



Episode 1,086: Lysander Spooner: The Evolution of a Radical Libertarian

Guest: Chris Calton

WOODS: You're never going to be in a situation where listeners, if you have a good podcast, are going to be upset that you're talking about Lysander Spooner. That's the great thing about a libertarian podcast. Talk about Spooner all you like. It just makes people smile all the more. And I had a chance to read a paper of yours that I'm linking to at TomWoods.com/1086 on Spooner and on the evolution of his thought and how it is that he eventually arrives at the position we associate with him.

Some people who know only his later work are perhaps surprised to hear him making constitutional arguments against slavery in the mid 1840s. This seems to be out of keeping with what we know about his views of the Constitution, but that's because he didn't come out of the womb as the Lysander Spooner of the 1860s. So let's start from the beginning about who this man is, what his background is, and at what point is he already starting to insert himself into politics and controversy.

CALTON: Sure. Well, he started in his mid 20s kind of stirring up controversy as a young man. He was an iconoclast before anything else, so his first writings in the 1830s are anti-religion writings, anti-clerical stuff. He was attacking church hierarchies and things like that. And it's not that he was an atheist, but he rejected organized religion, much as many iconoclasts do. So his first work in 1834 was on the – I think the subtitle, if I remember, is "On the Supposed Miracles of Christ." This isn't advocating it, of course. I'm a Christian. But you see these hints of iconoclasm that would stick with him all through the rest of his life, because even later on he's attacking the divine right to rule in his anarchist writings in the 1880s.

WOODS: But then he goes on to legal study at some point. Is it there – there's some point in his studies where he's involved in some kind of either protest or civil disobedience about the number of years of study that are required?

CALTON: Yeah, it's actually the year after he wrote that first anti-religious writing. He wrote a statement to the legislature of Massachusetts, and he did this, he was studying under two really prominent lawyers named John Davis and Charles Allen. They ended up becoming minor members of the government. One of them got into the federal government. And they encouraged him to leave the practice earlier than Massachusetts law would allow him to. According to Massachusetts law at the time, because he was not a college graduate, he should have studied under them for five years, but he stayed only for two years. They thought he was a genius, so they encouraged him to start his own practice in violation of the law, and then he wrote this letter to the Massachusetts legislature basically saying that they were

impeding his right to voluntarily contract with people. And they actually got the law overturned. With the help of Davis and Allen, Spooner got that law overturned.

WOODS: I read in your article that part of his argument also was that this requirement put an undue burden on the poor. So he views fighting against these sorts of things as being not a fight for privilege, but a fight against it.

CALTON: And in fact, one of my favorite controversies about Spooner is – everybody wants to claim him. The capitalist libertarians want to claim him like we do, and then of course the socialist libertarians want to claim him, and this is a lot of the stuff that the socialist libertarians try to point to to say that they have the true claim on Spooner, is in his writings. In his *Poverty: Its Illegal Causes and Legal Cures*, for instance, they like to say, look, he's talking about the inequality of wealth. He's talking about helping the poor. He's talking about being self-employed. So he does have that theme all throughout his work, and he wrote a lot of economic works all the way into the 1880s that have that theme. But even with that, it still is natural rights, private property, free trade. So yes, he is.

WOODS: Yeah, in a way – not that I want to make a comparison with Jesus Christ. I'm sort of hesitant to do that.

CALTON: Of course.

WOODS: But Christ himself has the same reputation. Well, he says things about the rich and he calls for helping the poor and all that, so therefore Jesus was a socialist. Except where does he mention using the state? Where does he mention violence? Where does he mention the welfare state? Just show me some evidence of that. And then of course it's crickets and they're not listening and they've moved on to the next thing.

All right, tell me how and when the American Letter Mail Company comes into this story and what that's all about.

CALTON: So that's a really interesting story. In the 1840s, there was – I think in 1844, there was a Supreme Court case. I can't remember the name of it. But it basically said that the government didn't have the right to stop somebody from starting a competing mail service. So there was a lot of people that started a competing mail service. Lysander Spooner wasn't the only one. But what made him different was the fact that he didn't start his just to make money. He explicitly proclaimed that he was doing it to combat the law, and he wanted to test this on legal grounds. So he was publishing pamphlets about this and sending them to like the head of the post office, stirring up controversy about that.

