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FOREWORD.

Many of us are familiar with the left-wing's penchant for referring to right-wingers as “right-wing nuts”. It is harder for liberals to refer to those holding Ph.D.s as “nuts”, but I have known some of the latter who were a little strange. However, would a left-winger refer to a psychiatrist (who naturally holds an M.D.) as a nut? Especially one who has forty years experience as a forensic psychiatrist (who diagnoses nuts).

It’s an interesting question, because what we have in this book, The Liberal Mind, by Lyle Rossiter, is a right-wing psychiatrist who shows persuasively that the thought processes of the average liberal are, in fact, a mental disorder. It’s a disorder not unlike a personality disorder. And, of course, Rossiter has dealt with personality disorders for forty years, since criminals usually display them. So, here we have a
psychiatrist saying most liberals are nuts. And, he can prove it. What a turn of the tables.

INTRODUCTION.

This is the eighth in a series of synopses of current books being used to formulate a Christian basis for interpreting the ‘signs of our times’. The previous seven books, five of which were secular, when taken together, showed inarguably, but surprisingly, that America was not only founded on Christianity, but that Christianity was, and remains, the context within which to interpret the United States’ continuing change, from the time of its founding.

Originally, America’s settlers were British Protestants. Their Protestantism continued developing in this country, although it withered in Western Europe, which is now characterized as the Post-Christian West. And, American Protestantism influenced the Roman Catholicism that also came to this land. So, today, American Protestantism and Catholicism are unique in the world, as is the United States, itself. The U.S. was always exceptional, and continues to be, in every way, including its Christianity.

Only two of the previous seven books were written from the Christian standpoint, those being McGrath’s¹ and Barna’s². But, surprisingly, two of the others, which were written from secular standpoints, discovered that Christianity was the key to the results they documented about the government of these United States. These were the books by Huntington³ and Steyn⁴.

It became obvious to me, from reading Huntington and Steyn, that I needed to know more about what the American settlers and national founders believed, in terms of their Protestantism. I needed to know what Christian beliefs were built into this country and its government. Alister McGrath’s Christianity’s Dangerous Idea¹ fulfilled that need. Now, with Dr. Rossiter’s book, The Liberal Mind⁵, I find that although it is not written from a Christian standpoint, it absolutely agrees with a Christian’s views about the same subject. And, it agrees completely with the Founding Fathers’ understanding of human nature, which they built into the form of the U.S. government they founded.

ROSSITER’S APPROACH.

His Analytical Procedure.

Rossiter’s book is analytical, as were the first five in this series of synopses (including Weiss⁶). That is, he works downward from a basis of established fact, and applies it to characterize and model the liberal mind. This is a deductive approach, much like proving a mathematical theorem. Rossiter is possessed of all the historically proven facts about personality disorders. He simply observes that by its beliefs and actions, the liberal mind matches that established data.

By mind, he means the thought processes that are used by individual liberals. He then generalizes to the corporate level of liberalism, from which proceed the liberal agenda and political actions. His characterization is in psychiatric terms, in general, and the terms of personality disorders, specifically. He models the liberal mind as a personality disorder because its beliefs and resulting actions fit exactly the psychiatric model of a personality disorder. His evidence supporting this model is the statements and actions of liberal politicians and intellectuals, individually and corporately.
Layout of the Book.

In the first 11 chapters of Part-1 of his book, Rossiter’s approach is to first show the psychologically observed procedure by which a personality is developed, from childhood to adulthood. Then, in chapters 12 through 42 of Part-2 of the book, Rossiter shows how a personality is socialized by parents and family, as a part of childhood development. He shows both good and bad outcomes of this personality development. He makes a point of showing something that should be obvious to most people. And, that is that it is the family that is the seat and foundation of preparing a child to enter the socialized adult world. It is at this point in Part-2 that Rossiter starts relating a competent personality development to the attributes of a competent (good) society. He also starts comparing competent personality development factors to items on the liberal agenda. He finds that many items on that agenda directly oppose competent personality development.

In Chapters 41 through 48 of Rossiter’s Part-3, he turns to diagnosis of the liberal mind, through comparison of its belief system to that of a competent socialized adult. He classes liberals into two types, those who are ‘benign’ and those who are ‘radical’ in their activities. By ‘radical’ he means those whose activities (the agenda) harm other individuals. It is the radicals’ corporate actions that harm a competent society, itself.

