



Episode 1,499: The Neocon Takeover of the American Right

Guest: Paul Gottfried

WOODS: I've had a number of episodes, I've told you, where I've taken a guest I've had on multiple times and just gone back in time and reconstructed that person's intellectual development. And even though, well, there's never any shortage of things you and I could discuss from the headlines, I thought today, that's what I wanted to do. Now, you have a PhD from Yale, the second best university in America.

GOTTFRIED: [laughing] Right, you went to the best.

WOODS: Of course. But I want to know about the young Paul Gottfried. First of all, are you one of these people who has a story to tell us of moving from the left to the right or anything like that? How did you start off? Who were you in the beginning?

GOTTFRIED: Well, with my political development, there was only a period of about maybe six weeks when I was in my teens, when I came through regard myself as a Marxist. I don't know why I thought that, you know, there should not be any laboring class, we should all be able to divide up income equally, or something like this. But it only lasted about six weeks. And I think what was left me disillusioned was visiting New York City and seeing an exhibit put up by the Soviet Union on technological advances under communism. And I thought the people who were there, who were probably dressed well by Stalinist standards, looked absolutely shabby. And the stuff that they were showing, washing machines and electrical equipment, sort of looked like the stuff that my grandparents would have thrown away. And after watching this, I went back to being, I suppose, a conservative Republican. I think I was a Republican even while I was a Marxist, during the period of six weeks. And then in graduate school, I remained a Republican, but I was sort of an East Coast Republican. I supported Rockefeller —

WOODS: No, you did not.

GOTTFRIED: I did. In 1964, I supported Rockefeller against Goldwater. And I was very happy to discover that James Burnham made exactly the same decision.

WOODS: Really? I would never have guessed.

GOTTFRIED: You would never have guessed, but I was; I was a liberal Republican.

WOODS: I also wouldn't have guessed about James Burnham, either.

GOTTFRIED: He was. He was. I wrote an article for an anthology that came out with Rowman & Littlefield, or whatever it was, on James Burnham, in it which I tried to explain why he was a Rockefeller Republican in 1964, despite the fact that he was, in terms of his worldview, on the very, very far right. And it seems that he thought that Rockefeller would be the only Republican who would be able to win, since he thought the country was moving toward the left — and he was probably right — and he thought that the Republicans would be more able to prosecute the Cold War, which was of course the big issue for Burnham at the time. I supported a Rockefeller or Scranton, because I thought they were part of the Eastern WASP establishment, who I suppose were predestined by God to govern America [laughing]. They were sort of the proper ruling class for the country, you see. I thought Rockefeller and a few of the liberal Republicans, East Coast Republicans like Clifford Case in New Jersey and Hugh Scott in Pennsylvania, were WASP patricians. They had a right to govern. Whereas Goldwater came from some strange part of the country in which people were Cold War fanatics and so forth. So I was, in fact, a Rockefeller Republican in '64.

WOODS: Whereas now, the fact that somebody comes from the East Coast establishment is pretty much reason enough for you to oppose that person.

GOTTFRIED: Exactly. Exactly. My perception of the East Coast has changed radically in the intervening 50 years or more.

WOODS: See? I knew there was a story to tell here.

GOTTFRIED: [laughing] Right.

WOODS: All right, so when you went off to Yale — now, hold on a minute. That was your PhD. Where'd you go undergrad?

GOTTFRIED: I went to Yeshiva University. I was given a scholarship, and my parents being very, very thrifty German Jews, decided that I should attend the school because it would be free. My brother went to Cornell, which cost a heap of money. So I went to Yeshiva University for four years, which, I did not enjoy myself very much. I didn't like the other students, although I did have some very good professors who got me interested in the study of European history.

WOODS: Why were you a conservative Republican, by the way? Was it the influence of your parents?

GOTTFRIED: My mother was Republican, and I hated the Democrats because they were all Irish machine politicians. Now, I have to say in retrospect, I'd be delighted to have those Irish machine politicians back —

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah, I know.

