



Episode 580: *National Review* Attacks Trump: Not a Real Conservative

Guest: Jack Kerwick

WOODS: I had to have you on when I heard from Paul Gottfried that you'd written this particular column. Paul's been a guest on the show several times. He is a tough critic, so if Paul likes somebody's column, then it's pretty darn good. And it's an interesting column. I was just telling people — it's going to be linked at TomWoods.com/580 — it's about the *National Review* response to Donald Trump. They had a cover story — it's a symposium, really, and it's called "Against Trump." Says that on the cover. They've got a lot of their contributors on there, and they are just going after him. They're saying he's not a real conservative, and we basically are the lodestar of conservatism — it was that style of attack.

And I want to talk about your response to this. What I find interesting about it is that — and extremely revealing — is that *National Review* did not publish anything like this in 2012 against Mitt Romney. They did not publish anything like this in 2008 against John McCain. I'm sure they had a columnist here and there wringing his hands about, oh, they're not going to be conservative enough. Yeah, probably got a little cry baby stuff like that, but then we got the usual, shove-it-down-your-throat, you've got to take this guy, you've got to live with Mitt Romney, you're going to be perfectly happy, because without Mitt Romney we're going to lose the country, and so on and on. We never got an attack on the scale that they've just done to Trump. Why do you think that is?

KERWICK: Yeah, I want to make it clear too that I wasn't out to defend Trump as much as I'm —

WOODS: No.

KERWICK: — as much as I was just stunned by the hypocrisy, and it just seemed to me just self-opportunism of these self-declared conservatives of *National Review*. Yeah, I do have some ideas as to why they have such a problem with Trump, and there are different theories out there. I think, for one, this whole notion that Trump is not really a conservative, he's socially liberal, well, if you look at his record I think the case can be made for that. But they weren't troubled by endorsing other socially liberal Republican candidates. Okay, Trump was in favor of gay marriage supposedly. Well today, these same people are telling us, hey, the Supreme Court settled the issue; you know, move on. Gay marriage now —

WOODS: Yeah, let me jump in on that; let me jump in on that, because the neocons have repeatedly said, look, you lost on that issue, get over it, we're going to move on, we don't want to dwell on it.

KERWICK: That's right.

WOODS: So all of a sudden they do want to dwell on it? Make up your mind.

KERWICK: Yeah, exactly right. And when it comes to Trump's position on abortion, again, this is another piece of just glaring hypocrisy here. Remember, a lot of these people were in favor of Rudy Giuliani some years ago. Rudy Giuliani was avowedly pro-choice. Mitt Romney was for abortion before he was against it, and then for it again before he was against it. And not to mention, given their attitude toward gay marriage — Supreme Court settled it, move on — well, the Supreme Court settled abortion decades ago. So what do they expect to gain by saying that this candidate's pro-life? What are these people actually doing? They've been funding Planned Parenthood for years and years, and this was under George W. Bush and his Republican Congress. The hypocrisy is just all over the place.

I think — and believe it or not, Tom, the other night I saw a clip of Chris Matthews' show, and he had someone from *National Review* —

WOODS: I was just writing down "Chris Matthews" just this second to ask you about that. Talk about that.

KERWICK: Oh okay, yeah. No, I just saw the clip; I don't watch the guy's show. But someone sent me the clip, and he had this young woman from *National Review*, and I'd never heard of her before, and she really seemed to out of her league to me, and that's saying something.

WOODS: Awful. She did a terrible job.

KERWICK: I thought she did an awful job, and that's really saying something, to be out of your league dealing with someone like Chris Matthews too.

WOODS: (laughing)

KERWICK: But here Chris Matthews said, "Can you name one contributor to this symposium who didn't favor the war in Iraq?" Now, she says that there are lots of people there who came to regret it, and then she couldn't name one. And he said to her, name one. She couldn't do it. Now, it is true —

WOODS: She said Ted Cruz. She said Ted Cruz. Okay, but he's not even in the symposium.

KERWICK: (laughing) That's right. That's right, she did mention Ted Cruz, right. But he meant name one contributor to this symposium who —

WOODS: Who's not a hawk.

KERWICK: Who's not a hawk. Okay. She couldn't do it. And it's true that while people like Glenn Beck have come to regret, have come to see the error of their ways in supporting the war in Iraq, but the fact of the matter is they supported it, and they were enthusiastic supporters of that war for years until things started really turning south. I think, yes, in part it's the fact that Trump did not support the Iraq War that has them bothered, but I think that's also indicative of a larger foreign policy vision on his part, because whereas Trump — Trump poses a problem for guys like you and I, I'm sure. He's not very articulate, and you're not really certain whether he has anything worked out that well.