And the result was that, with his encouragement as well as the competition of the other private business owners, he got the post office to where they started delivering to people's houses, something that we take for granted today, but at the time, you had to go to the post office to pick up your mail. Whereas the private carriers were actually delivering it to you. That was an innovation in the '40s.

WOODS: Oh, I didn't know that.

CALTON: Yeah, absolutely.

WOODS: Huh, okay.

CALTON: And they also cut the prices of stamps. Now, what happened — and here's kind of the sad part in Lysander Spooner's life — is because of this competition, the post office was kind of strong-arming him and saying to their letter carriers, *Okay, you're not allowed to deliver letters for Lysander Spooner's company if you want our business.* And so they essentially used their leverage to put him out of business. And he was very disgruntled about this and published another tract in 1849 saying that he should get paid for lowering the cost of stamps, and it wasn't very well received. People were like, look, you tried your luck and you lost. So it's kind of a sad ending, but he helped spur some of the innovations in the postal service.

WOODS: Well, also in the 1840s, we see in 1845 his book on *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery*. Now, I did an episode on this a long time ago. I'm going to link to it also at TomWoods.com/1086, where I went in some detail through the arguments that he makes in that book. In fact, I did two back-to-back episodes on Spooner, one about the stuff people are familiar with about him, and then the slavery stuff, which they kind of know he was an abolitionist, but they don't know about his unconstitutionality of slavery.

Now, what he's doing there is staking a position that is counter to what a lot of abolitionists held. Like, for example, William Lloyd Garrison of course believed slavery was constitutional, which was precisely why the Constitution was a pact with the devil that ought to be publicly burned. Spooner took a different view. So how does he do that, given that the Constitution does in several places at least appear to be referring to slavery?

CALTON: Yeah, so William Lloyd Garrison actually wrote a review of Spooner's *Unconstitutionality of Slavery*, and I kind of love the irony in it because Spooner eventually came around to Garrison's critique, but by the time he did, Garrison had flipped and was supporting the Civil War. So Garrison actually ended his review of Spooner's book with the famous line, "No Union with slaveholders," when he advocated Northern secession, before Spooner was supporting secession. So they kind of swapped sides. I'm oversimplifying, but it's an interesting transition for both of them.

Spooner's views were unique, and they are — I think it's a tragedy how much they're overlooked in history, because even Frederick Douglass — I was reading some of Frederick Douglass' writings just a couple weeks ago, and he names Spooner in some of his earlier writings. He's critiquing Spooner's arguments for the Constitution and then later comes around and says, "I accept Spooner's arguments."

WOODS: Yeah, that's very significant. Yeah.

CALTON: Yeah, like nobody talks about that. He's just such an obscure character. But he brought Frederick Douglass around on the Constitution. But again, he did end up abandoning his own arguments mostly because of I think the Dred Scott decision, though in the '50s, he started kind of abandoning the Constitution. But for people that aren't familiar with the work, it's worth giving — The two premises that he was arguing in there that kind of color his legal ideas. The first was natural rights, and this is the biggest and most consistent theme throughout all of Spooner's writings.

And to give you an idea of his view on natural rights, he saw it as almost like a Hans Hermann Hoppe view, like it was a very value-free view of ethics. He thought that there was a science to justice comparable to the laws of gravity, the laws of mathematics, and natural rights were a similar scientific law. And so any time you had a written constitution, which is talks about in the second chapter of the book, if there was any ambiguity at all in the text, obviously you had to revert back to the natural law, because that was the science of justice. So most of the book is attacking the wording of the text almost ad nauseam, but it's to show that there's so much ambiguity in the text.

One of my favorite examples is he talks about they don't use the word "slave" in the Constitution. They use things like "people bound to labor." And he says, well, what about infant slaves? What about elderly slaves? These people can't labor. Obviously, this could be interpreted in different ways, so we have to revert to natural rights. And if we revert to natural rights, people can't be slaves. So that's essentially the crux of his argument there, and he's presenting this for lawyers and judges to try to overturn pro-slavery laws as a legal argument.

WOODS: There's a distinction we can make in reading Spooner between so-called original intent and original meaning, original intent being what we associate with people like the late Justice Scalia, and the argument there being we try to figure out what the framers intended by certain clauses in the Constitution and then the judges rule accordingly. But Spooner's view really is what matters are the words that were written down. I don't want to try to intuit what behind closed doors people were saying or even using the ratifying conventions where we have written records of them. Instead, let's look at the actual meaning of the words and what they meant at the time they were written down. And if the meaning of those words, if we could take these words and give them a meaning that is in accord with natural law that doesn't do outright violence to the text, then that reading must be preferred, even if it is a strained reading. And that seems to be the rule by which he is able to take texts in the Constitution that appear to be referring to slavery and assert that they could be referring to something else.

