



Episode 1,382: Lew Rockwell on the 2020 Democrats, and Everything Else

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: I told the folks in my supporting listeners group that you were coming back and wanted to solicit some questions, and they were just beside themselves with joy. *Oh, these are some of our favorite episodes. Thank goodness, we're going to hear from Lew again.* So you good folks, if you want to be in that supporting listeners group where all the cool, smart, no-nonsense libertarians are to be found, SupportingListeners.com is how to get in there.

So I want to start with a fun question, and then we're going to get into the depressing questions like the state of the Democratic Party. And we could also talk about the Republican Party, but given that the Democrats this time – I mean, you and I talked a lot about Republicans four years ago when we covered every single Republican debate. Now it's the Democrats' turn. But the first question I want to ask you is one we definitely covered in the past, but it's in the real distant past, and it's an evergreen kind of question. I, probably two to three weeks ago, was telling people on this podcast that Murray Rothbard has another book coming out, this in the 24th year since his death. Yeah, it's unbelievable. It's Volume 5 of *Conceived in Liberty*, taking the American story up through the Constitution and Bill of Rights. And I talked about my impressions of it, having read it myself. And I mention that just because I bet I've got a sliver of listeners who actually are not even familiar with the name. But Rothbard is, to my mind, the most important libertarian intellectual. He put everything together: economics, history, philosophy, all of it. He's unbelievably prolific, just an irreplaceable person in every way. So this question is just on a personal level. How did the two of you meet? What were the circumstances?

ROCKWELL: We first met at Arlington House Publishers, which was the publishing house that both Murray and Mises and Henry Hazlitt and many other great people, under the aegis of the great Neil McCaffrey, who was the president of it, and this was when Murray was first agreeing to do, signing the contract for *Conceived in Liberty*, what was to be the five-volume set and now, thank goodness, is the five-volume set, from the earliest American history up through the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And I didn't get to know Murray really well until later, but course he was so funny, so charming. Among all his other abilities, he was like a standup comedian, so that when he was in a room, everybody gathered around him, and you were not in his presence for more than just a few minutes before you were laughing out loud. I mean, he was so funny, whether he was talking about politics or about people, just funny people, awful people. He was just so learned and also, I might add, unlike some other geniuses, he was not full of himself.

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL: He was a humble guy, actually. So he was just an extraordinary man, and again, so smart, so learned, and we're so lucky to have his books at the Mises Institute. We have all those papers and, by the way, the next – I'll break it to you: the next Rothbard work coming out is his collected letters and memos that David Gordon is doing. So this will be a multivolume set. And Murray's letters, people don't write letters like this anymore.

WOODS: No, they don't.

ROCKWELL: So funny, so interesting, just so learned. And of course, he's writing to people and telling them things about their own area that they didn't know.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: But in such a humble way that people were never put off. And so this is the next Rothbard work. It'll be several years, and David's putting it together, but he's thrilled to be doing it. We're thrilled, of course, to have him do it. And I've always thought that Murray thought of David as a son. I remember once seeing David coming into the dining room of a hotel where we were staying, and I was having breakfast with Murray, and David was coming in too. And the way Murray looked at him, I thought, this is Murray's son, the son Murray would have loved to have had, had he had a son. And David, again, somebody who's so smart, so funny, so interesting, and somebody who knows everything, so that he has to do very little research, although it's a vast amount of work still, of course, to annotate these tremendous letters. So these are letters to all the great libertarians. And I'll tell you, you've read some of them. You know I'm not exaggerating when I say these are – I mean, I've never seen letters like this.

WOODS: I'm so thrilled that this is happening. I didn't know about this till you mentioned it just now. What a great idea for a project, because the meat contained in these letters – in fact, I have to say a couple of things about this. First, one of my favorite stories about Murray's letters involves Bob Higgs. And I'm sure you know this story, because Higgs was had just finished the manuscript for *Crisis of Leviathan*, which was his classic book from '87. So he sent it around, and he sent it to Rothbard, who looked it over. And then he said, I received this letter – I forget how many single-spaced pages it was.

ROCKWELL: It was like 27 pages.

WOODS: Right, and he said, I realized that if I had five lifetimes, I could not follow up on all the bibliographical recommendations Rothbard made in his letter. He said, but what I loved in particular was when the book came out, Murray sang its praises in his review and never once was there even a mention of the unfollowed-up-on bibliographic suggestions in his letter to me. There was none of that. It was only, *This is a tremendous work, and we're very much in Higgs's debt*. So I love that.