In Part-3, Rossiter starts examining how liberals have obtained their harmful beliefs. He pursues this examination, to see how individuals could have developed in such a way that they would corporately display the attributes of the liberal mind. He shows that their individual personalities must have developed in such a way as to become the liberal adult result. And, he then shows precisely how that development must have taken place. And, yes, it comes back to the mother and the family. In the last chapter of his book, Dr. Rossiter prescribes an appropriate treatment for the liberal neurosis.

ROSSITER’S SPECIFIC MODEL FOR THE COMPETENT SOCIETY.

It’s Not Just About Modeling Liberals.

On his way to modeling the liberal mind, Dr. Rossiter does a gigantic service for the reader. He teaches the relationship between human psychology and social process. Starting from the psychological characterization of human nature, he derives the rule-based model of a competent society and its government. It is this model that agrees with what our Founding Fathers set up in 1776-1787. Rossiter shows how it is that the genius of the Founding Fathers provided a form of government compatible with the psychological nature of man.

Rossiter approaches the modeling of the liberal mind in the same way that one is taught to identify counterfeit currency. He shows in great depth what a well-developed, competent, adult mind looks like, when prepared to live in a well-ordered free society. He then compares that competent mind with that of the social and political liberal, based on the latter’s documented beliefs and values. Most of Rossiter’s book comprises a text on proper child-rearing. In my opinion, this makes the book extremely valuable, outside the narrower interest in modeling the liberal mind.

It Starts with the Bipolar Human Nature of Man.

According to Rossiter, it begins with the psychological fact that man is an autonomous source of human action, while being thoroughly embedded in relationships such as economic, social, and political. This is what Rossiter means by
the term, ‘bipolar’. Man is capable of independent action, but is constrained by his social surroundings to cooperate with others. It is from this nature that all else flows. And, it is to enable man to successfully operate in this natural environment that proper personality development must prepare him. And, that personality development is at first in the hands of others, normally being the mother and family.

**It’s All About Competence in an Ordered, Free Society.**

Rossiter is not interested in how to develop personalities to function in an oppressed tyrannical society. His interest (and mine) is in developing personalities that are functionally competent for adult living in a free society. And, this is essentially a matter of obtaining the necessary occupational and social skills.

He defines the competent adult as one who applies these skills in a society of ordered liberty. By ‘ordered’, Rossiter understands that maintenance of such a society requires rules to live by, some of which must be codified into laws. The latter is what he means when he talks about ‘the rule of law’. Other rules are matters pertaining to character and values held by such competent individuals, which may not be codified, but are nevertheless necessary. Rossiter lists the following demonstrable abilities of a competent adult in a society of ordered liberty:

- **Initiative** – Making things happen.
- **Agency** – Acting purposefully.
- **Autonomy** – Acting independently.
- **Sovereignty** – Living independently, through competent decision making.

**Man’s Natural Rights.**

Rossiter gives a definition of ‘natural rights’ for an adult person living in a society of ordered liberty. These are the exercise as one chooses of those abilities listed above, subject to the constraints necessary for society’s peace and order. Natural Rights result from the combination of Human Nature and Human Freedom.

- **Human Freedom** – Living as one chooses, subject to constraints necessary for peace and order.
- **Human Nature** – Exercise of abilities under necessary constraints.

**The Just Social Order.**

Based on all of the above and material in the first 22 chapters of Part-1, Rossiter defines what a just social order is, in terms of the five human attributes it respects:

1. Honors the sovereignty of the individual.
2. Respects the liberty of the individual.
3. Respects the ownership of property and the integrity of contracts.
4. Respects the principle of equality under the law.
5. Requires constitutional limits, to prevent government violation of natural rights.

**Individuation and Individualism.**

It is obvious that the Just Social Order is focused on the individual, not groups. It does not build a society around groups or classes of people. In fact, it recognizes individualism, which has always been a characteristic of Americans. Among nations,
that is a historical exception. And, that exception was made law by the Founding Fathers, in writing the Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

The emergence of individuality and an individual identity is called individuation in psychology. It is the last developmental step toward adult autonomy. Its foundations are laid down in the early years of life, according to Rossiter. And, he holds it fundamental to any society grounded in the principles of individual liberty. The autonomous individuated adult correctly assumes his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

However, this emergence as an individual does not mean that he can have whatever he wants. He must respect the individualism of others and interact with them through voluntary cooperation. Thus, individualism must be coupled with mutuality, to develop an adult, competent in a society of ordered liberty. This development of mutuality will constrain the competent adult to act only within certain moral and ethical boundaries, says Rossiter. Any adult who acts otherwise violates such boundaries, or never establishes them at all.