But he has made some remarks regarding foreign policy, like complimentary remarks toward Putin, for example. He's been angry about the fact that we weren't compensated by going into Iraq, that if we had to go in, which he opposed, we should — I think in no small part, the neocons — and that's what they are, you know the neoconservatives are running the show at *National Review*. They hold the levers of power and influence at Fox News. I think the neoconservatives are a bit scared by Trump's foreign policy vision. They're not worried that he's going to behave recklessly; they're worried about "isolationism." And so I think to no small extent, I think that could account for why they dislike him.

They also don't like him because they're worried he's going to damage the Republican Party brand. The Republicans are insistent that we only put up nicer and nicer candidates. You know, the Democrats are going to like us. The moderates are going to gravitate toward us. We're going to be able to immunize ourselves against these charges that the Democrats and the Left have been leveling against for years, in charges of being racist and sexist and so forth. You know, that's self-delusional in itself, to think that there's anything that they can do. So I do think they're also worried that Trump's style is going to — but also, they can't buy him. They've already pissed him off. They know that this guy keeps an enemies list. He's not going to forget what they've said about him afterwards.

And finally, Tom, I think the fact that their candidate — say Jeb Bush, he was the candidate initially. The fact that this guy has had millions of dollars spent through super PACs to support him and is hovering in the single digits right now. Marco Rubio also wasn't exactly tearing anything up. I think they're also worried that, hey, this could spell their own demise. People aren't buying what they're selling now.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, all right, let me jump in on that. Now, Bush — there's one poll that just came out that has him in Iowa at 1%. That's laughable. That's unbelievable.

KERWICK: (laughing)

WOODS: All the way down to 1%. Now, there's another poll that has him around 4, but there's a reputable poll — I don't remember the polling agency, but it's a reputable

agency that has him at 1%, so it's really, really bad. I want to amplify a couple of things you said. He also, Trump, said that Ukraine is none of our business.

KERWICK: That's right.

WOODS: Like, what in the heck reason would we have to get involved there? And I'm so tired of libertarians who say, (gasp) — I actually had somebody, by the way, who was a donor of mine, a small donor —

KERWICK: Mm hmm.

WOODS: — so in other words, somebody who listens I think carefully to me, and concluded that I was endorsing Trump and calling on people to vote for him just by simply saying, you know, the guy has said some things on foreign policy that I wish more people would say. I devoted an episode of my show to talk about the problems I have with Trump and the concerns that I have about him, but I'm glad somebody — why should I care who it is? I'm glad somebody is saying these things about Ukraine, about Syria.

KERWICK: Yes.

WOODS: Now on the other hand, he can be a real hawk sometimes too.

KERWICK: Yes, he can.

WOODS: But anyway, the point is he's said these things. Now, the other thing I think I want to add into this picture as to why they don't like him is he does not show the proper obeisance to the official conservative movement. He doesn't seem to care about their overpaid think-tanks that haven't accomplished anything.

KERWICK: That's right.

WOODS: He doesn't care about their magazines; he doesn't care about their talking heads. And these people live on their own sense of self-importance, and he is crapping all over that, and they are screaming and yelling. And what it reminds me is, you know, there are very few episodes in my life or in life in general that can't be amply illustrated by an episode of *The Simpsons*. And there's a *Simpsons* episode where Homer has this tremendous alcoholic drink, and Moe the bartender copies it and starts selling it to everybody, and Homer is really upset that he's not getting any of the credit. So he says, Moe, you just lost yourself a customer. But Moe can't hear him over the clamor of the thousands of people shouting for that drink. So poor Homer is saying you just lost yourself a customer, and Moe can't even hear him.

KERWICK: (laughing)

WOODS: In that case Homer is *National Review*. Hey, wait a minute! We 37 intellectuals don't like you! And no one can hear them, and it drives them crazy.

KERWICK: Yeah.

WOODS: I think that's part of it.

KERWICK: Oh, I think so too, and in fact, yesterday I was listening to — I don't know if you've ever heard of Dennis Prager, if you know who he is.

WOODS: Oh, I've been on his show, yep.

KERWICK: Oh, you've been on his show. Okay.

WOODS: Yep. Once. I was not invited back, but I have been on (laughing).

