



Episode 474: The Trump Phenomenon: Lew Rockwell and Tom Discuss

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: Normally I have at least some notes I scribble out; I read some articles; I prepare myself; I get some questions formulated. And then when thing gets going, it tends to be spontaneous, but at least I've got some back up. I've got no back up here at all. I just think, I'm talking to Lew Rockwell about Donald Trump; I think that's going to carry us through. Let's lead with this item that's from several days ago now about two different events that were held in New Hampshire, town hall events, one with Jeb Bush and one with Donald Trump. Let's start with that, because it's emblematic of what's going on in this race. What happened?

ROCKWELL: Well, Bush had been planning this town hall meeting for weeks, and 128 people showed up, mostly older people, a very quiet crowd. And Trump at the last minute decided he was going to compete with Jeb and have a town meeting at the same time, same day, a few miles away. More than 2,000 people showed up for his, and that was all that could fit. There was a big overflow. And he was teasing Jeb all through it, noting that he's a very low energy guy, that, as he warns journalists, if you interview him, you're going to fall asleep. Also Trump has said earlier on about Jeb that he's a very sad man, clearly he doesn't want to be running for president, and clearly he shouldn't be running for president.

WOODS: You remember Fred Thompson? His heart was obviously not in it, and it seems like he threw his hat in the ring just almost by default. Everyone was telling him to do it and saying it was inevitable, he was going to do great, so he did it, and he had zero enthusiasm. I remember one event where he actually had to prod the audience to applaud him. It was really bad.

ROCKWELL: This guy's a movie actor. I mean –

WOODS: Yeah. You're not necessarily cut out for this, either because you're a movie actor, or because people think there's an inevitability surrounding your candidacy. And I think that's what makes the Trump phenomenon so interesting, is that Jeb Bush was obviously the establishment's pick. You don't raise \$100 million for your PAC because you're an insurgent candidate who's going to shake things up. He's the safe candidate who has all the safe opinions on everything. And here is Trump, not only crushing the guy, but laughing at and ridiculing the establishment's choice. That does not happen. People don't do that. Now, I recognize that to an extent Trump himself obviously is

part of the establishment, but not to the point where he was going to sit back and let Jeb Bush just take things. He makes fun of Jeb Bush. You don't do that. He's breaking all the rules.

ROCKWELL: Well, it's true, and it's also as our great teacher and friend, Murray Rothbard, would point out to us if he were here today, it's no coincidence that all the official candidates are boring. They're unbelievably boring. And in fact, I'm just going to read a short quote from a speech that Murray gave in 1992 called "A Strategy for the Right."

WOODS: Love that speech.

ROCKWELL: "It is important to realize that the establishment doesn't want excitement in politics, it wants the masses to continue to be lulled to sleep. It wants kinder, gentler; it wants the measured, judicious, mushy tone, and content, of a James Reston, a David Broder, or a Washington Week in Review. It doesn't want a Pat Buchanan, not only for the excitement and hard edge of his content, but also for his similar tone and style."

So this is a clue into why the entire establishment hates the guts of Donald Trump, also fears Donald Trump. It's not supposed to be like this. It's supposed to be Kasich and Jeb and Walker and all these other sleep-inducing figures up on a stage, blabbing about some policy issue, keeping everybody calm. A guy like Trump actually, even though he's — as we would be the first to agree — no libertarian, it's why he actually is capable in a much more extreme way than has happened so far in totally shaking up the political and the media establishment. And that's necessary to reform. The dead hand of the establishment is on our throats, their boot is on our face, and if we want change, if we want change for the better, first we have to pry the boot off. Donald Trump is doing that.

WOODS: I'm going to link to that Rothbard speech, "A Strategy for the Right," on the show notes page, TomWoods.com/474, because that's the first thing that I had ever read by Rothbard, was the excerpt from that at least that they ran in *National Review*. They ran the excerpt that was all about Bill Buckley, of course — there's nothing else interesting that Rothbard would have to say. What does he have to say about Bill Buckley? But that's what first got my attention. I thought, who is this Rothbard, that he basically thinks Buckley is a sell out or whatever, and Buckley was my hero at that time, so that really got my attention. So I'd love for people to read that whole piece.