CALTON: Absolutely. And that's one of the reasons why people were critiquing his views, is they said – and they were correct to say this. They said of course they were referring to slaves. And yeah, the people drafting the Constitution were referring to slaves. It would be absurd to say otherwise. But that wasn't Spooner's point. Spooner's point wasn't trying to convince people that they were actually thinking about aliens and immigrants and infants. It was that they left this ambiguity deliberately so that we could interpret the words according to natural rights. So it was just strictly a legal argument that he was making.

And one of my favorite aspects of *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery* is actually just a footnote. It's like a three-page footnote. And he goes to task on James Madison's notes, which are the main source for a lot of people on original intent, and the records of the ratification debates, which would be the primary source to a lot of people on original interpretation. And he shows all the ways that they can't be trusted. We don't have all of the ratification records, for instance. James Madison's just one guy making these notes. Like, obviously we can't get a real, accurate, confident understanding of intent and interpretation from these sources. And he spends three pages in a footnote just destroying these sources. And these are the sources people still use today, of course. I found that very interesting when I read it.

WOODS: All right, so as I say, in my episode that I did on this, we go through the different – for example, the thing about the importation of slaves in the year 1808 and the Three-Fifths Clause and stuff like that, and there are ways that he gets around them. But again, as you're saying, he's not trying to pretend that there was no discussion of slavery. He's saying these are the words we've been given, and given that the natural default position is liberty, then we have an obligation to interpret these words in such a way that they conform with the standard of liberty if it is at all possible to do so. So he's able to then exonerate the Constitution, say that it is not a pro-slavery document and that it is a terrible, terrible accusation to make against the Constitution to say that it is pro-slavery. So that was his position there.

But then by the time we get to – certainly by the time we get to the Southern secession, something has changed. Now, what is the difference in his approaches, and do we maybe see any inklings of it in *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery*?

CALTON: Well, I think we would be skipping an important step there if we went straight to secession or the Civil War, because in the 1850s, he started part of this transition that I don't detail very much in the paper but it's worth kind of elaborating on here, if you don't mind.

WOODS: Yeah, please.

CALTON: In the 1840s when he's writing not just *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery*, but he's writing a lot of the unconstitutionality of the post office, the unconstitutionality of currency and banking, he's appealing to lawyers and judges. In the 1850s, there were a couple things that made him switch and start appealing to jurors, and this is important because it really paved the way for jury nullification. So of course the main one was in 1850, the new Fugitive Slave Act was passed and infuriated so many people in the North, especially abolitionists like Spooner. And so in 1850, he writes his *Defense for Fugitive Slaves*. This is his first track really outlining the idea of jury nullification. And so now what he was saying is, okay, I don't have faith that judges and lawyers are going to accept my arguments, but maybe the juries will because the juries can judge whether or not what a government is doing is right.

And a year or two later – I think it's estimated that this came out in around 1852, but we don't have the exact date for *Trial by Jury*, he expands on these arguments in a *Trial by Jury* where you're pretty much establishing jury nullification as a formal concept. So in the '40s, he's really – as I said in the article, he's a reformer as an abolitionist. He wants to reform the government by appealing to judges and lawyers. By the 1850s, he gets more radical and he starts appealing to jurors to try to nullify these laws and exonerate these people regardless of what the written text is. And then of course in 1857 when you had the Dred Scott decision, that's when he just throws out the Constitution completely and says whatever you have to do to end these bad laws is justified. So that's when he really starts becoming radical before Southern secession and the American Civil War.

WOODS: Okay, all right, so we have then that period. And then we get to when he starts writing the things that most libertarians who have read him are reading and namely what he writes in *No Treason*. Now, I want to talk about that, but we should also talk about his letter to Charles Sumner –

CALTON: Absolutely.

WOODS: – that I hadn't read before, and then I saw it in your paper and I read those bits. First of all, who was Charles Sumner? Because it seems, of all people that you would write an angry letter to, he wouldn't be in your top five if you were an abolitionist.