Rights That Structure Liberty.

After many pages of intense study of individual development, in terms of rules by which the competent adult must abide in society of ordered liberty, Rossiter comes down to just seven individual rights of the ordinary citizen, in which to exercise his autonomy, free of government interference:

1. Right of Self-Ownership (Autonomy).
2. Right of First Possession (To control previously unowned property).
3. Right of Ownership and Exchange (continue, or trade or exchange).
4. Right of Self-Defense (protect self or property).
5. Right to Just Compensation for Takings (by the government).
6. Right to Limited Access (to property of others in emergencies).
7. Right to Restitution (for damages to self or property).

Rossiter comments that these seven rights are called ‘natural rights’, ‘liberty rights’, ‘negative rights’, or ‘basic of background rights’. The use of the term, ‘negative’, means that these rights are rights from interference by government or others. Later, he compares these ‘negative rights’ to liberalism’s ‘positive rights’, counter to the seven, above.

It is obvious that all of these rights have to do with an individual’s self or property. It is also obvious that a government is required, to guard these rights. And, such a government needs be structured so that it does not infringe upon these rights. The duty of a government of a society of ordered liberty is to set and enforce such rules that protect the citizen from such infringement by either the government or others.

ROSSITER’S MODELING OF THE LIBERAL MIND.

Two Classes of Liberals – Benign and Radical.

In his Part-3, starting with Chapter-41, Rossiter turns to the psychodynamic analysis of the liberal mind. That means how the liberal mind works, what it believes, and what actions it prompts. The beliefs he pulls from liberal writings and statements. How it works, he gets by comparing liberal actions with those exhibited in personality disorders. He is able to nail down the liberal mind to some very specific causes. And, those causes go way back to an individual liberal’s childhood development.
want the government to be mommy, because their own mommies didn’t do a good job raising them.

Rossiter’s first result is that liberals come in two classes, benign and radical. The benign liberal subscribes to the mistaken altruistic assumption that the welfare state is the best solution to nurturing people. They naively assume that individual freedoms can be preserved as society is made more ‘caring’, even under the heavy hand of government. The underlying assumptions are based on benign liberal’s uncritical acceptance of a number of false beliefs (listed below). Although benign liberals hold a totally unrealistic view of human nature, they do not act in a way that is dangerous to the rest of society. So says Rossiter.

Radical liberals are a whole other class. They not only hold the same beliefs as the benign, but they act from an agenda on how to implement their totally unrealistic view of human nature in society. And, their actions are dangerous to the rest of that society (and, unknowingly, to themselves as members of that society).

The radical liberal acts out his intentions to have an authoritarian state, organized on socialist principles, and ruled by liberal elites. This utopian ideal sacrifices the historical tangible blessings of ordered liberty for the illusory benefits of the welfare state. So says Rossiter.

Foundation for the Liberal Mind - Beliefs.

Rossiter lists 26 things that liberals believe. These 26, when taken together, characterize the belief foundation upon which the liberal mind rests.

1. Traditional social ideals are outmoded and not currently applicable.
2. Governmental direction is better than citizens taking care of themselves.
3. Ordered society’s best political foundation is centralized government.
4. The primary purpose of politics is achieving an ideal collective society.
5. Individual’s political significance is from his collective membership.
6. Altruism is a virtue of the state, embodied in government programs.
7. Sovereignty of individuals is diminished in favor of state.
8. Rights to life, liberty, property yield to state’s collective rights.
9. Citizens are like children of a parental government.
10. Individual’s relation to government should resemble that to parents.
11. Traditional social institutions of marriage and family not very important.
12. Large government is necessary to ensure social justice.
13. Time-honored conceptions of justice are invalid.
15. Fruits of individual labors belong to the population as a whole.
16. Individual is entitled to only a government specified portion of his labor.
17. State should judge which groups deserve government benefits.
18. Economic activity should be carefully controlled by the government.
19. Governmental prescriptions from liberal intellectuals, not history.
20. Liberal policy makers are intellectually superior to conservatives.
21. Good life is a government entitlement, regardless of citizen’s effort.
22. Established traditions of decency and courtesy are unduly restrictive.
23. Traditional moral, ethical, legal codes are political constructs.
24. Individual’s destructive actions caused by negative cultural influences.
25. Judging actions should not be based on ethical or moral standards.
26. The same holds for judging between nations, religious, or ethnic groups.
What the Liberal Agenda has Produced.