Now I want to make clear, because I've gotten in some — and I shouldn't be doing this, Lew; I'm too busy. But sometimes I'll get on your Facebook page, and I'll wind up arguing with people who say, Lew, why are you supporting Trump? You don't understand Lew Rockwell at all if you think he's "supporting" Trump in the sense that we think it'd be great to have Donald Trump as president. We would be deploring him as much as we deplore anybody else, but we're political analysts to some degree, or at least we're observers of the scene, and we find this an interesting phenomenon.

And there is at least a moderate chance that on a couple of issues, there's a chance Trump could be marginally better. Now he'd be catastrophic in some areas. On trade, he's terrible. But it goes to show what a rotten job the other Republicans have done in promoting the idea of free trade. They've done a terrible job. They don't even try to defend their position on it, and he's coming in and exploiting that. But when it comes to foreign policy, I would say there's at least a moderate chance he could be slightly better.

ROCKWELL: And I think they're all bad on trade. The NAFTA and the Trans-Pacific Deal and all these things, they don't believe in free trade any more than Donald Trump believes in free trade. They believe in crony trade; they believe in government-managed trade for the benefit of the big corporations in cahoots with the government. Only Ron Paul, of any political figure I can think of, is actually for real, 100%, unilateral free trade. No tariffs, no quotas, no nothing. So Trump is of course wrong and terrible on a bunch of stuff. So are they all.

So what I'm interested in is where is he different, and also of course, as you point out, where can he shake things up, because I think that's necessary. I think it's also so much fun. I mean, I've always found politics interesting in the sort of train wreck sense, even though I don't believe in politics. After all, politics is part of the government. Elections are part of the government. Political parties are government institutions. So needless to say, I'm not in favor of any of them. But just since I was maybe a very young kid involved heavily in politics, I still find it extremely interesting.

But now, for the first time since Ross Perot, who Murray Rothbard was also enjoying — or Pat Buchanan, Murray Rothbard also enjoyed. Me too, in both cases. Finally there's a candidate who is really shaking things up, bugging everybody, and I don't say this is 100% true, but pretty much everybody who's paranoid about Trump is not anybody you want having any control over you.

WOODS: Well, yeah, of course that's true, and let's take an example of one of those. There are so many, but a personal favorite of mine is Frank Luntz.

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: Now, Frank Luntz is a personal favorite of mine, because I actually got to know him years ago. He had a fellowship at the Kennedy School of Government when I was an undergraduate at Harvard. And I was a part of the — yes, I was part of the Republican Club at that time, and I remember we were going to put a controversial plank through that was perfectly good and sound — through the Republican Club — and Luntz showed up. I thought he was on our side. He showed up and denounced it and said that we need to be more mainstream and respectable and this and that. I thought, we're finally trying to do something hard-edged at the Harvard Republican Club of all places, and Luntz shows up and screws everything up.

I couldn't stand this guy, and I thought, well, you know, Harvard Kennedy School of Government fellows is where washed up people come to disappear forever. I had no

idea he was just getting started, that I'd be seeing him on TV all the time. Well, he expects to run his focus group and have everybody genuflect and bow down to him, he's the expert. And to be basically called a loser by Donald Trump is the exact opposite of how his majesty, Frank Luntz, expects to be treated.

ROCKWELL: You know it's interesting, the focus group that he ran for Fox, Trump thought it was a set up. It certainly seemed to be a set up. I mean, you had these people who allegedly were all pro Trump before the debate, and then after the debate they were all denouncing him; he's no good; he's a bum; get rid of him. But of course that was —

WOODS: Yeah, how was he different after the debate than before? He was just saying the things he'd been saying all along.

ROCKWELL: But also, that was not the reaction of the audience. The audience liked Trump and felt that Fox's attack on him was a bad thing. But I've known Frank. I remember when he was hired by the Buchanan for President campaign as a pollster, and I thought holy smokes; that's not a good sign.

WOODS: Oh yeah.