GOTTFRIED: And I would vote for them. I would stuff the ballot box for them. But at the time, I thought they were sort of lower-class types, you know? And whereas all the local Republicans — I can't say I was a conservative Republican, since it was sort of the local WASP patricians who were Republicans, and they were people that I sort of looked up to at the time. And also, German Jews tended to be Republicans, although sort of liberal, sort of like

Kissinger in a sense. They were sort of liberal East Coast Republicans. I can't say I was really conservative. I did have misgivings about Franklin Roosevelt, but mostly because he was a Democrat. I didn't know very much else about the guy.

WOODS: Ah, okay. All right, so there's still plenty of education of Paul Gottfried to go on.

GOTTFRIED: Yes, there was a lot of education that would follow, or disillusionment.

WOODS: So did you major in history as an undergraduate?

GOTTFRIED: I took mostly languages. I took four or five different languages. I think I was sort of a history minor, but I took French, German, Latin, a few other things.

WOODS: And then you wound up getting into Yale for history. What did you do your dissertation on?

GOTTFRIED: I did my dissertation on conservative romanticism in Germany. I became sort of interested in people like that, and more specifically, on Catholic romanticism. I think most of the German romantic movement was Catholic, sort of restorationist Catholic. And my book came out as something like *The Romantic Experience in Bavaria*, published by Fordham University Press. Murray thought that my ideology or my worldview was sort of based on the romantic experience in Bavaria. He wasn't quite sure what that is, and when he met me, he discovered that this was just a dissertation that I had written. I went on to other subjects afterwards.

WOODS: I want to just make sure that everybody knows we're talking about Murray Rothbard, for any of you newbies, the Mr. Libertarian at the time.

GOTTFRIED: Right.

WOODS: So I guess the other thing I want to know, because we both went to similar institutions for our graduate study: what was the climate at Yale like? I'm sorry, I don't mean to date you, but can you maybe situate us as to when this was?

GOTTFRIED: I don't mind being dated. I mean, by now, I'm ancient. But back, sort of like in the mid 1960s, most of my professors today would qualify as neoconservatives. They were mostly Cold War liberals, although generally not as anticommunist as they were anti-fascist. My study of German history was sort of dominated by sort of anti-German German refugees, who accepted the Fischer thesis about World War I, that it was a war entirely planned and launched by the Germans, because unlike the British, they did not have democratic values at the time. I thought it was rather fishy. The professor whom I enjoyed the most by far was Herbert Marcuse, and he was sort of an out-and-out communist sympathizer.

WOODS: Yeah, now, this is fascinating. I've always wanted to know your opinions on him, because I think I have a pretty conventional, right-of-center assessment of him, and maybe you have something where you find some value in him that I don't see. But I really, really would like to know your — I mean, did you have personal interactions with him?

GOTTFRIED: Yes, I think in comparison to people I've met in Conservatism, inc., let alone in the entire academic left, he was a very tolerant person. He was quite willing to entertain disagreement. And as I indicated in my autobiography, *Encounters*, once he asked someone in class to defend the side of the anti-socialists in the French revolutions of 1848. And I defended the bourgeoisie against the working class revolt, and argued furiously against the so-called working class revolution. They didn't really have many working class, mostly revolutionary agitators from the more educated classes. But I did argue furiously on the side of the counter-revolution, and he argued with me, and then he thanked me. You know, he said: you defended your position valorously. And he gave me an outstanding grade for that class.

Now, I could not imagine this happening in the classes of my Cold War liberal professors, or anybody else that I had, or these very intolerant anti-German Germans. So he stood out as a tolerant man. He also knew a great deal about German idealist philosophy, which he conveyed to me. I read his work and I read other works in German that he recommended. So I found my contact with him extremely fruitful, and I remember him as being a relatively pleasant man. He did go off the deep end later on when he went out to California and taught in San Diego and influenced people like Angela Davis. But when I knew him, he was not quite as deranged as he later became. In fact, he was a nice person. He was a very good professor, and taught me a great deal.