The United States is well down the road to becoming a socialist welfare state. As a result of the liberal agenda being implemented in the U.S., the existence of many of its elements may be observed. So, present and future implementation of the agenda is not a matter of principle, but of degree. The following results can be observed of how the liberal agenda has transformed the U.S., in contrast to the original founding social attributes of the country’s citizenry:

Observation of Results of the Liberal Governmental Agenda.

3. Moral indulgence and relativism versus moral rectitude.
4. Collectivism versus cooperative individualism.
5. Indentured servitude versus genuine altruism.
6. Displacement of the individual as the primary economic, social, and political unit of society.
7. The sanctity of marriage and cohesiveness of the family undermined.
8. The harmony between family and community undermined.
9. Obligations of promises, contracts, ownership, and property rights weakened.
10. Rewards from merit and desert disconnected.
11. The moral and ethical basis for civilized living corrupted.
12. The population polarized into warring classes via false claims of victimization and contrived needs for political rescue.
13. An idealized parental and administrative state created, endowed with vast regulatory powers.

So says Rossiter.

Failures in Implementation of the Liberal Governmental Agenda.

Rossiter lists the following as just a few examples of governmental programs, at city, state, or federal levels, which have failed their grandiose expectations under the liberal agenda. The failures have at least two characterizations, being ineffectiveness (at great cost) to achieve objectives, and/or bankruptcy of the programs. By bankruptcy is meant failure to operate without governmental deficit financing. That is, the programs required more money than could be collected in taxes in given years. This we are seeing today, at every governmental level. And, it’s come to the point where it cannot go on.

1. The War on Poverty.
2. The War on Drugs.
3. Government Education Programs - Ineffective and Bankrupt.
6. Government Housing Programs - Ineffective and Bankrupt.
The Fallacies of Positive Rights.

In Chapter-39, Rossiter listed the seven natural rights of a citizen in a just, ordered society. He also characterized these as ‘negative rights,’ in the sense that they are rights to be free of interference by government or others. In Chapter-42, he examines the liberal agenda’s postulated ‘positive rights’ of people to government enforceable entitlements. These entitlements include:

1. food
2. clothes
3. houses
4. jobs
5. education
6. medical care
7. child care
8. abortion
9. clean and safe environment
10. adequate social status
11. leisure time or any other good, service, or condition

The problem with these positive liberal rights is that they are government enforceable. Therefore, they are entitlements subject to liberal beliefs 17. and 18., listed above. That is, the government shall determine who gets how much medical care, etc., and who pays for it. So, Rossiter’s negative rights are to freedom from government interference, and the liberals’ positive rights are based on government interference. And, so, these positive rights directly assault the citizens’ liberty in a just ordered society.

Rossiter than observes that the liberals’ positive rights flow from the belief that most human suffering is unjust, instead of being an inevitable part of the human experience. Being unjust, it can then be remedied by the liberal government in its quest for social justice. Thus, the liberal views the minimal libertarian state as profoundly unjust because it explicitly refuses to guarantee all those goods and services which only individual and groups can provide through their own initiative. In reality, the liberals’ collective state is the one that is unjust, because it directly violates the negative rights essential to ordered liberty. So says Rossiter.

HOW THE RADICAL LIBERAL MIND GETS TO BE THAT WAY.

It’s Basically a Deficit in Developed Values.

People are not born with a radical liberal mind. They acquire it, somewhere along the way to adulthood. They acquire it as they develop into adults. It can be identified by checking out the values it acquires. And, values are what a person acquires on the trip from infancy to adulthood. An adult, competent to function in a society of ordered liberty, acquires the requisite values from parents and family. A radical liberal doesn’t. So says Rossiter.

The ‘Does Nots’.

Rossiter focuses on the values that radical liberals do not esteem. This says more about the liberal mind than the values they do hold. The radical liberal ...