Second thing is, I myself am in possession of a letter by Rothbard that he wrote to me, a short one, but I treasure that thing, and that thing ain't going nowhere. It's hidden with my gold coins, stuff you'll never find. You'll never get that out of me. I don't care what the – waterboarding, you're never going to get that out of me.

The David Gordon thing, I remember you wrote the introduction to a – maybe it was the multivolume David Gordon collection –

ROCKWELL: His book reviews, yes.

WOODS: Yeah, book reviews. And you quoted from what Murray said about David, about, first of all, he reported to somebody, "Today I met a universal genius," the first day he met David Gordon. And then there's a letter that he writes to David himself saying, now look, I don't think you appreciate how brilliant you are, and it is a crime that you are not a household name, and we are going to do everything we can to turn that around.

Okay, just a couple more things. I'm sorry, but this means so much to me. Joe Biden had this event in Florida not long ago, and like Hillary and like other prominent politicians, he has this set of particular requirements, where the interviewer must be sitting, the types of questions that may be asked, the precise drinks that are to be waiting for him in the green room, the precise dinner he is to be served: angel hair pomodoro; he wants raspberry biscotti. He's got the whole thing laid out. And yet, in the grand scheme of things, he's a nothing. What has he contributed to the human race? Whereas Rothbard as you're saying, the idea that he would say, Now, when I show up, everyone should be standing and there should be a dinner served with this – right? And yet, if anyone had a right to do that, it would be Rothbard.

And then finally, I just want to mention I did an episode, number 1369 of this show, called "Church Politics in the Age of Francis" with Roger McCaffrey, the son of Neil, the son of the founder of Arlington House. And in opening that episode, I reminded everybody, if your libertarian history, you know the significance of Arlington House and, therefore, Roger's family, in keeping our tradition alive and publishing these people. But it seems to me Arlington House played a really significant role not just in the libertarian movement, but in your life, because wasn't it also because of an Arlington House project that you got to meet Mises?

ROCKWELL: No, it was one of the great moments of my life when Neil McCaffrey called me into his office and he said, "How would you like to be Ludwig von Mises' editor?"

WOODS: And you thought, Yeah, all right, I've got some time.

ROCKWELL: Because I was gobsmacked. I was just a young guy, and, well, of course it, I would say, shaped my entire life. And Neil was just a brilliant guy and a great Catholic theologian and historian too. I mean, he knew everything about the Church. And he was very sound on everything, I might add too. And so Roger follows in his footsteps.

WOODS: Yeah, no doubt, he's such a tremendous guy. As long as we're talking about Murray Rothbard, how did you make the transition, the jump from – I guess at one point you were a Goldwaterite, and then maybe you became a libertarian. How did you go all the way to ancap, which, you know, that's a big chasm to cover? How did you do that?

ROCKWELL: Well, it was really because of Murray. It's true. I've been a libertarian-oriented Goldwater guy, and I love Barry Goldwater, I think probably wrongly, but anyway, he gave him, for a college guy, a huge donation. I worked in his campaign. And it was funny, in Massachusetts, in those days, the entire official party left the campaign. They wanted nothing

to do with it go with Barry Goldwater whatsoever. And so those of us who were just kids could have significant jobs, and so it was a lot of fun and tremendously interesting. And that just a great moment. But I always had a slight problem with Barry's – and I must say, I didn't have it worked out, but I always has a slight problem with his foreign policy, the business of sending a bomb into the men's room at the Kremlin and that kind of stuff I did. I must say I didn't like that.

But it was only when I first started reading Murray and read his newsletter that I became an anarchist. And it was, for me, not a difficult transition whatsoever. I thought it just made all the sense in the world. And so but when I really got to know Murray well, I was already an anarchist. I'm not one of those was who was transformed by Murray, but I was transformed by his writings. And I also liked the books he wrote, and I was just tremendously impressed by him from the moment I met him. And you know what I'm talking about. In fact, it was one of my great memories. We had the Mises University in Claremont College in California, when Murray wanted to meet you, and so I got you two together. You were talking together, just going at it, and it was about two and a half hours later that I came back, and you're still talking. And I thought that is so great. And I thought this is going to have a tremendous effect on Tom's life, which of course, it did have.