ROCKWELL: And it wasn't a good sign. This guy's of course a very repellant neoconservative, a guy who's just a big government guy across the board, pro war, and no wonder he's at Fox. But when he denounced Trump, and I noticed he pretends to be this disinterested scientist, only concerned with the numbers and not having opinions himself. He denounced Trump at the recent Koch Con meeting in California pretty nastily, and Trump said, Frank Luntz, he's a fat slob. He said he's a —

WOODS: (laughing) That's what it was.

ROCKWELL: He said he came to me and he wanted me to pay him to do polling, and I wouldn't do it, and so now he's attacking me. So of course, apparently Trump, pretty much everybody has gone to Trump for money.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: And he either gave it to them or didn't. But it's very funny when he can say that about everybody, because he's very quick, very smart. A good friend of ours, who I won't mention — is a good fan of Trump's but is in that same orbit — told me this last weekend at the Ron Paul birthday party, that Donald Trump is extremely smart. This man is extremely smart too, so it was not a surprise to me, but I was glad to hear it. He's very quick and very smart.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah. And that's become clearer. At first they wanted to say he's a clown and this and that, but he's a clown, because he doesn't just give canned, boring speeches about nothing. Now granted, they're not speeches I would give, and I wish he'd say different things from the things he's saying, but the fact that he is

spontaneous and he's not measuring his words according to focus groups as the rest of them obviously are, and they all expected that that's all they have to do, memorize what the focus groups say they want to hear and go out and say it. I mean, that to me is fun to watch. That is thrilling to watch.

I will say one quick thing about Frank Luntz. The one thing in his favor is I did hang around with him quite a bit when he was on campus before I realized what a snake he was, and in fact, when he first moved into his apartment, I went to help him buy a rug. You know, I just got to know him. And the thing that he was known for at that point, this was like '92, '93, was that he had worked for Pat Buchanan. That was the thing everybody asked him about. Hey, you worked for Pat Buchanan, who would be not really very welcome at Harvard University. And I have to say, he never said an unkind thing about Pat. He always said Pat Buchanan is the nicest person I ever worked for; I never had any problems with Pat. So for all his problems, I still love Pat, and so I do respect that one thing about Frank Luntz.

But on the Trump thing, with Iraq, that's an interesting thing that he could say on the debate stage, not worrying that he's got to measure his words, or if I mention Iraq I have to say something about the surge or whatever. No, he said I told all you people this was going to be extremely destabilizing and stupid, and of course I was totally right about it. And he has also said – even though, yes, like other people, in the past he's not a perfect noninterventionist. He's not even a noninterventionist. But he has said obviously our men are being ground up in totally pointless wars that make no sense. Well, that needs to be said.

Again, I recognize all his problems. I don't need to get all the emails from people. But at least somebody is saying that on the stage, saying it clearly and it's not hurting him in the polls any. It's obviously not hurting him any. He's almost doubled the guy who's right behind him. So it turns out that just measuring your words and saying the right thing and so on, turns out that was a stupid strategy.

ROCKWELL: And he said I'm the only guy on this stage who opposed the Iraq War.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: I thought it would be a very bad idea, and it turned out to be a very bad idea. I just want to say that I also agreed with Frank Luntz about Pat Buchanan. You would never know this from the press he gets, but everybody loves Pat. People on the Left, people on the Right, people of no political views. He really is a very sweet guy.

WOODS: Yeah, absolutely.

ROCKWELL: So I'm not surprised that – also it's not a good idea to attack your previous clients if you're in business and hoping to get future ones.

WOODS: Right. At least Luntz knows that much. And I remember, even when Pat was at, of all places, MSNBC, people would come to him for advice – Pat, what do you

think I ought to do about such and such? – because they knew he had such a good strategic mind. Even though he had views they didn't like, they could sit down with him, and he would give them good advice. And that's always been true. I feel that way about you, Buchanan, and Roger McCaffrey. Those are the three people in the world, when I really need advice, I think if I can get advice from one of those three people, I know it'll be the right thing to do.

ROCKWELL: Oh, well that's very high praise. Thank you.