1. Does not insist that the individual is the ultimate economic, social, and political unit.
2. Does not idealize individual liberty and the structure of law and order necessary to its defense.
3. Does not defend the basic rights of property and contract.
4. Does not aspire to ideals of authentic autonomy and mutuality.
6. Does not praise courage, forbearance, or resilience.
7. Does not celebrate the ethics of consent or voluntary cooperation.
8. Does not advocate or understand the role of morality in human relating.
9. Does not comprehend or appreciate an identity of competence.
10. Does not analyze the developmental conditions that promote it.
11. Does not understand or recognize personal sovereignty or limits on its coercion.
12. Does not celebrate genuine altruism or private charity.
13. Does not learn history’s lessons on the evils of collectivism.

Characterizing the Liberal Mind as a Transference Neurosis.

Finally, in Chapter-43, Rossiter gets to the heart of characterizing the liberal mind by what it believes and what it does not believe. He characterizes it as a neurosis, based on trauma in his familial relationships during the development of his personality. That is, during his period between infancy and adulthood. And, it is a transference neurosis, in that it comprises the unconscious projections of early childhood psychodynamics into the political arenas of adult life. It is the result of a failure to be trained in the basic psychodynamic elements of an adult, competent to live in a society of ordered liberty.

Rossiter comments that a radical liberal will not admit to himself or others that he did, in fact, suffer early development wounds. If he does admit this fact, he will not realize that his wounds drive his political views. And, if he does realize this causal connection, he will not admit it to others.

The Liberal’s Five Developmental Deficits.

Basic Trust.

Rossiter’s first identifiable developmental deficit is that of basic trust. This is his distrust of relationships between persons who act by mutual consent. The modern liberal is unable to believe that human beings can make good lives for themselves through individual initiative and voluntary cooperation. He knows that people simply cannot be trusted to run their own lives effectively. They don’t know what’s good for themselves or how to obtain it. And, they don’t have the will to do good for themselves.

These ideas about human relations are projections into the world of economic, social, and political events of the radical liberal’s developmental deficits. These deficits started accumulating in the first year of life. The infant’s normal emotionally positive interactions with his mother introduce him to a world of relating that is safe, pleasurable, mutually satisfying, and “consented to” by both parties, according to Rossiter.

But, in an abnormal, abusive relationship, when the mother-child dyad fails to achieve these early milestones, something else happens. The acquisition of basic trust is profoundly undermined. If this situation persists over the first and second years, it creates in an infant a conditioned response that is a basic mistrust in the goodness of
life. When severe and long lasting, this type of experience eventually leads the child to use force or manipulation to get what he believes he cannot get by other means. This is where the radical liberal’s basic mistrust of people comes from, says Rossiter.

**Autonomy.**
Following the age of about fifteen months, a child begins laying in the foundations of autonomy, or self-realization, as well as the foundations of mutuality, or self- and other-realization. It is when a child learns to act for himself in such a way that he can get his needs fulfilled with the agreement of his caretakers. Within the idea of autonomy are the ideas of self-reliance, self-direction, and self-regulation. The “spoiled” child, who grows up dependent upon overly-indulgent parents is deprived of the virtues of self-reliance and self-control and the attitudes needed for cooperation with others. Enduring over-indulgence of the child will deprive him of the foundation of conscience and the achievement of individuation. Spoiling is actually a form of abuse that robs the child of autonomy. So says Rossiter.

**Initiative.**
Initiative is self-actuation. In normal development, it is the capability to initiate good works for good purposes. It is developed in the first four or five years of a child’s life. Rossiter divides pathological initiative into two categories, being ‘exaggerated’ or ‘inhibited’.

In the first category are dispositions characterized by excessive aggression toward or manipulation of others in the exercise of initiative. Such personalities are often described as being ‘on the make’ or ‘on the take’. Excessive initiative in the service of pathological greed is common, according to Rossiter. This category includes the classical narcissist, whose initiative serves exploitative motives, to control others. Many narcissists ascend to leadership roles in major corporations or seek public office, to further their personal agendas, while remaining indifferent to the obligations to others that are inherent in their offices.

In the second category are dispositions with severely inhibited initiative. Such persons are typically lacking in self-direction, will and purpose, and may be easily manipulated and humiliated, says Rossiter. They are also disposed to seek childlike relationships with others, yielding their rights to self-determination, in return for another’s real or imagined protection from the responsibilities of adult life.