CALTON: Yeah, that's what stuck out to me when I read the letter too. So the letter's really short. You can read it online. It is worth reading, because I think it prefaces a lot of the stuff he said in the *No Treason* pamphlets. So Charles Sumner, for anybody who's not familiar with him, and I do have – on the Mises podcast I do, I have an episode of Charles Sumner, and the graphic over it is of the very infamous painting of Charles Sumner.

So in 1854 when Congress passed the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Charles Sumner gave a speech on the House floor called "The Crimes Against Kansas." This speech lasted two days, and in it, he made a lot of sexual innuendo to criticize slavery, and of course that was far more controversial in the 19th century than it would be today. He was comparing people that supported slavery to people who would seek prostitutes, for example, and so this was obviously very controversial. And he named people such as Stephen Douglas and Andrew Butler.

Well, one of the relatives of Andrew Butler was a representative named Preston Brooks, who was from South Carolina. And so he came on the Senate floor in May of 1856 and he just beat the crap out of Charles Sumner with a cane, beat him almost to death. The guy was in a coma. He couldn't take his seat in the Senate for three years. And it was obviously a very, very famous act of violence, and they call it the caning of Charles Sumner. And it was a pretty integral event in the 1850s. So Charles Sumner literally was nearly beat to death because of his opposition to slavery. He was a hero among most abolitionists.

But then when the war came about, he was a Republican by this time, and he actually became a Republican because of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and he supported the war. But he also said that the Constitution supporter slavery. So even though he was anti-slavery, he supported the Constitution. So in 1864 when Spooner wrote his open letter to Charles Sumner, he was basically accusing him of treason because he said, look, had you accepted my arguments on the Constitution that the Constitution did not support slavery, then what you were saying would have been consistent. But you said that the Constitution supported slavery, yet you're willing to support the Constitution anyway. And if you support a document that supports slavery, then you're proving that it doesn't have any justification to have blood spilt on its behalf. But in 1864, hundreds of thousands of people had died because of Charles Sumner's supposed support on the Union on grounds that that was the constitutional Union.

So Sumner, in Spooner's eyes, was guiltier than the Southerners, because even though they were pro-slavery and obviously Spooner doesn't like that, they didn't pretend to be friends with the North. They didn't pretend to be friends with the slaves. They said what they were about. And as vile as their principles were, they at least stuck to their principles. This is Spooner's way of putting it. Whereas Sumner said that he had these principles, these anti-slavery, pro-liberty principles, but really what he was doing was violating that. So it's a very vicious letter accusing Sumner of hypocrisy and outright treason. I call it the second caning of Charles Sumner because it's so vitriolic. But it makes a really damning case against support of the Civil War from an anti-slavery view, and that's something that people don't even think is possible in modern views on history.

WOODS: What is the connection between the Civil War and the *No Treason* writings? Because what people are drawing from it when you read it without historical context is simply that the Constitution has no authority because I individually and we individually never consented to it. Now, that's a very important argument and we should talk about it. But how is that related – I mean, this is probably not a hard question, but just to make clear for everybody, how is that related to the issue of the Civil War?

CALTON: Well, it's most identifiable in the first *No Treason* pamphlet. So to clarify for anybody that may not be aware, there's three *No Treason* pamphlets. There's 1, 2, and 6, and in the preface of 6, he says he's publishing it ahead of numbers 3, 4, and 5, which as far as we know, were never actually written before he died. And most people are only familiar with *No. 6*. A lot of the versions of it you find on Amazon today would just say *No Treason: A Constitution of No Authority*, so they think it's the complete work, but *No Treasons 1* and *2* were shorter works that outline some of the arguments that he made in *No. 6*.

But in *No. 1*, which is just called *No Treason* with no subtitle, the basic thesis of the pamphlet is that the Civil War demonstrates that the Union government believed that it was morally acceptable to force men to submit. That was the thesis of the pamphlet, and it sets the theme for all of the *No Treason* writings. So by waging the war against the South, as Spooner put it, you're basically replacing chattel slavery with political slavery, because we can't maintain a facade of a voluntary government if we're forcing these people to be a part of it at gunpoint. And that's right up front in *No Treason No. 1*.

WOODS: Okay, so that's the connection. As I say, I've got an episode where I go through and deal with Spooner's arguments. But I love the emails I get from people who say I'm just getting into all this stuff and I'm listening to every one of your episodes I possibly can, and there are people for whom Spooner is brand new. And I envy those people. How fun life must be that you're just getting into Spooner. He's got a number of arguments, but how would you give a basic thumbnail sketch of what he's saying about government and consent?