WOODS: (laughing) Okay, sure.

ROCKWELL: But also Trump has never talked about foreign policy. The people who are the real warmongers, the people who really are itching for blood –

WOODS: It's all they talk about.

ROCKWELL: – it's all they talk about. Or at least it's one of the things that they always talk about. And we're supposed to be, there's an article in the new *Weekly Standard* by Bill Kristol, who is I guess the head of Neoconservatism, Inc. at the moment, and it's about, oh, horrible Trump, Scott Walker is the kind of candidate we want to have. Now take a look at this wonderful speech he gave about what should replace Obamacare, where he goes through really all the – and of course you can't even read the next paragraph. The thing is like Walker himself, unbelievably boring, and I must say it's a particular enjoyment to me that Scott Walker is the anointed candidate of the Koch machine.

And another great thing that Trump has done: he's diminished magically and wonderfully Sheldon Adelson and the Koch brothers. Just recently it was, who's going to get their money, who's going to get their support. All the candidates were salaming them and saluting them and trying to get their money and their support. He's even put Barack Obama in the shade. Somebody wrote me yesterday and said he really already is the president. He's like the private president. Everybody pays far more attention to him than any politician.

WOODS: What about this complaint that he has a lot of bravado and a lot of funny speeches, but he's long on rhetoric and short on policies? We want his policy papers. Why isn't he producing policies. What's your response to that? Because I can think of two ways of thinking about that. One the one hand, I can see a point to that objection, in that there is a kind of Teddy Roosevelt aspect to Trump, and that's not a compliment. That, look, I'm the representative of the people, and you've got to just trust that I'll exercise my judgment in a way that'll benefit the people. And I could easily see him issuing a million executive orders, because he's Donald Trump and these people in Congress are idiots. I could easily see that happening. And I would like to see him kind of hemmed in by what he's going to do. But on the other hand, these policy papers are not worth the paper they're written on. They're produced by, again, specialists in snowing the people. They get thrown in the trashcan as soon as the person steps into office. They don't actually wind up meaning anything anyway.

ROCKWELL: Policy is a synonym for lie. That's all you have to know. Anytime anybody's talking about a policy, they're lying, so I don't think this is a problem at all. As to his speeches, I love the fact that the other day he said nobody running for president should be allowed to use a teleprompter.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: Because of course he gives extemporaneous speeches, versus speeches written by somebody else for him to deliver. So you know, it seems to me you kind of have to like that. And there are people who accuse him of being a potential dictator. I talked to David Gordon about this and other people who know far more than I do. None of us can think of a businessman who's ever been a dictator. Now of course that's not proof that a business person can't be a dictator, but since all American presidents have been dictators since Franklin Roosevelt, and then of course Lincoln and Wilson before that, again, would he be worse than George W. Bush or Barack Obama? He could be much better in the fact that he's not controlled. He's actually capable of doing radical and good. Or maybe he'll just be as bad as John Kasich. That's a possibility too.

But are we really supposed to fear him more than Jeb Bush? I think not. So I don't mind the fact that he's just laying out a broad program that he'd like to see established. But again, he would have to get things through Congress. I hope nobody becomes president, by the way, but anybody who is president, you can't just — even at the present stage, you can't just do it all by yourself. So I think they also believe him.

There's the Ron Paul factor too. People hear him speak; they think he believes this. Now of course Ron is a great intellectual and a great man in every sense, so I don't want to compare him to Trump, but people think Trump is authentic. People believe that he believes what he's saying. It doesn't mean he's right, but they like that. They know that they can't believe anything that the rest of the politicians say, so no wonder they find him refreshing.

I noticed that he was going to have a big rally in Mobile, Alabama on Friday, and immediately he was criticized, what, this is nuts, going to Alabama when you're only supposed to spend all your time in Iowa and New Hampshire, but I thought, well, I don't know why he's doing it, but it's interesting. So of course first of all it turns out they keep growing out of the venue that he's going to be in, and now they're going to rent a football stadium for him to speak at 5:30 in Mobile, Alabama on Friday.