WOODS: My experience, I made a lot of good friends as an undergraduate, but in graduate school, at least in my program, I could be friendly to these people, but I didn't have anything in common with them, and I didn't particularly enjoy their company. I had to make my friends outside my academic circle. What would the other students like at Yale?

GOTTFRIED: Well, most of the students were ideologically leftist social snobs, and they would have very little to do with me because I was a Republican, and they were all left-wing Democrats with sympathy for the communists or the Soviets. They were certainly anti-capitalist. But there was a small circle of very right-wing students with whom I would hang out. One of them was a Hungarian I lost contact with named, Laszlo Bodgashi, I think whose uncle was shot after the war by the communists as some kind of right-wing collaborator of the German regime or something like that. Another person you may know is Bill Marschner, whom I've totally lost contact with. He became Catholic, very conservative Catholic, and his wife, Connie, was involved in all kinds of anti-abortion activities.

WOODS: I don't think I ever met him, but I think, was he at Christendom College?

GOTTFRIED: He was for a while. Yes, he may still be there, for all I know.

WOODS: So I know who he is, but we've never met.

GOTTFRIED: Right, right. But there were about 10 or 15 graduate students with whom I was friendly. Very few of them were in history. They tended to be in things like ancient Near Eastern studies or classics. But generally, I did not enjoy the company of other people in the history department, although I found that that once you got out of the field of modern European history, if you studied medieval or ancient history, my colleagues seemed much more normal, and they were less pretentious.

One of the things that I noticed when I was in graduate school was students walking around carrying what was then the newly created *New York Review of Books*. And if you were seen holding the *New York Review of Books*, and if you mentioned one of its contributors by his or her first name, that, won you, I suppose, merit or something in the minds of your fellow students. So you'd see these people walking around. Or if you quoted *Le Monde*, which was sort of typically pro-Soviet in its editorial policy. Or if you did things like deplore the fact that Germans could not be as good as members of the English Labor Party, or Americans couldn't be as good as members of the English Labor Party. So there were these people who sort of had vapors, were extremely pretentious, and invariably held these silly leftist views, which I can share.

WOODS: Well, yes, indeed. What would be some examples here, especially given the today, it's 2019, maybe these seem really conservative now?

GOTTFRIED: Well, that's true. No, no, I mean, by the current standard, these people were at the very least Nazis or something. I don't remember anyone ever coming out in favor of gay marriage. They simply considered homosexuals to be deviants. Another thing, which I think was sort of interesting, was that, although they were of course all against the Vietnam War, which meant they actually sided with the Viet Cong, when you get them on other questions, like the civil rights question, of course, they favored the civil rights movement and this sort of thing, but they did not have a particularly exalted view of black culture or black social life. I mean, they thought that, like the Germans, they'd have to be reeducated, you see. I mean, it was only later, maybe seven, eight years later, that you would hear the people praise the black underclass and their marvelous culture. And so this was not a characteristic view of my leftist fellow students when I was in graduate school.

WOODS: Yeah, now, that comes as a surprise for a lot of people. They don't realize that, as we've said on this show, the old left was culturally fairly bourgeois. As much as they denounced the bourgeoisie for its economic exploitation, they dressed like the bourgeoisie; they acted like the bourgeoisie; they spoke that way. You know, they had haircuts that looked like — you know, that's how they were.

GOTTFRIED: They were also extremely anti-homosexual.

WOODS: Yeah, nobody knows this. Nobody is aware of this. Almost nobody.

GOTTFRIED: Yeah, they keep this quiet, but I remember my late friend, Will Herbert, who'd been a member of the Communist Party one time, said that anybody who was thought to be a homosexual was kicked out of the party, at once. And of course, we know that in communist countries, homosexuals were put in concentration camps, as was done by Barack Obama's friend Fidel Castro.

WOODS: Yeah, that one's a little bit of an awkward —

GOTTFRIED: I'm doing this book on anti-fascism, which Cornell University Press is bringing out, and it is remarkable either the ignorance or amnesia of the current intersectional left, which is of course antifascist. It continues to glorify communist regimes, although communist regimes were far more intolerant of these strange lifestyles than the United States was up until 20 years ago.

