



WOODS: All right, July 4th is falling on a Saturday, so this is the closest we can get to Independence Day on the Monday-through-Friday *Tom Woods Show*, and I thought Kevin is good guy, probably had you on in the past on Independence Day. I haven't looked. I would be crazy not to have done that, especially since this will be the sixth Independence Day I've had while doing the show.

So let's talk about the meaning of it and what people don't quite know about it. I have a few things that I've jotted down that I think run counter to or at least are not part of the mainstream understanding of Independence Day. But I actually want to start instead, if we can, with an email that you received. It was a mass email sent to everybody in the system from I guess the — who was it, the president of the Connecticut state university system?

GUTZMAN: Right. So Connecticut has four regional state universities and numerous junior colleges and he's the president of the newly consolidated system.

WOODS: Okay, so let me read just the first paragraph, because it's the usual kind of boilerplate email that everybody has been sending. And here we go:

"Dear CSU community,

"When Thomas Jefferson wrote that all men are created equal, he of course was referring only to white, landowning men, intentionally excluding women and people of color from his vision for America. Words that were once viewed as a groundbreaking, inclusive proclamation and lionized in history books look far less progressive in today's context. The tragic reality is that the inequity highlighted by Jefferson's declaration persists in many ways to this day, the vestiges of slavery manifested in structural racism continues" — he means to say "continue" — "to prevent far too many people of color from reaching their full potential. This extends to nearly every facet of society. And of course, higher education is no exception."

All right, I'm going to let you just riff on that, but I'll just start by saying: that statement right there is straight from the Borg. That's my new term for the complex that includes the media, the entertainment world, and academia. It's the Borg. It's the hive mind. There's one mind. It says the same things. It uses the same terminology to say the same things. It's entirely predictable. And if you dissent from it, well, bad luck for you.

All right, what's your response to that? That, first of all, Jefferson was "of course" referring only to white, landowning men?

GUTZMAN: Well, this is false. It's false in every sense. So Jefferson, for example, was not part of the group that wrote Virginia's first republican constitution. He wanted to be, but he wasn't because he was often in Philadelphia, where he would have to content himself with drafting the Declaration of Independence, which he thought was a far inferior task.

But anyway, as soon as he saw this first republican constitution adopted by the people's representatives in the history of the world, the Virginia constitution of 1776, he sketched out several objections to it, one of which was that there was going to be a property qualification for voting. Now, he thought that if you paid any taxes, or if you participated in the militia, or essentially, if you were a citizen of Virginia, you should be allowed to vote. He also thought that it should be very easy to become a citizen of Virginia. You should just show up and say, I intend to stay here, and people in Virginia should accept that, okay, you're a citizen of

Virginia. You should have to essentially swear allegiance and you are in. So insofar as it is about only property-holding men, that's false. That claim is false.

Then the bit about *white* men is also false, and this of course gets to the idea that Jefferson was content with the continued existence of slavery in Virginia. The current editor of the papers of Thomas Jefferson is a scholar named Barbara Oberg, and she says that Jefferson took more discreet steps against slavery than anyone else. So to list the specific ways that Jefferson undermined or proposed undermining slavery would take quite a while, but we can note, for example, not only did he write in the Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal; he also drafted a bill that failed by one vote in Congress that would have banned slavery from the entire West. So essentially, everything west of the Appalachians would have been devoid of slavery if Jefferson had had his way, and this proposal failed by one vote. Jefferson was extremely unhappy about that. And he wrote to a correspondent, "Surely God slept" when this happened. He thought this was a terrible outcome.

But he did succeed in — well, he wrote the first draft of what became the Northwest Ordinance, which of course banned slavery from what we now know as the Midwest, what was then known as the Northwest. He also as president called on 1806 upon Congress to pass in 1807 a bill that would have banned slavery at the earliest constitutionally permissible moment; that is, would have banned slave imports at the earliest constitutionally permissible moment, the earliest moments of January 1st, 1808. Congress responded by passing such a bill, which President Jefferson signed, and so the moment it became January 1st, 1808, slave imports were banned by the federal government at Thomas Jefferson's behest.