WOODS: I have cherished those moments forever, absolutely, and will continue to do so. On this subject of foreign policy, I saw a poll recently, and now I can't find it, unfortunately, but in which Democrats and Republicans were asked about whether they thought it was important for the United States to be engaged in world affairs – which is always a euphemism, right? But you know, we know what it means, and most people polled know what it means. And it was interesting to see the trend, that the Republicans' "yes" answer to that has been going down, and the Democrats' "yes" answer to that has been going up. Do you think that's a real phenomenon? I think that's real. I think that's actually happening.

ROCKWELL: I think it's real. I think the Democrats are becoming worse, and the Republicans better, so it's unfortunate what's happening to the Democrats, but I'm of course glad it's happening to the Republicans. I wish it were happening to President Trump, but that's, I think, another matter.

WOODS: Yeah, and you know, sometimes he stands up to people and you think, well, gee, he's got some guts. And then he does some crazy, erratic thing, like he's going to announce US support for, acknowledging Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights, and then you read an article, how did he come to this conclusion? I was just telling Paul Gottfried about this; he hadn't seen this. It was like a three-minute conversation he had, where he said, "Give me a quick briefing. What's going on over there? I need it quick. I've got other things to do. Give me the quick story." And he said, "All right, we're doing this." Now, there are some things, like all you would need is a three-minute briefing on agriculture subsidies, for instance, to make a good decision on that. On this, I think you need more than a three-minute briefing [laughing]. Oh, man, is that frustrating.

So let's now – I think, Lew, unfortunately, the time has come. There's no stalling any further, where we have to say something about the Democratic Party. But let's talk specifically about the Democratic field. There are a lot of candidates who have announced, just like the Republican field we talked about in the last cycle. What's your assessment of them?

ROCKWELL: Well, of all of them, of course, I like the Tulsi Gabbard the best, and I like her for the fact that they want to kill her. So anybody that the interventionists and the statistis want to kill is okay with me. So I hope that she actually turns out to be as good as she seems to be. We'll just have to see. As to the rest of them, whether it's Biden or Beto O'Rourke or Faux-cahontas, these are not impressive people. And I think they're not impressing even the Democrats. I think that they're really a terrible bunch. The leader is, of course, Walter Block's schoolmate from Brooklyn, and –

WOODS: Bernie Sanders, for folks who don't know.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, and maybe he's not the craziest, because he actually is not the – it's odd to say – not the wackiest Democrat. They all, of course, want reparations, so-called; they all want more welfare; they all want open borders, and all the rest of that. But actually, he's the one person who said we don't actually want open borders, because if we have open borders and a generous welfare state – of course Milton Friedman made this same point – the whole country will come down. You can't actually have such a thing. So I've not heard him criticized for that, because everybody else says, no, no, we must have open borders, we must bring in the entire world to live off the American people. So I don't know. Maybe this is all calculated. Maybe he's just smarter than the other ones. But it's pretty pathetic if a socialist is the least crazy guy.

WOODS: Well, what I'm curious to hear are your thoughts about the likelihood of a Joe Biden candidacy, which seems almost 100%. But what about the likely success or failure of it?

ROCKWELL: Well, I'd like to think that the whole touchy-feely business will damn him, but who knows? These things don't apply to their own people. They apply to Republicans or conservatives or libertarians, but they don't apply to their own people. So I guess we'll just have to see. But it seems to me he's just a nut. I mean, there's something basically wrong with him, and I'm not talking about here the touchy-feely business. There's just something wrong with him, and so my guess is he doesn't actually have a chance, even though I think he is number two to Bernie in standing in the Democratic primary – quote, unquote, primary – so far. But my guess is it's not going to happen, and I think that they're going to hurt themselves if they say, well, really, Me Too stuff doesn't apply to our guys. So of course, the whole thing is crazy. He's crazy, and I do find it interesting that Obama is not defending him, Obama who said he was the greatest vice president in American history, although I guess that's not exactly much of a standard. But I don't think Biden can do it. I think that Trump would easily beat Biden. I think that's probably not true, unfortunately, of Bernie, but he would easily beat Biden. I don't think Biden, frankly, has a chance. We'll see if I'm right or wrong in saying that.