So there's something happening in this country. It's driving the elites bananas; it's bringing up issues like — you've got Jeb Bush complaining about anchor babies. I mean, it's quite amazing to see all these guys try to turn Trumpian, because they do the polling, they know what the people are wanting, and they know that they are all being rejected. It doesn't matter than Jeb Bush has \$100 million. It doesn't matter that Scott Walker is endorsed by the Kochs. It doesn't matter that Sheldon Adelson loves Marco Rubio. Maybe these are all negatives, as indeed they should be negatives.

WOODS: It's interesting you mentioned the anchor baby thing. I sometimes see libertarians who think that it's a libertarian position that you have to interpret the 14th Amendment as mandating anchor babies. In other words, if somebody is born in the U.S., even if their parents are illegal, they are automatically citizens. Why would a libertarian have a position on citizenship, which is a total state policy which wouldn't even exist without the state, and especially when what it means is you're entitled to all kinds of special benefits and affirmative action and all kinds of state-led goodies that you get that other people don't get? I don't see why a libertarian would support that. Ron Paul was correct to be against that.

But yeah, of course that's not an issue anybody's supposed to talk about. We're supposed to talk about so-called public policy and this and that. Why do you think – maybe it's related to the point you just made – why do you think it doesn't stick when the objection is made that Trump supported Hillary in the past or said kind words about this one or said that he identified more as a Democrat? Why is that not sticking to him?

ROCKWELL: Well, because they believe him when he says he doesn't have that view anymore. And of course when he said the nice thing about Hillary, she was a senator from New York; he was a businessman in New York. You can't, if you're going to be a successful big businessman, you can't needle the senator. That's because of course the state has such unbelievable power at the federal and state and local levels. So I think – and maybe Hillary is – if you were to meet Hillary at a party, maybe she's a nice lady. It seems to me you can't rule that out. Certainly Bill Clinton comes across as a great guy if you meet him, even though he isn't. So I think, again, because people think he's telling the truth. They thought he was telling the truth then; they think he's – not necessarily truth with a capital "T", but just that that's way he felt then; this is the way he feels now.

And another thing I love about him, he's totally destroyed political correctness. They call him a racist for his immigration position; they call him a sexist, misogynist for begin upset at Megyn Kelly. It just bounces off. I mean he definitely is the Teflon candidate. And I think he's dramatically diminished the whole political correctness business. Just the fact that when he was asked about what he would do if Black Lives Matters came to him – which now it turns out is founded and run by a white guy, so we'll see what happens to Black Lives Matter, given that – so he said, what would happen if they tried to break up one of his speeches, and he said wasn't it terrible when they did that to Bernie Sanders? He let these two loud women escort him off the stage, take his mike, he said that he showed that he's so weak. He said I can tell you, they're not taking my mike. I don't know whether the fighting would be done by me personally or by people who work for me; they're not taking my mike. And everybody cheered, of course.

WOODS: Yeah, that's a very popular position.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Yeah, of course it is.

WOODS: I mean, especially given that, they even disrupt Bernie Sanders? I mean, you can't just – have your own event. We don't disrupt things, right? We have our event, people listen to us; we have the Internet, the whole world can listen to us. But somebody's giving a speech? Like, I remember as an undergrad, everybody who came to give a speech was a rotten jerk that I would have hated to listen to, but it never dawned on me to make an ass out of myself, whereas when we would have one guy show up, one person who was different from what everybody would be hearing at Harvard, well, there were demonstrations and screaming and people making idiots out of themselves. It's a totalitarian impulse, that I cannot allow the expression of any opinion that is different than mine without my alerting the world, which of course is awaiting your pronouncement with baited breath, of my objection to it. It's just horrifying.

ROCKWELL: Of course it's a violation of property rights, too.

WOODS: And that too.

ROCKWELL: And manners.

WOODS: And manners. And of course, Bernie Sanders was a complete pushover about the whole thing: well, gee, I'm sorry you don't want to hear what I have to say. Stand up for yourself, man. I mean, give me a break. What an opportunity he had to give a rip-roaring speech there, and he just folded completely, just pathetic.