He took numerous other steps against slavery, as I said, so the idea that he was content that there should be slavery, that he thought that black people didn't have an equal claim to natural rights is just false. And there's actually no proof of it. So I find it just exasperating that this claim is ambient now.

WOODS: Let me remind everybody that you and I actually did an episode on Jefferson and slavery, so I'll put a link to that on the show notes page for today, which would be TomWoods.com/1686, so you can listen to that. And really, you could just have a Gutzman extravaganza one day and just listen to all the previous episodes, because every one of them will blow your mind.

All right, let's switch gears now, talking about Independence Day, which is practically upon us. And I want to talk about what we really celebrate with Independence Day. And it seems to me that the things we celebrate in it are not things that, let's say, left progressives have been known for championing. So I actually asked my fellow graduate students when I was getting my PhD, just out of curiosity — they're all left progressives — what are you guys celebrating on Independence Day? What is it that makes you excited about it? Like, what cause that's involved in it are you in favor of?

And the best I could get was — because I was trying to say, look, the US government does a lot of the things that people were objecting to at the time today, and you're not complaining about those things today while you celebrate independence. And the closest I get was, well, there was a — I kid you not, the exact words used was "there was a distance involved." So the ruling class was just too darn far away in the old days, and thank goodness we got the ruling class right here, right in our faces just where we want it. [laughing] I mean, that was the best they could do.

Because it seems to me that the key thing — there are several things that you can identify, but one of them is local self-government. And that is about the last thing these people favor, except occasionally, as we saw with the virus, they will call the Tenth Amendment into use in order to be able to impose more restrictions on the people. They will not use the Tenth Amendment ever to say the federal government has overstepped; it's that you've under stepped, and we the states have the power to step even more on your necks.

GUTZMAN: Well, it's somewhat ironic this year that the commemoration of independence is falling in the midst of this grand iconoclasm spasm that we're witnessing all over the country. And so, for example, in places like Charlottesville, Jefferson's hometown, they're taking down statues of Confederate generals. And essentially, it seems every politician is saying, well, Jefferson's understanding of Independence Day was traitorous; that is the idea that sovereignty lay in the states and that government ought to be as decentralized as possible, ultimately down to having individuals have extensive rights. And then, of course, insofar as it was practicable for government to be exercised at the local level, he said between the federal government and the states, of course I prefer the states. But then within the states, I prefer the counties, and then within the counties, I prefer ward –

WOODS: Republics, yeah.

GUTZMAN: – republics, what we would call precincts. And nowadays we're told, well, the idea that the state could secede from the union was treason. So it's a good question. I guess people generally do have the idea that the Revolution was about transferring our allegiance from hereditary nobles and the monarch in the United Kingdom to Clapper and Brennan and Comey and Stroke and Paige and Ruth Bader Ginsburg and these people in Washington. That is really what it comes to. That's not how I understand it. I think the idea was that, in general, people had a right to govern themselves, and if there was going to be government, which there shouldn't be much of, it should be as locally centered as possible.

So Jefferson, essentially was a devotee of what in Catholic theology is called subsidiarity. And maybe that was his chief principle, leaving aside republicanism, which of course was a given in the Revolution. That's really what Jeffersonianism was. And so yeah, I guess we've come to the point where that's essentially written out of polite conversation, and now it's just be like Ruth Bader Ginsburg, better than Elizabeth II.

WOODS: I mean, that's a pretty lame result, if you ask me.

GUTZMAN: That is. What's all the hoopla, you know?

WOODS: Changing one for the other.

GUTZMAN: I don't think that people don't really think about this very much.

WOODS: No, they don't, I think probably in the same way that when Labor Day comes along, they don't really sit around thinking about the Knights of Labor or Terrence Powderly or any of these people from history. They just think I have a day off, right? And this time they have a day off where they set off fireworks. I think that is as far as it goes.

