



## Episode 1,025: Ron Paul on the Revolution at Ten Years

Guest: Ron Paul

**WOODS:** So you've got a book out now called *The Revolution at Ten Years*, looking back on what's happened since you kicked things off in 2007 with something I'm sure you had no idea was going to blow up into what it did. So give me just your basic summary as you look over these ten years: the pluses, the minuses, and the state of the revolution.

**PAUL:** Well, really the theme is that there's been so many articles appearing in regular media and even in libertarian literature that that so-called revolution of '07, which we thought was important, no longer exists. It just disappeared, and therefore we're back to scratch. And I disagree with that. A lot has changed. We don't have exactly the same thing right now as we had in '07 and '08, because there was a lot of excitement and a lot of support, and mostly the solid libertarians had a lot to say about exactly what was involved in the revolution, what the beliefs were. But after the campaigns, it was sort of changed because the Republicans got interested, it was a successful effort, and others wanted to control it, and the Tea Party people sort of got in a change. They changed the foreign policy.

So the original revolution of the '07-'08 campaigns and '12, that has changed, but only if you look at it superficially. That means it's not in Washington; you can't read about it in the newspapers; it's not on television. But the theme of my book is that it's alive and well and it's very important. Real revolutions are ideological and they don't start with a mass movement. They start with intellectuals. And you and I spent some time at the Mises Institute just recently, and it was well recognized that ideology of free markets and libertarianism, they're alive and well like it's never been before. Nothing like this when I started in the 1970s and early 1960s even and getting involved.

So intellectually, I think the ideas are alive and well, but I can understand why people would say, "Hey, you know that thing Ron Paul was involved with? Nobody really cares. It doesn't exist anymore." And I was trying to set the stage for saying, well, you have to look in the right places. And if you look in the right places, you'll find out that the revolution, which is not something I started but I participated in and I advanced it to some degree, I think is very much alive and I'm very optimistic about that, because you deal with a lot of young people and you do know and we meet them at the Mises Institute and other places, and there's reasons to be encouraged.

**WOODS:** I guess I – and I know I raised this with you before, but there's still the fact that – You're right. Things are much, much better now than they were when, let's say,

you were in medical school. They're much better than they were ten years ago. I mean, I think you moved the discussion on foreign policy to a point where more Republicans than ever are at least somewhat skeptical of foreign intervention. That's at least something. Very few people can say they moved the needle on a major area of discussion. Likewise for monetary policy, which nobody was talking about until you came along. So we have to appreciate these things.

But at the same time, when you were out there in politics in those races, you were the guy. We could say, "That is our leader." Now, I know we don't like the word "leader," but in other words, that's the guy who when he's on TV, he's going to be defending us. He's prominent and we all support him. We don't have that kind of center of gravity anymore, and I think some people feel like the intensity is not there the way it once was, and so now we see people like Bernie, who was in the political eye, he's getting a lot of the enthusiasm. And I think that's why people are feeling demoralized.

**PAUL:** Yeah, I certainly think that's true what you're saying, but I think he's getting the attention and it shows how tough a job we have. I think it's because he has some strong allies on his side — that is, the government, the media, Hollywood. You know, the establishment, they're very, very powerful and there has to be maybe an uptick force in '07 and '08 and '12, but then there's going to be a reaction and that's what I think happened and so they became more aggressive.

But just think of the tools they have. We have more tools now than we had when I first discovered that there was a different way of thinking about world events and economics, and that's when I tell people I resorted to going and hanging around with Leonard Read and the Foundation for Economic Education, and that was a little more difficult. We had to order the books through the mail and go to an occasional conference and things like that. It was much different, but it was very solid. But just think, the other day when we were in New York, I mentioned that I think Murray Rothbard understood this very well because he was part of an old group that kept these ideas alive, but he also introduced us to these. So even though I was at a key point and hopefully helped, I still see the intellectual leaders that are important.

One thing that Mises said that keeps coming back to me, he said it's very important to have individuals who are the theoreticians who can devise new thought and write theory, people probably like himself and Murray. But he said it was also necessary to have individuals who can make these ideas palatable to the majority of people. Yeah, leadership was important, but you still had to get support from a majority, at least palatable to the masses so they would accept that. And I often worked along that way. How can I help get people to understand it? And of course, some of the tools and efforts that I followed came from some advice from Leonard Read on just how you approach this, and to achieve change in people's minds, and you don't change them massively; you change them one at a time. I think you participate in it all the time, trying to change people's minds. You don't think you're going to have the majority with you tomorrow or next week.

And that's why people ask me, *How did I stand being in Washington? Didn't you get totally frustrated with it?* And I really never did, but you know, my expectations were I think a little bit above board. I didn't have wild expectations; I just thought I'll do my best and see what happens. But like you indicated during the introduction, maybe

more happened than I realized. And it did. I never would have predicted that, because when I started, the last thing that I ever thought would happen would be that I would even go to Washington. So one thing led to another.