ROCKWELL: Martin O'Malley cringed and had to apologize for saying "All lives matter."

WOODS: Yeah, I'm deeply sorry for saying that all lives matter. Because I should understand the context. Anyway, it's only – we could do a whole episode on Black Lives Matter. Let's talk about, is Trump going to have any electoral success?

ROCKWELL: Well, I think he's likely to be the nominee. I think he's likely to be the president?

WOODS: Really?

ROCKWELL: And in fact, I've thought that from the very beginning. He clearly lit a prairie fire. I mean, from the very beginning, from his announcement, it like he plugged in the population. Just everybody was riveted. And the polls have shown it. I must say I thought that Fox made a very bad mistake in going after him. And of course, Fox, which has been going from strength to strength, beating all the other cable channels, high ratings and so forth, it was their first big stumble. And they've in effect had to apologize to him, and we'll see what happens to Megyn Kelly and those other creeps who were the so-called moderators.

But I think people like him. And it's true that he's bombastic – although Erick Erickson, of all people, once wrote an article and he said I can't stand – he said politicians are virtually always very different in private than in public. I must say Ron Paul is the one

exception to that rule – I'm saying that, not Erick Erickson. But he said, for example, Rick Perry, very, very nasty for the people who work for him and who can't respond. I mean, very, very nasty. And he said I could have no respect for him after I saw that. He said Donald Trump is the sweetest employer in the world. He said he's very, very nice, he's calm, he's quiet, and his employees all love him, and he's very, very nice to them. And he said it's too bad that people will never see that actual personality of his in public, because of course he has a very different public personal, TV persona.

WOODS: It's interesting that you say this, that you make this kind of prediction, because of course the mainstream media has had exactly the opposite view since the beginning, that he's not going to accomplish this, he's not going to –

ROCKWELL: Every single article. Every single article said this.

WOODS: And he'll never get to this threshold or accomplish this or jump over this hurdle. And I remember when I saw *The New York Post* say that Donald Trump is toast after he insulted what someone later called Saint John McCain. And I thought to myself, look, I'm not even the most astute political observer in America, and I know for a fact that is not going to finish him off. And of course I was right; I was totally right, and *The New York Post* was completely wrong, and the fact that they could be so deeply wrong – I mean, it's not like he went down ten points but he's still ahead. He didn't go down, as far as I could see. He's still doing great – shows how utterly disconnected – the fact that people like the people at *The Post* thought they could trot out Jeb Bush and Scott Walker and keep the masses satisfied is deeply revealing.

Now on the other hand, when Scott Walker drops out, Bush drops out, are those people going to go to Trump or are they going to look for another? These seem like the safe people. Aren't the safe people going to go to Kasich or something?

ROCKWELL: Well, we've still got a while to go, but of course you made the same point about Tim Pawlenty, they're all saying hey, look at Kasich; he's going up, he's amazing, he's exciting the crowds – of course it's not true.

WOODS: No.

ROCKWELL: Another very, very boring guy going nowhere. So I don't know, will they try to bring somebody else in? Who knows what they're going to try to do to Trump. Sometimes terrible things have happened to people who have threatened the establishment in the way he's threatening them, so we can't know about that sort of thing. These are very bad people. They are in a situation where one line in the federal register can take billions of dollars from somebody or give billions of dollars to somebody, and of course in a system like that there's so much at stake, and it's like the mafia. I don't mean to impugn the mafia, but government has similarities to the mafia. But I think as long as his health is good, as long as he keeps it up, I think more and more people are going to come to him. And by the way, talk about something that's not being emphasized: Democrats love Trump. Working class especially – Democrats love Trump.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: Group that the Democrats have never been able to get in recent years. So I think he's much bigger than the Republican Party. He's put the Republican Party in the shade. All the operatives, the political consultants, all the other politicians, they've all shrunk to a tiny size. So, you know, he's got an outsize personality, and apparently people like that. He's a very American figure. He could never go anywhere in, say, British politics, but he really taps into something that was noticeable in America in the 19th century too. This sort of businessman, people admire him, and all the talk of class warfare and envy and that sort of thing, nobody feels that way toward Donald Trump. They admire him as a successful businessman, and they like his flash and his – I must say a lot of that's not to my style either, but he really taps into what people want.