WOODS: Yeah, see, my concern is I do think Biden is not as formidable opponent as people have thought. But Bernie's issue is he would be throwing out all kinds of misinformation that leads people to think socialism is a good idea. And Trump, being totally uninterested in being briefed on anything, he's going to have nothing to say except slogans to respond to that. Now, you may say, Woods, listen, he got by pretty darn well with slogans in the past, and don't you tell him how – but this is different. I mean, he was up against Hillary Clinton, who had no passionate support. There was no – but there is passionate support for Bernie, even from people who should be suspicious of the guy, given that he endorsed Hillary, which is something that Ron would never have done. Ron Paul would never have endorsed any of the

creepy Republicans he was up against. And that tells you something about the kind of guy Bernie is.

But even if you get Biden as the nominee, you're just holding off the socialist transformation. And by "socialist," obviously, I don't mean in the Marxian sense, but you are just holding off for a brief time the transformation of the Democratic Party. It seems just unavoidable that you are going to get a nominee like that at some point. And the other side just doesn't have the will or the knowledge or the fire or the principle or anything to really stand up against it in a really principled and exciting way. I just don't see it in Trump or anybody else. But you're right about the weakness of the field. I just saw a poll today saying that Elizabeth Warren is registering at third place in her own state of Massachusetts. That's terrible. Which is a good thing, because I think she is actually one of the worst.

ROCKWELL: She is one of the worst, but I think she was killed by the Faux-cahontas.

WOODS: Oh, that just — that was an unforced error, as it's sometimes called. Nobody told her to do that DNA thing. She didn't have to do that. Then she not only does it; she idiotically releases the results as if they vindicate her. And the media tried defending her for the first 24 hours, remember? They tried for 24 hours saying, oh, it's only the crazies who are going after her for this and then, and then I think some of them said, you know what? This is a bridge too far, even for us. Sorry, this one's not happening. No, I think things have changed even in the past 10 years. I think, even 10 years ago, it wasn't to the point where everybody who disagreed with Elizabeth Warren was a racist, to the point where there's no point in having a conversation with any of these people.

But I remember about 10 years ago, maybe it was 12 years ago, Bob Murphy and I actually just on a recent episode of *Contra Krugman* mentioned this, about that much time ago, you had Naomi Wolf, on your podcast — I think you've had a run more than once. But there was one episode in particular, where you kept her on for about 50 minutes, and you started — I mean, in not even remotely a condescending way, but you were kind of, frankly, educating her about the Federal Reserve and talking about stuff that ought to appeal to progress and has always amazed me that they couldn't be less interested. And she was very receptive. And we decided on *Contra Krugman* as one of the best examples we've seen of one of our people talking to a progressive. And it's so funny, because your reputation among left libertarians is like the great Satan. And yet you made more progress with Naomi Wolf in that one thing than they have in their entire careers. In fact, I'll link to it at TomWoods.com/1382, so you folks can listen for yourselves.

I don't know if that that you could really accomplish that anymore, because nobody wants to listen on that side of things. But how did you do that? I mean, suppose you had a progressive over lunch who wasn't going to call you a racist and all the usual nonsense terms. What would be the way you would appeal to that person?

ROCKWELL: Well, you're right. The Fed I thought was an issue — of course, I think this should apply to all progressive, but as you pointed out, somehow it never does. They all love the Fed. Of course, you mentioned Pope Francis earlier. He loves — or rather, has never criticized central banks, ever, even though he blames everybody else for everything, capitalism and so forth, as evil. But I just found her interested and I began talking to her. And part of it, I think, was that I liked her. I mean, I thought she was a very interesting lady. I don't agree with her, obviously, on everything or even on most things. But I thought she was a

very likable person, a very smart person, and maybe that had an effect. It was not an antagonistic show, which I must say, I don't like doing antagonistic shows anyway. So I won't be having Bernie on.

WOODS: [laughing] Right, right. Yeah, you're right. She was willing to listen, she was interested, and she treated it as, well, I disagree with this person, but sometimes you learn something from people you disagree with, and I'll see what he has to say. And this seems like an amazing novelty, like this is worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize that this was even possible to happen.

Now, I want to shift gears completely and get your thoughts about the upshot. I know we haven't seen the full report yet, but what are the long-term consequences in your opinion of the Russiagate fiasco, if any?