So another issue that you brought up, of course, is secession. Now, obviously – I don't know. I say *obviously*. It's obvious to you and me – the American states have a far greater legal claim to secede from the United States than the colonies did to secede from the British Empire. They had no legal argument, as far as I can see, none, whatsoever. The British Empire did not think of itself as a federation consisting of sovereign entities that could reclaim their sovereignty and reclaim their independence whenever they should. There's no such thing as that. And yet, so even with a weaker case, basically, they nevertheless did it and we celebrate even that weaker case of them doing it.

GUTZMAN: Yeah, it's funny that as you were saying that, I was thinking what you were outlining was precisely Jefferson's argument in the Summary View of the Rights of British America. The whole thing was about a right to self-determination by states, which of course, the word *states*, people in American English today have lost what that meant. But it wasn't like a province in Canada or a province in Australia. A state was a sovereign entity. In other words, it wasn't Andalusia in Spain or Yorkshire in the United Kingdom; it was Spain or the United Kingdom. So if you said Connecticut was a free and independent state, you were saying that it was on par with Spain or the United Kingdom. And that's what Jefferson meant.

Actually, for him, that was what the Revolution was about vindicating this claim that Virginia was an integral unit. Now, he thought it should have federal relations with other states in North America, first for the purpose of winning the Revolution, and later for some limited other enumerated purposes, that was up to Virginians to decide. But having the right to make that decision was what the Revolution had been for.

So again, there is a real absence in our certainly 2020 public dialogue of the real claim that these people were making. They weren't saying, again, we have a right to be governed by Ruth Bader Ginsburg instead of Elizabeth II; they were saying we have a right to local self-determination. We want taxation by representation, if at all, meaning here in Connecticut, we want to be taxed from Hartford instead of from Westminster. And people now seem not really to care. It's North America, it's Britain, what's the big difference? I think it could be, probably generally is that if you give members of the ruling elite information about this, they're going to say, well, I actually favor the kind of globalist view of this. But my actual impression is that virtually nobody understands this. Virtually nobody knows that this was what it was actually about.

WOODS: No kidding, and that's why *The Tom Woods Show* exists, among other reasons, but that's one of them. How about the Declaration of Independence itself? There's a lot of controversy about this, and now, mainly it's among nerds, but let's be honest: if you have a dispute and it's with people called the West Coast Straussians, you've already lost 99% of the public. Nobody even knows what this is all about. But in terms of the role of the Declaration in American life and in our legal understanding, there's a major controversy, because these are people who do think of themselves as being conservative. Whether they are or not, that is how they think of themselves. They say the Declaration and the philosophy that they believe is presented in there is the lens through which the Constitution is meant to be understood. And so really, the Constitution has the idea of equality more or less embedded in it because of its necessary attachment to the Declaration. Try and make sense of all that for us, if you would.

GUTZMAN: Well, what they really think is that the Civil War was a kind of founding of the country and that Lincoln is the great Solon or Lycurgus of the United States. And so the way we're to understand the regime is that you start with Lincoln, and the way that he propagandized about the Declaration of Independence is the legitimate way to understand the Declaration of Independence. So what this means is that we have Daniel Webster's union and liberty, now and forever, one inseparable. And the Declaration of Independence is to be invoked only when it's useful in propagating that idea, that the eternal union with a particular basis, and it's a centralized system that is going to enforce a particular idea of liberty, and it's entitled to do so.

So really, it is a negation of what made the American Revolution peculiar and a substitution of a unified national state of the kind that was being made in the middle of 19th century, also in Germany or Italy. And is it conservative? Well, I suppose you could say, in a sense. I mean, it's about conserving the centralized national state that was created by the Civil War. I don't think that really has much to do with what happened in the late 18th century. It's an interesting theory. Maybe it's possible to say that it would even lead to better policy outcomes than the one that we were talking about before would lead to, but that's a different question from what was the Revolution really about. So these people don't say here's a way to get better outcomes than you would get by teaching way the Revolution was really justified; instead they say that the revolution was as Lincoln described it. So I guess that way you can have the advantage both of being able to invoke Lincoln and being able to invoke Washington, Marshall, John Jay, and so on.