**WOODS:** Let's talk about — there's a chapter in your book on the deep state, the police state, and surveillance state. Let's just talk about the deep state and your understanding of the deep state, what it is, and how it exercises a hold over U.S. policy.

**PAUL:** Well, from my viewpoint, in Washington there was always somebody outside of Washington that seemed to be pulling the strings. And there's a lot of definitions for the deep state and understanding, and I don't imagine there's one paragraph that you can define and say this is the deep state, but in general, it's the people who have power over influence and can pull the strings in Washington.

I think the FBI and CIA are part of the deep state, because they're outside of government and they're very, very dangerous. And if you look and buy into any of the conspiracy theories with the assassinations of individuals overseas as well as here in our own country, including our president, they are very, very powerful.

And I think the Federal Reserve is immensely powerful, and no matter what a president might say — and I've written recently about a new chairman of the Federal Reserve board, it's going to be more of the same because they are in charge. And when it comes to foreign policy, I think they have been immensely in charge.

And I lament the fact that people say Washington's problems could be solved if we just had more bipartisanship. But I always thought it was too much bipartisanship, because all the important issues were dealt with secretly and they were dealt with by the leadership. So you have these appropriation bills that they used to have a little bit of importance, but they just sort of gloss over them. And then they don't get finished, and then they have an omnibus bill and then they rush something through at the last minute and everybody votes for it. And you don't have time to read it, but people like Pelosi and Boehner did the work and they got the money for welfare and warfare. So there's a bipartisan intellectual agreement that the role of government is to have interventionism in all areas. And it's people who have that influence.

I don't think it's monolithic. I don't think they have 12 people to get together and this is the policy. I think there's people who do talk to each other, they do have their meetings, and they have ways of influencing individuals, and I think it's very, very powerful, much more so than anybody believes. But I think the answer to that is just better ideas and getting our ideas to expose them, because they're going to expose themselves. It's sort of like a lot of people were critical of communism for a long time, but we didn't have to fight communism but it failed on its own. And I think we have to let people know what's happening, who's pulling the strings, it's going to fail, and what are we going to replace it with.

And that of course is what I see the liberty movement should be involved in, is in preparing those individuals who will be around. And that's why I like to talk to young people, college students, and I get probably a slanted view, because the people who come out to our rallies that I still go to, they're very impressive in spite of cultural

Marxism, which drives me nuts, and the control they have over the university. And I think another answer to this is what you've been so helpful on, is the Ron Paul curriculum. This is how we reach people.

So on one side, I'm optimistic. I know it's ideological. But I also understand it's a tough fight. And really understanding the deep state and dealing with them is difficult, but I think they'll take care of themselves. I think they'll have self-destruction.

**WOODS:** I'm just curious about something. Maybe you can give me just a 30-second answer. But I'm curious about — maybe I'm just naive, but couldn't a really, really determined president — for example, a Ron Paul — get elected and then turn to these different agencies we associate with the deep state and say, "I'm nominating all new directors. Those directors are people who are in my corner. They're going to clean house, and I no longer have to worry about some shadow government because I just got rid of all you people." What am I missing?

**PAUL:** The people wouldn't accept it, and a president like that, if you stopped war, brought the troops home, and got rid of the Fed or had a Fed that didn't do what they're doing, you'd be impeached or you'd be killed. So I think you have to change the attitude of the people to come to accepting the government. I think Mises said that all governments depend on the support from the people. So enough people must have supported communism in the early years for them to take over.

So no, I think if you did exactly what you're suggesting, you're a lone person doing this and the people resent it and the Congress resents it, it would be bad news. I don't think that means that we shouldn't argue the case and try to do it and push it along, but if the people don't think it's in their best interest, they're going to come down hard and they will government along with the dictator who said they're just trying to destroy your life.

That's why they have to understand economics, because people now say, *Well, if I need medical care and houses and food and take care of my floods and things like that, the government will do it. Let the government do this.* They have to get away from that. Until they do, I don't think one person can go up there and do it. And people say, "Why did you even try?" Because I thought we could nudge them in a different direction, but I never thought that one individual could do it.

I do think — and you've given me some credit on this — that we have awoken a few people. And that's what I enjoy the most. I just loved it when teenagers, 14- and 15-year-olds would come to my office after those campaigns, and I bragged on them because they knew more about the Federal Reserve than the people in Congress did. So that's where I think the answers are, is changing people's minds. And in a political office, you can do some of it. Leonard Read wasn't even for political activity, but he certainly liked what I was doing because I was promoting the ideas a lot more than a political career.

**WOODS:** Well, speaking of the deep state, what did you think of this talk about the possibility of opening up the CIA's files related to the JFK assassination? Do you think anything will come of that?