ROCKWELL: Well, it ought to be damning to all those people who were promoting the Russia hoax. They ought to all be wearing sackcloth and ashes and going on pilgrimages to Rome to apologize. But somehow they don't. Somehow every lie they told is nothing to be worried about, and now they of course move on to other lies. But I think and hope that this really is going to have a tremendous effect, even though Trump, it seems to me, he's not really taking advantage of it, because he's moved on to the subsequent 12 things. But I think and hope that they are going to be permanently tarred by what they did and by the lies they told, especially the people in the media. I mean, the Democratic politicians are all evil, and we know they're terrible, and so are the Republican politicians, of course, for the most part, except Ron Paul. But I'd like to think that the Democrats are going to be, again, tarred permanently, but what they did, and I'm not worried that there's stuff to come out in the Mueller report that nobody knows about yet.

So I think this was a great thing. I know I have friends who have been accused of being tools of Russia and that kind of thing, like so many others, who were just so relieved when this news came out. I mean, they were just — I didn't realize quite how worried they'd been about being themselves tarred as tools of the Kremlin.

So I think it's a quite wonderful thing. I'm looking forward to seeing what the bigger report will say. Will he turn over the whole thing? I guess that's up to Trump. Apparently, it's illegal for Mueller or for the Attorney General to turn over things that are from grand jury testimony and other things. You're not supposed to turn that over, so we'll see what happens. But of course, the Democrats are going to keep calling for it. But it seems to me like the Attorney General is not going to go along with it, so we'll have to see. But, of course, the Republicans, it doesn't seem to me, they're not jumping on this. Maybe there's Nunez and a few others, but most of them are just, I must say, ridiculous, and they're all just Never Trumpers; they're all just people who are on the side of the Democrats, and they don't want to criticize anything that the Democrats do. And they really are a terrible bunch. Both sides of the political spectrum are really quite horrible. But I still think that the people — just if we look at what happened to the CNN and MSNBC's unbelievable drop in their ratings, like a 50% drop in the ratings in the first day. Their audience just disappeared. So that I thought was quite wonderful. And these are, of course, progressives, who were hoping that Trump and his family were going to be put in jail. They openly were hoping that. So I don't know, I shouldn't mention that recently I've been red-baited for the first time in my life.

WOODS: Oh, what's that all about?

ROCKWELL: Well, I shouldn't name the two guys, both of whom, by the way have CIA backgrounds, who've been going around, sending stuff that Rockwell – what they referred to as Lew Rockwell libertarians are pro-communist

WOODS: Of course, what else would we be? Yeah

ROCKWELL: Why is that? Because of not wanting the Trump administration to intervene in Venezuela.

WOODS: Oh, yeah, well, what other explanation for that could there be?

ROCKWELL: [laughing] So I thought it was quite funny.

WOODS: Well, and that really gets to the heart of the Russiagate thing. There were some, as you know, because you publish some of them some good, and I mean good writers on the progressive left, who saw through Russiagate from the start.

ROCKWELL: Yes.

WOODS: And I hold them in very, very high regard for standing up in a way that got them basically blacklisted from outlets where they had appeared for years. It was very, very hard for them to just stand up and tell the truth. But of course, the correct position to take on this was, first of all, it's baseless and obviously so. But secondly, why are Democrats pushing this, of all possible things? There are a lot of things you could say against Trump. And there are a lot of things he needs to be called to account for. But more of those things than they themselves want to admit, their own party has been guilty of, Obama was guilty of. So you can't go after Trump on Yemen, because Obama connived at that too. So therefore, you come up with this crazy conspiracy that has no basis in fact, and you hammer him on that, and meanwhile, all the things that a progressive should be upset about, they wind up and page B38. And that's what the progressives were trying to say. But the left or the establishment left that pushed this thing, the thing is, what fundamentally characterizes them is, unlike the mythical left that wanted to burn it all down, these people love the regime. They love the empire. They love the CIA. They love the FBI. The very fact that someone could question what our intelligence services say makes them appalled. And these are supposed to be the bold progressive leftists? This is unbelievable. So they love this thing, and so they want to push a narrative that obviously benefits the empire and the deep state. This is what they want, because these are the institutions they fundamentally love.

ROCKWELL: It's absolutely true. I mean, they are evil, and they love the evil which is the CIA and FBI and all the rest. And what are they, allegedly 16 so-called intelligence agencies. ONI – I'm remembering the whole long list of evil. But yeah, MSNBC, CNN, I must say, I don't look at these networks anymore, but they were just horrendous, and they found it outrageous that anybody would criticize the FBI. And yet, we now know that the people who did criticize the FBI typically did so in a way that was far too easy on the FBI. And probably the real danger is, of course, the CIA, and I noticed that the Republicans are saying we have to look into the FBI, we have to look into the Department of Justice. Well, yeah, okay, but what about the CIA? Well, that's somehow already dropping out. And quite terrible.