WOODS: I realize we're talking about Independence Day, but we can't be in a cocoon here. We have to acknowledge the context of what's going on around us. And since you did mention George Washington, I wonder if you might want to say something about George Washington,

because now it's become almost mainstream to think George Washington was a terrible person and we can't have him. And as I pointed out, I know that tu quoque is not an open-and-shut type of argument, but for heaven's sake, most of the people, and I mean most of the people, who are unhappy about a statue of George Washington have no problem with Che Guevara, have no problem with Angela Davis.

Angela Davis, I just said in my email and also in my episode the other day, had very close relationships with the brutal regimes behind the Iron Curtain. And when she was asked if she could maybe use her influence with them to get some political prisoners and dissidents released from prison, she said no, no, they were probably trying to undermine the governments there, so we're just going to keep them in prison. And as if to show that the left cannot be parodied anymore, lately the left's obsession is: why isn't Angela Davis being called on to talk about prison abolition when everybody's interested in that subject now? Well, maybe the reason is she obviously doesn't favor prison abolition if she thinks people of conscience in communist countries should have to sit in prisons.

So if these people are really upset about George Washington, I'm sorry, I don't believe them. I don't believe that it's just their delicate moral sensibilities that are challenged by George Washington. They apparently can look the other way on a lot, these people.

GUTZMAN: Well, my first year at the University of Texas law school, I took the required course in federal civil procedure and my professor was Mike Tigar, who had been Angela Davis's attorney.

WOODS: You've got to be kidding me.

GUTZMAN: I'm not kidding you. Actually, this is a fellow who had been hired to be a Supreme Court clerk by Justice William Brennan, who if you know anything about American constitutional history, you know was literally the most left-wing justice in history. And between his being hired and his starting at the Supreme Court as a clerk, Tigar gave a an anti-Vietnam War speech that was so outlandish that Brennan rescinded the offer. So this was just hard to [inaudible].

But anyway, first of all, it's unhistorical. Every criticism that's being made of George Washington, insofar as it has any substance, is just completely unhistorical. So for example, I see people saying well, George Washington owned slaves. Well, yes, he was born into a slave-owning family. He owned slaves. In Virginia, you couldn't legally free them. So what was he to do to avoid having been a guy who would own slaves? And I think what's interesting – well, there are many things are interesting about George Washington. One thing that's interesting about him is that having been born essentially a prince, owning 8,000 acres on the Potomac River, which is just an unimaginable principality, Washington through his life ended up deciding slavery was just morally wrong. And when he died, he freed all the people. And in fact, he provided them landholdings.

And so this, I think, is spectacular, but people are now attacking him on the ground that he was a slave owner. So they don't take into account the setting. Imagine you're born into a situation in which nobody's ever criticized this. Nobody you're going to encounter thinks there's anything wrong with it. That's the situation he was in. And not only was he a freakishly republican republican, that is, not only did he, in a day when victorious generals routinely wrote their own treaties and sent them back to the king and said, "Here's your treaty," which is the kind of behavior that, for example, Bonaparte engaged in, during the Revolution negotiators went to Washington from the British, and he said you've come to the wrong guy, you need to go talk to Congress. That was unheard of, but he was going to be subordinate to civilians.

The idea that our generals are subordinates to civilians and we never have to think about it? We're so used to that, that we don't recognize that Washington making that our system was just outlandishly unusual. Who did that? Nobody did that.

And then, of course, at the end of the war, he famously resigned the position of commander-in-chief. Who did that? Nobody did that. And then after he had been president for two terms, he decided, well, we should have a tradition of people not staying in this office until they died, and so he quit that too, right? There's a reason why, in his day, people on both ends of whatever political spectrum there was could agree that they admired Washington. He was really the kind of figure your country can't expect.