**PAUL:** Unfortunately, I'm a cynic on these things because government has failed so often. I think trying to understand Trump, he's going to do something, but I think the really big stuff we're not going to get hold of. They say they have 100% proof in the actual correspondence of people collaborating on how somebody in our government was planning on killing Kennedy. They will not let that come out. I just don't believe it. I think something will be released. But Trump said something the other day: *Yes, I'm planning on releasing this, but first I have to send it through a few of the organizations that are involved and get their opinion on it.* I mean, that to me sent the message, Well, don't expect too much. But a little bit is better than none, but I don't expect that this will be the answer. I think the deep state is too powerful. And if they got very close to turning it over, all of a sudden there'd be a bomb and every bit of evidence would be blown up, I think.

But people who have done the research already on this have been pretty thorough, and I know there's a lot of different opinions, but in a way there's a general theme that our government was very much involved. I think commissions are totally worthless. I think they're just nothing more than cover-up. If they're covering up their own plans or their own mistakes, they're still cover-ups. So a commission is never designed to get to the truth. It's always to distort the truth and protect the government.

**WOODS:** Now, flipping through your book and recalling a lot of these issues that you emphasized so strongly during your campaigns, if there was – if you could just have one of these – if Ron Paul had the authority to make one change, what would that change be?

**PAUL:** I guess you're talking in a political sense?

**WOODS:** Right, like maybe the Fed or the empire, or what would you do?

**PAUL:** Yeah, well, I will give you one thing, but the one thing that more broadly needs to happen is – and I mention this frequently – is the people have to decide what the role of government ought to be. What is the relationship? And that's everything. If the government is there to take care of us and have welfare and warfare and all these other things, then it doesn't work. If you have a government that's very, very limited, what should the role be? And of course I think the role should be only to protect liberty and let the chips fall where they may, and I think the world would be much better off.

But if you're looking for something like which is the most important thing – like is it the income tax or is it the Federal Reserve or just what – in some ways – I think all those are so important and they compete with each other, but in some ways, it's the spending process, limitation on spending and debt, because that just invites everything. As long as they can spend and not worry about debt, which is a consequence once again of the ideas of the Keynesians – debt doesn't matter, you monetize this, you print the money – that is where the problem comes from. And as long as they can do that, then you're going to have income taxes, you're going to have inflation, you're going to have borrowing, you're going to have welfare and warfare.

And as long as this mystical trust in the dollar exists, they're going to get away with it. It's amazing how they were able to undermine the gold standard totally and completely in 1971 and for this fiat money to last for so long, but it just turned out that we were economically powerful and militarily powerful. We pull a lot of strings. But I think it's destined to end. But I would say it's the spending process. How do you curtail it? And of course it would have to be the appetite for government has to be removed.

**WOODS:** One last question before I let you go. This is actually a question that I believe Edward Snowden asked you when you were interviewing him on *The Ron Paul Liberty Report*. He was curious to know: was there ever a time as a congressman that you went to one of these classified foreign policy briefings and you emerged from it having changed your mind based on what you'd heard?

**PAUL:** Yeah, I remember that, and the way that came up, it was almost an add-on because I did the interview, and then I think we sort of like ended the program and he said, "I want to ask you a question." So it was pretty neat and it was interesting. And the answer was no, never, because I didn't go very often. At the beginning, I'd go to one or two of them, and it was just a propaganda session.

And so I never believed anything they were telling us, and it was really emphasized with Walter Jones' experience, because he was much more of a neocon, he supported the war and the military and he was gung-ho after 9/11. He was the one that said you can't even call them French fries because the French weren't strong enough for us. And he finally found out they were lying through their teeth after he had voted to support the war. So he made a 180-degree turn and he became even now one of the strongest antiwar congressman right now. But he was converted by their lies to never believing them again. That I think is the strongest message.

And the other reason I didn't go is most of that stuff ended up in the newspapers. So if I went to these briefings, then I had to be, *If they mentioned it there, then I shouldn't say this*. And that way I didn't have to worry about where I heard what. But they were absolutely worthless and they were not dependable. Now, Edward was a little bit more sympathetic because he was from a family where, I'm sure there were decent people in the government and the CIA that he knew and worked with that were trying to do a decent job. And that is true. So what I say doesn't apply to every single individual that ever existed in the CIA. As a matter of fact, some of the people that come and help us out now on dissecting this have been in the CIA, in these organizations, but they've come clean.

But I never was converted. I never went to one of these and said, "Oh, I didn't want to go to war, but I guess we'd better now because it looks like we're going to be nuked here shortly and I don't want to be caught not having supported — being in opposition."

**WOODS:** Well, the book is *The Revolution at Ten Years*. I'm going to link to it at [TomWoods.com/1025](http://TomWoods.com/1025), and of course folks should be watching *The Ron Paul Liberty Report*, shouldn't they, at [RonPaulLibertyReport.com](http://RonPaulLibertyReport.com). How often do you release that?

**PAUL:** The *Liberty Report*? We do it daily.

**WOODS:** Every single day a dose of Ron Paul and you people aren't doing it? Get out of town. Check that out at [RonPaulLibertyReport.com](http://RonPaulLibertyReport.com). Easy to remember.

**PAUL:** Very good. And Tom, thanks for having me on.

**WOODS:** Always a pleasure, Dr. Paul. Thanks so much.