CALTON: Well, that statement is really the integral part of it, is if people aren't governed voluntarily, then they're slaves. So that's the theme of the whole argument, and then he elaborates on things like, you have an episode talking about people didn't sign the Constitution. And that's one of Spooner's arguments where the Constitution can't bind people that – you know, this is a social contract argument. Nobody alive today signed the Constitution, so how could it bind them? And then he goes, even at the time, the vast majority of the people it was supposedly binding didn't sign it.

And that's actually one of the most important points in understanding his transition of thought, because he never kind of questioned that in the 1840s when he was defending the Constitution. It never seems to have occurred to him, that logical contradiction. So he had all of the foundational ideas in natural rights that led him to this conclusion, but it wasn't until the Civil War came about that he started connecting these logical conclusions from their premises in natural rights. So he said people don't sign it.

And then another one that I really like that people don't talk about is his view on voting. In *No Treason No. 6* he has this scathing critique of the Australian ballot or the secret ballot, something that we take for granted today as just an axiomatic good. Of course people should have privacy in who they vote for. But Spooner said no, no, no, because by voting, you're voting to use a government to force themselves, to impose themselves on other people. And

so by voting to do this, you are that person's oppressor. But by making secret the voting with the secret ballot, which was very, very new in the middle of the 19th century – you used to be able to know who anybody voted for. But by making this secret, people don't know who specifically is oppressing them. And so that argument is one of my favorite ones in the *No Treason* pamphlets.

WOODS: Yeah, there are so many interesting arguments and points that he makes that sound like a modern libertarian made them two weeks ago.

CALTON: Right.

WOODS: And encountering them, especially when I pretty much had been exposed to Spooner only secondhand, and so I knew the gist of them, but I didn't realize how relentlessly he pushes it and how many different considerations he has. It goes well beyond simply the question of consent, although that is the crux of it, isn't it? Because of course in all human relations, consent is the key thing. If there's no consent, we don't consider something to be binding in any situation other than this one. Now, it's true that you can find – we talked about this on the show a few days ago – cases where there is implied consent. Like when you sit down to a meal at a restaurant, it's understood that at the end, you're going to pay.

CALTON: Right.

WOODS: Or there's a custom that you're going to tip the server and so on. But can you really compare something like that to we have the right to conscript you anytime we want and send you anywhere we want and put you in danger of life and limb anytime we want, and we're just going to assume you're okay with that. Somehow, that's a little bit different from ordering a piece of pie and being expected to pay for it.

CALTON: And Spooner actually addressed notions of implied consent as well. When he talked about immigrants that would come here and take oaths of loyalty, that was consent to him. He thought that was okay, but the citizens who were born here, born under the government, they take no such oath. They take no such voluntary contract, so to speak, so they can't be said to have consented. So he does kind of address that dilemma between people who move to this country and people who are born to this country, for instance.

WOODS: Let's talk for a minute about your *Historical Controversies* podcast over at the Mises Institute.

CALTON: Sure.

WOODS: I've heard rave reviews from people about it. People in my Facebook group – if you're not in my Facebook group, go over to SupportingListeners.com. I have people saying they would not be on Facebook at all if it weren't for this fun group. Well, anyway, they are big Chris Calton fans over there, let me tell you something.

CALTON: Thank you.

WOODS: They are absolutely enjoying that podcast so much, and they're been saying you've got to get this guy on. But sometimes people will say this guy makes good videos or this guy

does such and such, get him on. And then I don't know what — so then when I get him on, do I talk for like three minutes about each one? So I thought, no, I want to pick a good, juicy topic. I'll get you on, and then we'll talk about the podcast. So I can heartily recommend it to people. We're going to link to it at TomWoods.com/1086. It covers quite a diverse range of topics and includes a lot of interesting information about those topics. So tell us how it got started and some of the juicy issues that you've raised on it.

CALTON: Forgive me. Are you talking about the podcast or the YouTube channel?

WOODS: Oh, the podcast.