WOODS: I think their view was that homosexuality was a bourgeois deviation of some kind.

GOTTFRIED: Yes, exactly. That was their view.

WOODS: And somehow, that's overlook-able for these people. They can overlook it for the commies, not for anybody else. They can overlook it there.

GOTTFRIED: From their perspective, the left is the French expression, *la gauche vers bloc*, that it's sort of a unified block, the entire left. I think it was Clemenceau who so said that. And they do not see any difference between the left as it exists now and the left the way it existed, I don't know, when the Soviet Union — or maybe it was a little different, or Castro's Cuba. The left was always good. It always held the values that it holds right now.

WOODS: Yeah. Well, now I'm curious about the values of a certain Paul Gottfried, because you get out of Yale with a PhD. Are you still a Rockefeller Republican?

GOTTFRIED: No, I think by then I changed. I became a Nixon Republican [laughing] in 1968.

WOODS: [laughing] Oh my gosh. I thought I had things to apologize for.

GOTTFRIED: Oh, no, no, no, it took me a long time to move. Sort of ideologically, I saw myself as being on the right, but I thought you needed to kind of moderate Republican in office, and became actually enthusiastic about Richard Nixon, during the presidential campaign in which he announced that Nixon is the one, you know, in 1968.

WOODS: At what point did you meet Pat Buchanan? Was that much later?

GOTTFRIED: Yeah, I did not meet Pat until the 1980s.

WOODS: Okay, because obviously, we all know about his work with Nixon.

GOTTFRIED: Right, right. And of course, you have to remember Buchanan was just a kind of — he was never a conventional speechwriter, but he worked for conventional Republicans for most of his career.

WOODS: Yes, he did, but man, could he write a speech. I remember reading — like he would write a speech for Spiro Agnew, and Agnew would just be delighted, just absolutely in his element. Whereas if he's working for Nixon, he'd realize, okay, there's certain things Nixon just won't say, whereas with Agnew, he'll say whatever you put in front of him.

GOTTFRIED: Exactly. Exactly. The "nattering nabobs of negativism."

WOODS: [laughing] That's right. That's right. So what was it that made you say, *You know what? To heck with the whole establishment, to heck with the moderate Republicans. I'm making a big change here?*

GOTTFRIED: Okay, in 1980, I was an alternate delegate for Ronald Reagan from Illinois, and was very much of a kind of Reagan Republican. And in fact, my name was affixed to a declaration of support for Reagan put out by the Heritage Foundation. What happened was

that I encountered the neoconservatives, and I saw how easily they took over the conservative movement and the Republican Party. And I think what happened to Mel Bradford in February of 1981 turned me around politically. And then, of course, things that subsequently happened did, which was the things that the neoconservatives did, sort of imposing their will on the conservative movement. And also, I was struck by the extent to which Reagan was taken in by neoconservatives and their rhetoric about global democracy. And this became particularly the case after I moved to Washington in 1986 and I was the editor of *The World* magazine.

WOODS: I remember that magazine, yeah.

GOTTFRIED: Right, I was passionately anti-neocon by then.

WOODS: Okay, so you observed the — I mean, the neocons started to become a phenomenon, I guess, really you could say in the late '60s, but really in the '70s, they came into their own.

GOTTFRIED: Right, right.

WOODS: Did you observe them — I mean, was there a time at which you just thought of them as being just fellow travelers of yours?

GOTTFRIED: No, no, I never liked them, and in 1974, I published a piece in *Modern Age* on the neoconservatives that was extremely critical.

WOODS: Oh, I want to find that and link to it.

GOTTFRIED: I'm sure it's available online somewhere. But it was written quite early — but there I'm sort of mildly critical. I don't really consider them as being on the right or conservatives, but they were useful in the struggle against communism. That was my position at the time. But I was hoping they would never be allowed to gain the upper hand either in the Republican Party or the conservative movement. But certainly in the 1980s, I think I turned, at least in my own politics, decisively toward the right, even the far right. And it was largely in reaction to what the neoconservatives did to the conservative movement and later to me.