People are also – he's talking about issues that have been suppressed for decades, that have not been allowed to discuss, and all of a sudden he wipes away all the political correctness. Now everybody can discuss immigration, whereas it could never be discussed before. And on the subject of immigration, I just want to – maybe you'll link to these too, but there are two great Hoppe articles on why, if we had a private property order, if we had a libertarian society where everything is private property, there could be no involuntary immigration. All immigration, like all trade, would have to be voluntary, and so that clearly should be the ideal.

And the idea that you can just bring the entire world here, a lot of them go on welfare, get affirmative action, get public schools and all kinds of other government so-called services at the expense of the taxpayers, trample on other people's private property, vote themselves other people's private property. The idea that current property owners and taxpayers, whether it's in Italy or Britain or France or the United States, this is of course a worldwide problem, should not be able to say anything, that it's politically correct not to like this, he wiped it away. Boom, just snap, with his announcement. They predicted after his announcement, well, he's gone, he's dead, you can't criticize mass immigration without being a racist and a bum and a fascist or whatever.

WOODS: And of course they normally want an issue like that to be, as with all major issues, something that both parties agree on, so that it's never ever raised in a debate.

ROCKWELL: That's right.

WOODS: You can't talk about this – and there's a whole laundry list. That's what this whole show is about. The whole laundry list of things that the Democrats and Republicans will agree on, so they will not be brought up. So whether it's, you know – I don't know where Trump stood on the bank bailouts –

ROCKWELL: This is your 3x5 card.

WOODS: Yeah, the 3 by – exactly. You're right. And by the way, I think – and this is just a gut instinct, but I think despite – maybe not despite, but because of his war on political correctness, I think Trump in a head-to-head match against Hillary or whoever the Democrat is, I think he would actually do much better among American blacks than any GOP candidate in recent memory. Do you have that same instinct?

ROCKWELL: You know, this is the only candidate actually capable of reaching out to the black community.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: Black people like his style, just like white people like his style. More to the point, black people don't like mass immigration. They hate mass immigration. There was a time when Jesse Jackson, before he got paid off, used to hold rallies at the Mexican-American border denouncing immigration as taking black jobs. So I think there's no question he's going to get a very significant number of black votes.

I would also predict a significant number of Hispanic votes. Already the polls show he gets about 25% of the Hispanic vote. Now, why isn't that a huge news item? Because of course what this means is the people who are workers, who are settled here, who jumped through all the hoops don't like the idea of a lot of bums, welfare bums coming in and being given all kinds of privileges. They don't like that anymore than anybody else likes it.

So absolutely, Trump will get some huge – from a Republican standpoint – huge percentage of the black vote. He's already beating Hillary in the polls in North Carolina. He's climbing up against her in all the other polls. And I was thrilled to see a poll today that he's beating Rubio and Bush in Florida, in their home state of Florida. Both these guys, of course, very boring. Rubio also, may I say something politically incorrect, extremely stupid, and I know this not only from observing him but from people who've had dealings with him. This guy's a boob. But we're supposed to hail him and think that he's just America's future.

WOODS: One more thing on this: the way the GOP normally tries to engage in outreach to the black community, or say, ever since Jack Kemp, I'm going to be the candidate who reaches out to the black community, it's always with some list of wonkish proposals that no one is interested. I'll bring enterprise zones to your community or whatever. I don't even know what you're talking about. Whereas just a plain spoken guy I think would have vastly more success than anybody showing up with his wonkish policy papers. I mean, really, they've been so utterly inept in doing this.