CALTON: Oh, sure. Well, how it got started is kind of just a funny, casual story. I was a fellow at the Mises Institute this past summer, and you know, you come and talk to us out there sometimes before Mises U, so you know we like to sit around in circles and drink alcohol and just chit chat at night when there's not much else to do. And just one evening when everybody else had gone to bed, Tho Bishop just brought up to me, like, "Hey, have you ever thought about doing a podcast?" And I said, "Sure, I've thought about it." And that was pretty much the start of it, is why don't you do a history podcast since you study history. And of course the big dilemma we had is how are we going to offer something that Tom Woods isn't already offering between his podcast and Liberty Classroom?

So the way I figured I'd go about doing it is trying to tell more of a story than a lecture. I like diving into the details. Not everything there is necessarily something that has a libertarian lesson, but everything I think has interesting details, interesting stories, and I try to dive into some stuff that people won't know. But the first season of it was on my favorite historical topic, which is the war on drugs, and then now we got into the Civil War, which is of course going to be a much bigger topic than I anticipated. I thought I'd already be through the antebellum years by now, and I still have several episodes left to record on that. And then the war, who knows how long that'll take? So I don't know what I'll do after that, but I'll probably try to jump to something — I don't know, Soviet history or something completely different to give a change of pace for a while.

WOODS: Can you give us just a juicy tidbit or two from your discussion of the war on drugs? Because a lot of libertarians are interested in that to the point where it's one of their top issues, and it would be hard to find stuff that libertarians don't know about the war on drugs.

CALTON: Yeah, so here's my favorite anecdote that most people do not know on the war on drugs, and it's just kind of a double whammy for libertarians. So after cocaine was criminalized — Well, I should actually back up. Everybody knows that Coca Cola had cocaine in it, and this is usually overstated. When you ingest cocaine orally, it's a lot more benign, and there was such a small amount in it that it wouldn't have been harmful. It would have been not very different from caffeine itself at the time when you would actually have drunk a Coca Cola with cocaine in it. But Coca Cola got rid of this in 1903 before cocaine was criminalized or even regulated. It didn't have its first regulation until 1906, for example, so they didn't need the government to get cocaine out of Coca Cola.

But shortly after cocaine was criminalized in 1914, they also passed laws regulating the import of coca leaves. And this was a very cronyist law, because cocaine was still used for like numbing agents for small surgeries, localized surgeries like eye surgeries. And you know, we use Novocain still at the dentist. So we needed to import cocaine, but they gave a license

to import this to a single company. I actually can't remember the name of it now, but today it's Maywood and Company is what it's called, and it still has this license to this very day. And they extract the cocaine alkaloid and they give it to a single pharmaceutical company that's allowed to fashion it into drugs, and then they take the coca leaves and they make a flavoring ingredient called Merchandise no. 5 that then they're only legally allowed to sell Coca Cola. So people think Coca Cola has its unique formula because they have a trademark or they keep their formula in a vault or something like that. That's not it at all. It's because the government will not grant any other soft drink company a license to purchase coca leaf flavoring ingredient from this company, Maywood, except for Coca Cola.

And this was such a big controversy around World War II that there were other soft drink companies trying to get a coca leaf flavoring. It doesn't even have cocaine in it at this point, just the flavoring. And Harry Anslinger, the godfather of the war on drugs, wouldn't allow it. And one of the companies at the time that had a license to access coca leaves was owned by a German, and he was going to have his company confiscated in the United States and sold to the highest bidder. And the only person who wanted to buy it was a guy named S.B. Penick, who had been for years trying to get a license to purchase coca leaf flavoring. And one of the executives of Coca Cola wrote a letter to his friend Harry Anslinger, who said, you know what? We're not going to confiscate this German-American's company because we don't want to have to give this license to use coca leaf flavoring to anybody other than Coca Cola. So it's like he actually did the right thing by not confiscating this guy's property but for so anti-libertarian reasons.

So it's such a funny example of cronyism, as well as the war on drugs, that still exists today. All these laws are still on the books. Coca Cola is the only company able to flavor anything with coca leaves in this country.

WOODS: Ah, how about that? All right, see? There you go. Now imagine a whole podcast full of stuff like that. *Historical Controversies* is the name of it. As I said, we're going to link to it at TomWoods.com/1086 so you can start listening immediately. Chris has a YouTube channel. I will also link to that on the show notes page. And of course I'm going to link to your paper over at LibertarianPapers.org on Spooner. So plenty of great stuff to check out at TomWoods.com/1086. Well, Chris, thanks for your time today. Great discussion.

CALTON: Thank you. Thank you for having me on.