WOODS: Okay, well, let's do the first things first. What precisely did the neocons do to the conservative movement?

GOTTFRIED: Well, on any number of issues, they've pushed it toward the left. And even their anti-communism was leftist anti-communism. They were simply the part of the left that rejected the Communist Party, because it was not true to its ideals, or later because it did not support the Zionist objectives of the neoconservatives. And they also fought against communism in the name of some other leftist ideology, like global democracy, their notion of human rights. They really were leftist revolutionaries who just didn't happen to like the communists. So I think that's why Murray Rothbard and I used to joke about how the Mensheviks are now fighting the Bolsheviks, because we did see them as a force of the left. And they took over completely.

The other group that seemed to be closely allied to them, which I thought was equally obnoxious, were the West Coast Straussians — Straussians generally, particularly the West Coast Straussians — who pushed this idea of conservatism predicated on the idea of universal equality. So they bothered me. But in terms of actually controlling political institutions, I thought the neoconservatives were much more dangerous, because they were much more expansionist, much more interventionist than the Straussians, the West Coast Straussians. But I saw both of these people becoming very powerful in the 1980s. And if you read my book *The Search for Historical Meaning*, particularly the last chapter, it is a warning against them, and allowing them to gain any more influence, either in the Republican Party or over the American right.

WOODS: Ah, okay. So now I want to talk about what I know happened, but I don't know the details. When you say "what the neoconservatives did to me," what did they do to you? What did they think was wrong with Paul Gottfried, and how did they try to make your life difficult?

GOTTFRIED: Yeah, this is very curious, because I never took — unlike Murray Rothbard or Lew Rockwell, I never took any anti-Israeli position. But they assumed that I was against Israel, because I didn't agree with him on other things. Like I was critical of the New Deal. I was critical of the civil rights revolution of the 1960s. I was critical with the Immigration Act, which they supported. And I did not think the Germans were entirely to blame for the outbreak of World War I. Believe it or not, that is a big issue for them. You know, they hated the Germans because of the Nazis, and they would read German Nazism all the way back into the German past. And I thought the stuff that they wrote on World War I and the Franco-Prussian War was nonsense. And I wrote it as somebody, my family did fight for the Austrians in the war.

But you know, the reality is I think the war was an absolute tragedy. I thought the United States could have done a great deal perhaps to end that war in Europe and try to act as an honest broker. So I disagreed with them on that. I always joke that I disagreed with them on the Peloponnesian War, because I think the Athenians were much more to blame than the Spartans for starting that war. But what they do is they sort of read back their prejudices into everything in history, and I think the fact that I was very contemptuous of their attempt to filter the past through their own experience, their own sort of bizarre experiences, that made me very, very suspicious.

But among other things, they went after me for a graduate professorship in classics and politics at Catholic University in 1987. And they called up the administration, they attacked me, and the charge that they made was that I was not quite safe on Israel, which I thought was remarkable, A) because I'd never written anything against Israel, and B) because even if I were anti-Israeli, that would not keep me from teaching Polybius and Xenophon and Aristotle without bringing in my anti-Zionism, if I were an anti-Zionist. But they seem to have terrified the Catholic administration of Catholic University, which withdrew an offer that they had already given to me. They had second thoughts. I could have sued them, which I didn't do. It would have been a long legal hassle.

But then afterwards, I noticed the neoconservatives would continue, they would write to universities not to publish my books. They intervened at university presses. They also intervened at other universities to keep me out of jobs. And they raised some nasty things about me to each other. Once they went after you, whatever their reasons to keep you from a job — this is the same thing they did to Mel Bradford in 1981. Once they went after you, what

they would do is keep going after you in order to justify their initial decision to destroy you. They behaved exactly like the Communist Party. You know, the Will Herbert used to describe how the Communist Party USA would act once they decided to go after you. They acted the same way. They were the same sorts of people. And these were the ones who took over the conservative movement, were able to fill positions with their own people. They took over philanthropic organizations. And the effect of seeing them take power, and seeing magazines like *National Review* fall to them, I think had a very sobering effect on me and definitely helped turn me toward the right, towards I suppose what they would consider the very far right.

