals that simultaneously commemorated, condemned, and covered up the original gruesome patricidal feast. This sacred meal in turn became the foundation of religion and its moral prohibition of incest and patricide. There it is. Look into our dark past, Freud maintained, and we find in the branches of our family tree incest, patricide, and cannibalism.

Freud's rooting of religion in incest and patricide was a direct attack not only on religion as a whole, but especially on Christianity—both on the Eucharist and perhaps on the idea of the Virgin Mary—with his implication that the most holy sacrament of the Christian Church was a vile recapitulation of patricidal cannibalism fueled by incest.

Freud's originality was his embedding of the Hobbesian view into the discipline of psychology. He claimed that psychological disorders were the result of the unnatural repression of our naturally unholy and anti-social desires, and that some people just couldn't handle the repression: "neurotics ... react to these frustrations with asocial behavior." The irony of Freud's position should be evident: We are naturally asocial; civilization is frustrating; neurotics react to this unnatural frustration by asocial behavior. Therefore, neurotics are the only sane people because they react to unnatural frustration by trying to reclaim their original, natural, asocial and amoral state. The result: the anti-social psychopath who kills without conscience is the most



natural of all. The interesting effect of Freud's proclamation that evil is natural was the seemingly unintended consequence of making psychopathic insanity natural.

The greatest crimes in the history of mankind came not from those in thrall to the "illusion" of Judaism and Christianity, but from those who claimed to be atheistic, scientific socialists. Yet despite this abominable evidence, Freud's fairy tale account of religion remains, for all too many, a grand illusion too compelling to give up.

## #9

**COMING OF AGE IN SAMOA****By Margaret Mead**

In 1925, a very young graduate student in anthropology, Margaret Mead, sailed to the island of Tau in American Samoa to test a rather interesting hypothesis: whether adolescent rebellion, turmoil, and angst were natural or cultural. Mead published her findings in 1928, adding to a swelling pile of confusion. The inter-war years were indeed good times for bad books that added immensely to the West's treasury of pseudo-science. Mead's contribution was to foist on the poor Polynesian Samoans her own vision of a happy sexual paradise in *Coming of Age in Samoa*.

Mead's quest was flawed from the beginning, because even if a "primitive people" are carefree and libidinous, one cannot infer that simply because they appear more primitive that they are somehow closer to what is natural and good, and can therefore provide a corrective to our own way of life. They might be both more primitive and more perverse. Their societies might have declined rather than advanced. The fundamental point: technological ability is morally neutral. A rogue is a rogue, whether he is armed with a club or an AK-47; there are primitive barbarians and sophisticated barbarians.

The fallacy of thinking the primitive is superior because it is allegedly more natural is especially pernicious when it is used as it was by Mead: as a means to smuggle in a sophisticated and highly questionable theory about human nature. "Here is my theory. See, these natives exactly conform to my theory. Therefore, my theory must be correct."

Mead was using the Samoans to push her own sexual schema, but that is not all she was pushing. As she makes clear in her finale, she was peddling an entirely new approach to education, "Education for Choice," one whose entire emphasis was to avoid any emphasis, and whose core belief was that there was no core belief.

She attempted to show that Samoan society was largely free of conflict—especially the "storm and stress [found] in American adolescents"—because the sources of conflict and anxiety embedded in our society were largely absent from Samoan society. If they were

absent from Samoan society, then, Mead reasoned, they must not be natural.

For example, in Samoan society, there is very little conflict between parents and children because Samoan children are cared for indifferently by parents, aunts, uncles, cousins, and generally anyone older than they in the village.

Mead draws the conclusion that “it would be desirable [for us] to mitigate, at least in some slight measure, the strong role which parents play in children’s lives,” so that we might duplicate the weak role Samoan parents play in their children’s lives.

Whereas we in the West get all worked up about both heterosexuality and homosexuality, the Samoans bypass our entire set of cultural anxieties and antagonisms by regarding all sex as merely play. We are narrow-minded about sex; they are entirely open-minded.

The way to get over sexual hang-ups, then, is sexual saturation of the culture. If sex is entirely indiscriminate, and the moral cords that entangle us have all been cut, then we’ll recover our natural, anxiety-free existence.

## #10

**SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE HUMAN MALE****By Alfred Kinsey**

Even more than Rousseau or Mead, Kinsey's revolution was intensely personal, a revolution rooted in his own epic sexual perversity. He represents, in sterling coin, the evil that results from attempting to change the world to match one's character, rather than changing oneself to match the deep moral order written into human nature.

While Kinsey's book was by no means the first manifesto of modernity's sexual uprising, it was certainly the book that broke the dam. Released in 1948, it washed away every moral boundary of sexuality with a torrent of charts, graphs, and technical lingo. Kinsey's careful posturing in lab coats, his dour glare as he churned out data to the naysayers, his aura of disinterested objectivity—all were calculated to one effect: to ram through the sexual revolution as just another aspect of the scientific revolution.

It was not until the release of James Jones's biography of Kinsey in 1997 that the lab coat and scientific screen were ripped away to reveal the seething fleshpots of Kinsey's private life. If his secret sexual saturnalia had seen the light of day fifty years earlier, Kinsey's book would have been revealed as what it really was: a thickly disguised attempt to force the world to accept his own unnatural sexuality as natural. But, alas, by the time Jones's *Alfred C. Kinsey: A Public/Private Life* came out, the revolution was over, and Kinsey had won.

Kinsey wrote that most people satisfy their sexual urges in a number of ways, and (as he attempts to show) that makes them all the happier and more natural. They ignore moral boundaries and do whatever tickles their fancies. Kinsey counsels his readers that as animals they should feel free to act like any other animal in satisfying their sexual urges, and precisely because they are only animals, they can discard the Judeo-Christian notions of right and wrong.

That's Kinsey's strategy in action. There are no such things as sexual deviations. If something happens sexually, it must be part of the natural spectrum; if it is part of the natural spectrum, it cannot be considered either abnormal or unnatural, even if it is relatively

uncommon; but as it turns out to be so much more common than anyone suspected, then it really must be quite normal and hence quite natural.

Why? Because Kinsey's own sexual perversities were so astounding that the only way to escape the unnaturalness of his activities was to declare them to be natural, to say that there was no sexual good or evil. In short, Kinsey's private life was a Hobbesian sexual state of nature.

Kinsey had no anxiety about using data collected by child molesters because he believed that the very notion of "molesting"—a negative term—was a holdover from religious hang-ups. Science was the cure for such religio-moral obscurantism. A good Darwinian approach, a scientific approach, puts pre-adolescent sexuality in the proper context, as just one more way to "express" ourselves.

So there we have Kinsey. Of course, he undermined any notion that pre-marital sex and adultery were wrong using the very same kind of reasoning. Since it all appeared so scientific, and we wanted to hear it, Kinsey's pseudo-science became foundational for the sexual revolution, used both in courts and classrooms to push a limitless sexual revolution that began in the 1960s and through which we are still living.

*Want to read more about the books that screwed up the world? Order Benjamin Wiker's book now.*



*Find more commentary, book reviews, sneak previews and more at the Conservative Book Club, a growing online community for conservative readers just like you!*



Visit the **Conservative Book Club**  
at [www.conservativebookclub.com](http://www.conservativebookclub.com)