When I was a kid, I lived in Latin America for four years. The country I lived in Panama had a "president," but everybody knew Omar, whose skyscraper-sized image was on the main building in downtown Panama City, was the real ruler of the country. He's the guy in the photographs with Jimmy Carter signing the Panama Canal treaties. And that was the system not only in Panama at the time, but in Argentina and Chile and Cuba, you name it. So this is what you get. And it's been true since Washington's day in basically every European country except the United Kingdom. So knocking down images of Washington is just a way of accepting the idea or broadcasting it to the world that you're not worthy of him, I think. You're too ignorant to get it.

WOODS: My guess is that people doing this, if you were to ask them about George Washington, they probably would have two sentences worth of knowledge.

GUTZMAN: Right, that he was white and he owned slaves.

WOODS: Yeah, well, no, maybe three pieces of knowledge: that he was president at one time. I think they might know that. But that's it. That's it. They don't know any of the things you just said. And I don't see any people going out of their way to tell them at a time like this.

GUTZMAN: Nor will you.

WOODS: Yeah, it really is like a mini French Revolution, just watching things be pulled down. It's just weird. I mean, and by an enraged mob that represents a tiny sliver of the public. I mean, during the reign of terror, it was not the entirety of France that was idiotically guillotining statues of saints. I mean, what kind of an idiot would you have to be to do that in the first place, right? It was just a bunch of crazies.

GUTZMAN: And before they got rid of Louis, nobody was out saying: *but here are the good things about France*. There was just no defense. And now, in theory, we have moderate Democrats and Republicans in Congress who should be out saying, no, this can't be happening. If you want to make changes, this isn't how we do it. We could do it, but this is not the kind of behavior we can accept. No, nobody's saying that. Crazy.

WOODS: Yeah, especially when, if you want to be — now, yes, you'll be hated by everybody, but you'll be hated by the Borg, let's say. When I say *everybody*, you'll be hated by the Borg and the robots who take their orders from the Borg. But the normal people in America would very, very much latch on to just a common-sense person who came along and said this is a disgrace and ridiculous, and I can't believe nobody has the stones to say it, so I'm going to say it. So it seems to me that four years from now, the only person I can see with any credibility on the political right is frickin' Tucker Carlson. If he ran for president, he would have a lot of support. There's no question about it, because he actually will say the things that — I'd like to

say the things that other people think but won't say. I don't even think they think them anymore, you know? They're so weak and pathetic.

GUTZMAN: I don't believe there's any thought going on.

WOODS: [laughing] That's another thing.

GUTZMAN: This kind of was kicked off by the 1619 Project at *The New York Times*. And I don't buy the idea that everybody at the times even endorsed that. I think they just kind of they ran it for their own internal political reasons, and then it just has snowballed without anybody really answering it. So I mean, I wrote an essay answering it, and you and I've talked about it, but I don't think there's been a prominent politician who's said *I'm going to stake my career on this, or This is actually more important than my office. I'm going to go out and use my office as a bully pulpit and talk back about it.* No, nothing has happened.

WOODS: Right, right. And Trump himself, just don't even get me started. He has no knowledge, no curiosity, no desire for knowledge. But his gut tells him there's something wrong with pulling down a George Washington statue. Like his gut tells him that. If only he had some curiosity, because he could give a speech that would shame the hell out of these crazy people, incorporating some of the material you just said that almost nobody in America, frankly at this point after the dumping down, even knows about. And it would help him, and yet he just won't — I still am doing Independence Day stuff, but for heaven's sake, why will the guy not give a speech to the country where he just lays out:

Look, folks, what's been happening here over the past four years is ridiculous. I mean, I have my faults and nobody's perfect, but what's been going on, the way I've been treated and the way all you ordinary Americans have been treated with the name calling and the whatever, this is absurd, and it's not the way we act toward them. We don't act this way.