WOODS: The other day, I was writing a little something about the Southern Poverty Law Center, and in recent years, like really just the past year or two, you see more and more regular conservatives looking at this thing and saying: maybe it isn't just a watchdog group for the Ku Klux Klan. Maybe there is something more sinister going on. Whereas up until — I mean, even when they went after the Family Research Council, that still wasn't enough for some conservatives to wake up to what was going on.

GOTTFRIED: Right, right.

WOODS: Because the conservative movement was just like the Southern Poverty Law Center. They would destroy you. The very first thing anybody said about you, they wouldn't bother to look at the details, you were out. They were all too happy to enforce the dictates of the Southern Poverty Law Center.

GOTTFRIED: Yeah, unless one of their own got hit. If they attacked David French or David Horowitz or someone like that, they'd fight back and they'd hire lawyers.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. That's true. But then it would just be this weird aberration from this otherwise noble organization, whereas now, even a fairly mainstream libertarian like John Stossel, I saw him linking to an absolute takedown of the SPLC. So that kind of makes me feel a little bit better, but just, when you're describing how they act, I thought, yeah, no wonder they had no problem enforcing the SPLC's decrees about people. That's how they act. That's how they act toward people.

So all right, so you got that that hostility coming from the neocons. Now we're getting to the end of the '80s, into the early '90s. And this is where — not like the story culminates with Woods; however, this is where I do enter the picture because I'm old enough to know what's going on. And it was in 1993, I think, that I first met you, because I was at the John Randolph Club meeting, because I was interested in that. I was interested in Rothbard, and I was interested in the people at *Chronicles*. I liked both, and so I thought I would attend this thing. So can you maybe say something about that? Because that was a moment where, after the Cold War, it looked like there are people who have been at odds with each other because of foreign policy, who have so much else in common that maybe it might be worth having a discussion.

GOTTFRIED: Yeah, no, I think that was maybe the last high point of the American conservative movement, the attempted fusion — it wasn't a fusion, but a coalition —

WOODS: Yeah, Woods comes onto the scene, and it's all downhill from there.

GOTTFRIED: Yep, it was all downhill, because I suppose we were in the same position as the Japanese when they declared war against Russia, when they attacked Russia in the Far East, that they could win one or two battles, but as soon as the Russian army was going to get there, the Japanese would have been wiped out. So it was a good thing that they got the Treaty of Portsmouth in 1905. We really were not equals of the neoconservatives in terms of firepower, resources, money, and good relations with the mainstream liberal media, which they certainly enjoyed far more than we did, right? But we could run Buchanan as president. We could take advantage of his early successes, and we did have the Mises Institute, and we had the Rockford Institute, and a few other institutions that were leaning in our direction and probably would have declared support for us if we had more firepower and were able to put up more of a fight once Buchanan went down.

But once Buchanan went down, I suppose the alliance fell apart, for other reasons that perhaps we shouldn't go into right now. But it was certainly weakened, I think, as a result of Buchanan's withdraw from the race in 1992 and the fact that we were not able to pull in more. It was sort of the other historical analogy is Hannibal after he defeated the Romans in some significant battles, like Cannae, he's roaming around in Italy, but the Latin Confederation would not give him any support. And I think only one town did, Aquila, and they got wiped out by the Romans later. We weren't able to pull loose any members of the conservative coalition, who by then were taking their orders from the neoconservatives. And I think that probably was the death knell for our side.

WOODS: And then the Randolph Club eventually split apart. I mean, there are individual libertarians and individual paleos who have relationships, but institutionally, there's been a kind of an alienation. But I don't know, I think maybe that's slightly coming to an end. But in this day and age, with the internet, these alliances are not really so important. It used to be that, well, there aren't that many magazines out there, so we have to have an alliance with this group, because they have a magazine and maybe they'll publish our articles. That's not so important anymore, that you have this formal relationship. But now today, I know it's pretty grim, so I hate to ask Paul Gottfried for good news, you know? I hate to put you in that position.