Persons with this personality will often assume a childlike role in relation to government, voting for those who promise material security through collective obligation, rather than for those committed to the protection of individual liberty. These individuals populate the benign class of liberals categorized above.

The inhibition of initiative may occur from excessive guilt acquired in early childhood, arising, for instance, from the Oedipus complex. However, exaggerations of initiative are the enduring effects of early trauma and are typically thought of as neurotic or personality disordered. In extreme cases they may be part of a psychotic process. So says Rossiter.

**Industry.**
As Initiative is the ability to initiate acts with good goals, so Industry is the ability to complete them. With increasing development the school-age child is able to complete them more and more competently. In the industry era, the child learns to make things and do things and to relate in more complex ways to persons outside of his nuclear family. The goal of this era is the development of adult competence. It is the development of the ability to make a living. So says Rossiter.
The developing child learns to trade things on the playground, work in odd jobs, earn a fee or allowance, save or spend money, make decisions about what he can afford, and consider competing alternatives. For him, this is the era of elementary economic education. It is also the era of socialization. The child’s budding capacity for useful effort is rewarded conditionally by parents, teachers, and neighbors.

When what is learned in this phase falls largely within accepted codes of conduct, the child’s growing acquaintance with his culture’s possibilities helps to channel his interests toward pursuits that enhance cooperation. When things do not go well enough, he may drift toward behavioral disorders, drug abuse, or delinquency and the aimless discharge of tensions antithetical to cooperation. Thus, will be generated an underlying sense of inferiority and actual deficits in education, social skills, and constructive identifications, which may preclude the achievement of adult competence.

Attitudes arising from these pathological emotions may promote passive dependent behavior as a defense against the accompanying fears, shame, or rage. And, passive dependent behavior is the first of the benign liberal beliefs. Contrarily, for children already in serious conflict with parents, the subculture of gangs, delinquency, and drugs may offer alternative affiliations that further undermine the development of industry and competence in the adolescent phase.

Identity.

The adolescent’s sense of identity is altered as he explores multiple, often contradictory persona on the way to constructing a new self. He must meet new challenges to already established balances between trust and mistrust, autonomy and shame, initiative and guilt, industry and inferiority. This phase tests the child’s previously developed emotional stability, rationality, sense of adequacy and acceptability, overcoming of obstacles, and deepening relational abilities. So says Rossiter.

Development of his adult identity involves his perceived risk in trusting society’s institutions. He wants a worldview he can believe in. This is especially important if he was subject to developmental forms of abuse in his earlier years. He may seek a view broader than those of his family and neighborhood. He is looking for how to orient himself in his entire culture’s rules for living. His increasing consciousness of who he is facilitates an integration of past and present selves with imagined future selves, paving the way for achieving adult competence.

It is at this point of development that a young person may fall prey to the illusory offers of societal and political liberalism. Rossiter explores this possibility to great depth in his Chapters 31-36. His results on this final phase of development are far too numerous to summarize, here. Let me just conclude with a slightly paraphrased version of Rossiter’s comment on the transition point for the development of identity, when a person has arrived at the ability to make a living:

“The now employed adult is thus confronted with a new relationship, which is a forced and permanent marriage to the state. And, the new spouse is demanding, imperious, usually unreasonable, and very expensive.”

By this point of development, the young adult has usually chosen to go one way or the other, with the liberal view of society or with the traditional American view that is today termed conservative.
CONCLUSION.

In this writer’s opinion, the present synopsis contains enough of Rossiter’s results to show what is his model of the liberal mind and how he derived it. For readers wanting more justification or greater detail, the only recourse is to read the book for themselves. I greatly enjoyed it, but found it hard to synopsize in a relatively few pages. But, in my series of synopses in which it fits, it does plug an obvious hole in understanding where America is and how it got there.

The current liberal administration of the U.S. government has taken actions that seem ‘crazy’ from the traditional American viewpoint. From the other books synopsized in this series, it is clear that this Administration is hell-bent (the term used advisedly) on completing the transformation of this country to a Democratic-Socialist Welfare (Nanny) State. The apparent thinking behind this goal is not understandable to a majority of Americans, who still hold traditional views. And, so, it must be concluded that the ‘crazy’ actions are proceeding from ‘crazy’ thinking. Rossiter creates a foundation for understanding what has produced that thinking.

What we do with this understanding is the next question.
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