I don't know why he doesn't give some kind of rallying speech or whatever, why he just wants to tweet and do rallies, why he doesn't speak to the nation. I don't know, because I would. And even though I think I'm a pretty good speech writer, I would bring on the best of the best to write the best one I could and then deliver it. The problem with him is when he delivers a prepared speech, he looks like he's reading a ransom note. He doesn't deliver them very well at all. And when he delivers them spontaneously, yeah, it reaches his people, but it doesn't reach people beyond that. Anyway, that's just an aside. I don't know how you feel about that.

GUTZMAN: Well, it's true that he's not really cut out for communicating this kind of complicated message. I don't think that's really his wheelhouse. So I actually know people who wrote speeches for him last time around, and I know they're good writers. I know they can do it. I think he's not in the market right now for that. And of course, the main problem his campaign has is there's no platform. There's nothing. We know that Biden is in serious mental decline, but the alternative is what? Trump has really not said what he intends for the next term. So yeah, it's pretty pathetic. Actually, it seems to be getting worse. I thought in the 1988 presidential campaign, this is as bad as it can get.

WOODS: Yeah, I know. And we would kill to have that back, wouldn't we?

GUTZMAN: [laughing] We would. When they went to the flag factory and Dukakis was posing in the —

WOODS: [laughing] Like, this is a new low, right?

GUTZMAN: And it turns out that no, Dukakis and Bush, maybe those were the halcyon days.

WOODS: It's incredible. I've actually been thinking I would even — because I'm reasonable, Kevin. I'm a man of compromise. That's not true, but let's pretend for a minute. I have been willing to say I'll take Bill Clinton back. Honestly, the Bill Clinton of the 1990s? I'll take him at this point.

GUTZMAN: Well, you'll have Republican Congress. Yeah, sure. That was much better than what we have now.

WOODS: Yeah, I mean, just in every way. I mean, at least he had some sense. And he still does now. You have this feeling he's not a hard leftist. I mean, he's been dragged on a few issues, because there's nothing else he can do. But in his heart, he knows that the Democratic Party is alienating itself from the white working class, which now, white working class means Nazi today. Yeah, I get that. But he understands that's not true. He's got some instincts that would be helpful for the Democrats, and they won't listen to them.

And the Republicans are running away from this type of insight right now. They think if we say enough things about Black Lives Matter, maybe people will vote for us, but I just don't think that's true. You can certainly say: I absolutely 100% believe everybody should be treated fairly, and if it turns out that anybody is being disproportionately singled out, whether a person or a race, we have to knock that off. But I'm not signing on to the obvious baggage of this movement, which is not — perhaps I'm going too far — is not simply about reining in the police there. There's a slight, eensy-weensy bit of an agenda behind that.

GUTZMAN: Yeah, well, apparently, a lot of our major corporations don't recognize that. I understand that once the NBA returns to playing in its bubble, they're going to have Black Lives Matter slogans on the court they're playing on, so we're going to see that constantly if we're interested in pro basketball.

WOODS: That is insane.

GUTZMAN: Abolish the nuclear family. Yeah, that's great.

WOODS: And then you look at the — I mean, it's at least one of the original BLM people traveled to Venezuela to meet Maduro and said, ah, what a breath of fresh air it is down here. Okay, so that's the kind of society you want? That's the society you want? Maduro of Venezuela? Are you kidding me? So yeah, this is about a little, tiny, tiny bit more than: we're unhappy with the way the police behave themselves. A lot of people may feel that way. But this has gone a little bit beyond that.

GUTZMAN: I actually think this long digression is relevant to the topic we started.

WOODS: [laughing] Oh, thank you for bringing us back to it. Explain how.

GUTZMAN: Well, I think that people generally aren't being taught what the principles of the American Revolution were, how they've played out, why they're significant today, how they affect us now. This is all extremely important. And as I said, besides of course studying other cultures, I've lived for an extended time in a country that did not have any of these elements of our legacy, and if you'd lived there, you'd want not to, basically. And of course, kids today aren't taught that. All they're told is Thomas Jefferson's statement that all men are created equal of course didn't apply to people of color and women. That's it. That's what you get. So kids are in the streets tearing down statues.

