

# NEO-FEUDALISTS

There's been a lively discussion about labels recently—particularly as more true conservatives attempt to create a position from which to oppose Bush without ceding their identity as conservatives. It's a discussion I've been thinking a lot about, not least because I'm dabbling with an argument that we need to think of the "Conservative Movement" as a more cohesive, intentional whole. These thoughts, plus my recent obsession with Texas Royalty, makes me want to argue strongly for the term "Neo-Feudalist."

One of the problems—both for the left, and those true conservatives seeking to distance themselves from Bush—is that no one has challenged the misnomer "Conservative Movement." There is nothing conservative about what BushCo are trying to pull off—he's trying to radically alter the structure of our government and society, in the process cynically capitalizing on conservative moral values while violating those values himself. And BushCo doesn't aspire to anything so impermanent as a movement. (Though I do wonder whether they cling to the word "movement" in deference to Michael Ledeen's belief that the Italian fascist movement was all good, it was just the regime that went bad.) We on the left would do well to avoid accepting this frame for their efforts. And the true conservatives really deserve to have their word "conservative" back, without the taint that it has acquired from its Movement and Neo appendages.

And in search for a term that more accurately describes their plan, I'm settling on Neo-Feudalist.