WOODS: A couple more quick things. I know you know that Bob Murphy and I have a weekly podcast. This one runs every weekday, *The Tom Woods Show*, but I do a weekly podcast with Bob Murphy called *Contra Krugman*, and we go after a Paul Krugman column every week. And we now have a new feature of the program, because Krugman just came right out and said in one of his columns there's no question that there was collusion and all these brazen statements. So we now have a new segment of *Contra Krugman*, and instead of "avoidance," we're using the word avoision, because a *Simpsons* character used that word. So we're calling it the Krugman collusion avoision meter, and this meter dings for every column since the release of the Mueller report that Krugman himself has not acknowledged the existence of the Mueller report. And as of last week, we were up to five dings, five columns had been written. And I just checked, it's been two more columns, no mention of the Mueller report. Now, suppose the report had come out and said, yeah, Trump is basically a Russian spy. I'm pretty sure the avoision meter wouldn't have rung once. So there's a slight double standard.

And that goes to show, by the way, if I were a political consultant, and I mean like not one of these establishment – most political consultants are terrible, but one who actually wanted to win and not just collect a salary – the ads I would make – because I could imagine myself being president, let's say, and they're constantly going after me for nonsense stuff about nothing like Russiagate. I would think to myself, you know what? I'm going to use this against you in my reelection. I'm going to make ads where I'm going to compile all the people who said I couldn't possibly win, and then I'm going to have my big, fat grin at the end, with cheering crowds and say, "They didn't think it was possible. You made it possible." That's how I'd rally my base. Or I would compile all the crazy wild things they've said about me, and then I would put the headline with the correction, and then I would say, "Have you ever seen a president who has been hit harder than I have? Why do you think they're doing that? Is it because they don't like my suits? Is it because it's – It's because I'm the first one who stood up for you." I mean, I would spin it that way. Even if it's not true, I'd spin it that way. And I would make lemonade out of lemons. I think that is the way to go. Now, they won't do that, but I think that'd be very effective. It certainly would rally his folks. And it would make at least some fair-minded people say, oh, yeah, there is something a little unusual about the media's behavior isn't there [laughing]?

ROCKWELL: Tom, you'd be a great candidate, by the way, and I don't mean as a libertarian, either.

WOODS: That's very good of you to say. You know, we should maybe talk off the air. I don't know if you heard the rumor about Jacob Hornberger, but he has considered throwing his hat into the ring, which would be interesting.

ROCKWELL: No, it's my understanding he is running.

WOODS: Oh, well, I don't know that there's an official announcement.

ROCKWELL: That may be right.

WOODS: I do know that he gives everyone authorization to go talk it up, so I'll take that. I'll take what I can get. I love that guy. Before I let you go, do you still have – last time we spoke, you had a forthcoming book. Is that on its way out soon?

ROCKWELL: It is on its way out soon, and Hans Hoppe was good enough to write an introduction to it, which I hope to have shortly, and then we'll get it out.

WOODS: [laughing] All right, so is that your way of saying we need to fly to Turkey and hound Hans, or do we think this is coming? All right, well, that's great. Can you tell us the title?

ROCKWELL: *Against the Left.*

WOODS: Oh, all right, good.

ROCKWELL: And so I talk about the libertarian left, as well as the more generalized left.

WOODS: Oh, just the other day somebody sent me a screenshot of a left libertarian who was saying – I'm not smearing all – I even have a few friends in that camp – but where he said, "The Nazis were evil, but the communists were just wrong." And then he even says, exact quote, and just to be perfectly explicit, "No, I do not think the USSR was evil." And so one of the people in my supporting listeners group – this is why you should join at SupportingListeners.com, this is the kind of people you have in there. Somebody said, "Well, look, the guy's right. I mean, come on, it's happened to all of us, right? You've been trying to do good, and you accidentally starve millions of people. Come on, we've all been there."

ROCKWELL: [laughing]

WOODS: [laughing] So terrific. All right, well, look, obviously, Lew, we're really, really looking forward to the release of that book, and everybody is grateful that we've had you back on, we had this time together. Thanks so much.

ROCKWELL: Tom, I'm grateful to you, and thank you; it's an honor to be on your show.