WOODS: Now the thing is, you wonder what do you do about this? And some people, the instinct is, well, if some people are having a big demonstration, then our side needs to have a big demonstration. But the thing is, our side does not excel at that. Our side is not interested in that, doesn't know how to organize that way. It's just not how we are. Because part of it is, and this is a point Dan McCarthy made, when you have a big gathering or a big protest and you're going to hold signs and stuff, you're reducing what is always a complicated question. I don't care — I mean, every once in a while, it's okay, this protester was shot dead. Not much complicated about that.

But virtually anything people are talking about is complicated. Like even the Iraq War. I think that was a really, really horrible thing, but I get that you have to discuss it at a high level. I mean, I get that there's a lot of information and material involved. But a demonstration like this takes these sorts of issues and reduces them to four-word things that you can chant. And

so the demonstration is basically saying: we've given up on reason. Right now, we're going to shout, and we're going to intimidate, and we're going to feel good about ourselves.

That's what the demonstration always winds up being. A demonstration is not a series of propositions from Wittgenstein. It's not a public debate. It's not a lecture. It's some shouting and some chanting, which is the opposite of reason. It would not occur to me to act like this, to think this way. So we can't fight fire with fire. I wouldn't want to. So having said that, do we just sit back and write articles? I mean, what happens?

GUTZMAN: Well, in the short run, it's necessary that people who know the truth speak it. But if it's the impulse of prominent politicians, media figures who want to be involved in this, or who actually have a gut feeling of opposing it or maybe you have an intellectual predisposition to oppose it, that they're just going to sit back, or they're going to go along to some extent because they want to placate the mob, then I think it can only get worse. Mobs are never satisfied. They'll move on to the next thing, as they've already done. I remember when Trump was saying, well, maybe they're going after Robert E. Lee now, but soon it'll be George Washington, Thomas Jefferson. And then he was mocked on *Morning Joe* and MSNBC and *The New York Times* mocked that, and here we are.

WOODS: But thankfully all those people who mocked him have apologized.

GUTZMAN: Yeah, well, they always do.

WOODS: They're always very, very strict about apologizing.

GUTZMAN: They have high ethical standards.

WOODS: [laughing] They have very high ethical standards, indeed. Listen, before we go, get us up to date on what you're working on these days. You're always writing a book. And actually, we may have mentioned it the last time you were on, and its release date is a ways in the future, but can you say something about it?

GUTZMAN: Oh, well, I have far too many irons in the fire —

WOODS: Virginia, the presidents one.

GUTZMAN: Yeah, the main thing I'm working on — I'm actually at the moment surrounded by a stack of books as I'm talking to you. The main thing I'm working on is a history of the Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe administrations, of which there has never been one. So the way that's going to be organized starts with Jefferson's famous first inaugural address in which he lays out more or less the program of the Republican Party, and among other things, that includes having an end to political parties. So by the time you get to the Monroe administration, Monroe is actually acting on that. And essentially every bit of what Jefferson had described and some things that Jefferson hoped for but that he didn't mention in the speech have been implemented, most of them to good effect, some highly controversially, and then of course, in the case of economic coercion as an alternative to military might in international affairs, became a big debacle. But anyway, that's what the book is going to be about. It's going to show how those six terms laid out how they thought they were implementing the Revolution, essentially fulfilling the spirit of Independence Day and seeing how it worked.

WOODS: Well, I'm glad you said the magic words "Independence Day." It makes me feel better about this episode. I mean, look, honestly, an episode of just you and me talking is fine. But I did want to hit on obviously this timely topic, given that we're releasing this episode on July 3rd. So I appreciate your time, very last minute, by the way, to come on and chit chat, and I really look forward to the release of that next book. And also by the way, I enjoy your Facebook feed, because you know, I thought I didn't suffer fools gladly. I am like a pushover compared to Kevin Gutzman. So thanks a lot, Kevin. I appreciate it.

GUTZMAN: You're welcome.