GOTTFRIED: I actually have very good news, but I'm not free to divulge it —

WOODS: Oh, okay, I actually know what that bit of news is, but I will divulge it when the time is right.

GOTTFRIED: You can divulge it when the time is right, but I think we may be getting a lot more firepower on our side.

WOODS: Okay.

GOTTFRIED: And this is why in my last years on this planet, I have undertaken labor basically to bring something like the old alliance back into existence. And I think the Conservatism, inc., has probably reached its zenith, sort of its media zenith. They have a television station, they run Fox News, all kinds of other things. But I think there's an entire younger generation that they don't reach, because most of the people watching Fox News are in their 60s and 70s.

WOODS: Yeah, that's a problem.

GOTTFRIED: Most people reading *National Review* are in their 60s and 70s. I think you get a much younger crowd who come to the Mises Institute, right? And there are other conservative outlets that are able to appeal to the young much more effectively than Conservatism, inc., which much to our pleasure, is not doing a very good job.

WOODS: Indeed, indeed. And I will say, by the way, that the cruise that Bob Murphy and I have hosted for the past four years attracts a much more younger clientele, let's say, than the *National Review* cruises, and we know that not because I've been on one of those, heaven help me, but rather because the same company does our cruise that do the *National Review* cruise, and they tell us. And they say it's all silvery-haired people on those cruises. Now, Paul, nothing against those silvery-haired people, but we need the younger folks. And you think, well, how can they afford to go on a cruise? But we have a lot of young professionals who come on our cruise who would never in a million years go on a *National Review* cruise.

GOTTFRIED: Yeah, I believe that. I'm not going to say they're entirely spent force, but it seems to me that they're having difficulty reaching people — people who read *National Review* continue to read it because they've been reading it for years. People who watch Fox News are very often retired people who are sitting at home. They're mostly that. So that there is a younger age group who are just waiting to be reached out to, and I think this is where our hope is. It's with the younger people who are not very interested in listening to another commentary by Sean Hannity or by Laura Ingraham or watching Dinesh D'Souza come on and tell you that the Democratic Party is the party of slavery or something like that.

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah. These people are so clueless.

GOTTFRIED: [laughing] So ridiculous.

WOODS: Yeah, they're so clueless and tone deaf, it's crazy. I actually very much liked your book, which I guess you — did you write it with Tom Fleming, the book on *The Conservative Movement*? I liked that book. That taught me a lot when I was young.

GOTTFRIED: The one that came out in 1986, in which we coined the term fairly conservative.

WOODS: Okay, well, I'm going to write that down as a book on the show notes. The show notes page, TomWoods.com/1499. I almost had you on the nice round number 1500, but I couldn't quite make that work. *The Conservative Movement*, yeah, that definitely will help fill in a lot of the blanks for people as to what happened and who the people were and the institutions and all that. It's pretty well documented in there.

GOTTFRIED: The book doesn't seem acquainted? I'm just asking that as a question. I mean, it was published in 1986.

WOODS: Well, I'm a bit antiquated, because I read it like around 1986. But I just remember at the time, thinking, all right, this explains a lot to me. Actually, no, I take that back. It was the early '90s when I was rethinking — I was going through my own Gottfried moment. I was thinking being a Bush Republican, and I wanted to know what the alternatives were. And that's when I discovered *Chronicles* magazine, and so I saw that there was a

noninterventionist alternative. I thought, what is this? Aren't these people unpatriotic or something? So I went through that whole thing, and your book was actually very helpful to me. So if it's good enough for Woods, it's good enough for everybody else out there, is my view. So I'm going to refer people there. And then when your good news is revealed, I'll be the first one shouting it from the rooftop. So everybody, check out TomWoods.com/1499. And as always, Paul, we thank you for your time.

GOTTFRIED: Thank you very much for having me.