ROCKWELL:: Look at the candidates who think, for example, that the way to reach out to the black community is to go to Ferguson. You know what? The rioters, the burglars, the looters, and so forth – why do they do that? People to trump up appeals to are the people who have jobs, who have families, who have homes, who have a stake in the community, are very concerned about their future and are concerned of course about the black unemployment rate. So Trump says he's going to do something

about that. I'm not in favor of what he wants to do, but that is a very, very powerful — jobs is a very, very powerful political issue to the vast majority of the black community, who actually like to work, or do have jobs and want to keep their jobs. It doesn't appeal to the welfare bums who are shooting people in Ferguson. But you know what? That's okay, and the guys who went to Ferguson and tried to make a moral issue out of, isn't it terrible that people in Ferguson are being maltreated because they're not allowed to loot, that doesn't work. Doesn't work with black people, doesn't work with white people, doesn't work with anybody else.

WOODS: And as I say, it's been tried again and again, and the results are terrible, so they think if I just try this harder, if I do three times as much as this, I'll get three times the results. And you do: three times zero. It doesn't do anything.

ROCKWELL: Well I know black people who talk about these enterprise zones that Jack Kemp promoted, we have other candidates promoting that. They know that if there's an enterprise zone set up, the people who are going to get the benefits are going to be the cronies. They're not going to be people in the area. Whatever tax or other kind of regulatory benefits go to people who are going to bring in a factory or whatever will be cronies, the people with pull with the government. They're not going to be regular people. They know. So all this stuff is of course worse than wonkish. So what if somebody has a big policy paper? Nobody pays attention. Trump said the other day to Chuck Todd, who wanted to know why he didn't have 75 policy papers on things, he said, you know, Chuck, people don't care about policy papers. Voters don't care about policy papers. It's just you people in the media. Of course that's entirely right. And they want them so they can go through and hang him. That's the purpose.

WOODS: Right, right. And of course, I'm sure Ron had some kind of policy paper, but it would be like one sentence. This thing needs to be abolished. That's my policy. What else do you need to know?

ROCKWELL: And he would right columns and so forth, but he never had a policy paper.

WOODS: Yeah, right, because the whole thing wrecks of government and wrecks of I got my degree in government from such and such university, so now here's how I'm going to try and change society and all that. Eh. I mean, every single one of these things winds up in the trashcan. Every policy paper from every wonkish institute winds up in the trashcan. We all know that. That's why the Mises Institute doesn't write policy papers, not only because they're ineffective and stupid, but because the premise on which it's based is that the government basically has control over people's lives and property, and we're going to try to figure out how it ought to exercise that power, maybe with a little bit of a nod in the direction of freedom. No, no, no, we think in a whole different paradigm.

ROCKWELL: Let me just mention one last thing.

WOODS: Please, go ahead.

ROCKWELL: Another thing Trump has done, he's gotten rid of all the Beltway think tanks. I mean, they all still exist, but nobody cares about them, nobody thinks about them, everybody ignores them. Heritage, Cato, AEI, Brookings, and so forth, all these places that make vast sums of money putting out policy papers, nobody reads them, nobody cares about them, and now probably their buildings are all a couple of stories shorter because of Donald Trump.

WOODS: Yeah, it's very interesting. So I mean there definitely are silver linings here. As I say, neither of us wants to see a victor in this terrible race in general, in elections in general, because we never get anything good out of it. But there are some good consequences.

ROCKWELL: But if he brings down the establishment, if he wounds the establishment, hurts the establishment, that's to the benefit of every decent person in this country and every decent person in the world.

WOODS: Exactly right. He has embarrassed the establishment, because everybody knows the establishment and Jeb Bush are in cahoots. Like, that's the guy you were supposed to support, and he is making a laughing stock out of him. It seems to me everybody has to be happy about that. If you're not happy about that, go have your head examined, because this is a happy moment. Also, while you're in the waiting room to have your head examined, check out Lew Rockwell's Political Theatre blog. Go to LewRockwell.com and where you see "Political Theatre" click on that, because of Lew's two blogs, this is the one that Lew writes exclusively. No one else contributes to that. And it's just Lew's commentary and links all day, everyday about what's going on in the race, and it's a lot of fun to read. If you have to endure an election, you might as well get some enjoyment and entertainment out of it – and education – through Lew Rockwell's Political Theatre. Well, Lew, it's been fun, as I knew it would be. Thanks so much.

ROCKWELL: Tom, thanks a million.