KERWICK: Well, you know, Tom, I remember years ago before I even started getting into the writing and this kind of thing, I remember hearing you on Michael Medved's show.

WOODS: Oh yeah, I've been on there, yeah.

KERWICK: And Medved, he's a colleague of Prager's; they're both on the Salem Radio Network, and Medved was also one of the contributors to this symposium in *National Review*, which came as no surprise to me. But I heard Prager, just exasperated yesterday, saying it doesn't matter what Trump says. Because he's no Trump supporter at all. And it's frustrating these people that Trump is allowed to get away with saying as much as he has. I mean, if you remember, back when he made that remark about John McCain, I think it was a *National Review* writer then came out: "Trump's Campaign is Toast." That's it; he's done.

WOODS: (laughing) I know, I love that.

KERWICK: And I'm thinking, do you really think that you have a bunch of people out there that are big fans of John McCain?

WOODS: Of John McCain? See how out of it they are? They think that if you criticize Saint John McCain, your life is over.

KERWICK: Well and you know, you hear Prager and these guys, they always talk about how the Left lives in this hermetically sealed bubble, and yet the neoconservatives do as well. They are self-delusional. They really are disconnected from the events on the ground, from what's actually going on. They live in their own bubble. To think that 22 people from *National Review* can come out against Trump and that that's somehow going to hurt him, it just baffles — I said immediately this is going to boost his esteem in a lot of people's eyes.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, because people are going to say, oh, gee, the pointy-heads don't like him. Well, isn't that exactly what I would expect? It plays right into his narrative. It's so dumb the way they did it; it was so sledgehammer.

KERWICK: Yeah. A good friend of mine came out and said to me, my friend said, if the GOP establishment was really smart, what they would do is get McCain and Lindsey Graham to come out and endorse Trump.

WOODS: Yeah.

KERWICK: That would be a smart move to make.

WOODS: Yeah, exactly.

KERWICK: But instead Graham comes out and endorses Jeb Bush (laughing). I mean, you can't make this stuff up.

WOODS: Yeah, really, really. Could there be a less consequential event than the official endorsement of Jeb — of one loser by another loser? Ridiculous.

KERWICK: (laughing) I know.

WOODS: You've got a quotation in here from Glenn Beck's piece saying that Trump is no conservative, because he supported the stimulus, the auto bailouts, and the bank bailouts. Now to me, that is horrifying, and of course the whole Tea Party did get started over their opposition to TARP and the bailouts, so to suddenly say, well, that doesn't really matter because at least he tells it like it is, is somewhat problematic to me. But how do you handle that here in the column?

KERWICK: Well, all I say is, listen, George W. Bush is the one who got this whole ball rolling with the big bank bailouts. John McCain also, if you remember back in October of 2008, McCain claimed to be suspending his presidential campaign so he could go back to Washington and they could find a way to resolve this financial crisis. And McCain signed on to the bank bailouts. But my whole point is Glenn Beck, even if he didn't like McCain, he was endorsing McCain, and he was doing so on the grounds that McCain had this great running mate, Sarah Palin. And then McCain later on signed on to the auto bailouts. And even back in 2008 earlier on in the year, February 2008, McCain revealed his own stimulus plan, but Beck had endorsed him. *National Review* endorsed him. Michael Medved was an enthusiastic supporter of McCain. I mean, he was a more enthusiastic supporter of McCain than was McCain.

So the fact that Trump supported these things — like I said, yeah, in none of my writings do I ever intend to defend Trump. In fact, I even published one article months ago noting that, yeah, Trump has no record of conservatism in my judgment. People should be suspicious of him. But again, my key objective here is just to unveil just the really scandalous degree of phoniness and hypocrisy on the part of these Trump critics.

WOODS: Yeah, of how outraged they are of his opinions, when McCain, on top of all the existing interventions at the time of the housing collapse, he wanted to spend an extra \$300 billion to buy up bad mortgages.

KERWICK: That's right. He said that during a debate. That's right.

WOODS: Yeah. And he said this isn't George Bush's plan; this is my plan. And they wrung their hands, oh, John McCain. But there was nothing like this. So my sense also is that they feel like McCain would be predictable, because he's basically a dolt.

KERWICK: Right.

WOODS: Right, he graduated at the bottom of his class. He has the IQ of a tricycle. So they don't have to worry about him. He'll be controlled and bought, and nobody has to worry. Whereas Trump, he may do some things *National Review* likes. He'll probably do more things *National Review* likes than things that I like.

KERWICK: Yeah, likewise.

WOODS: But they can't be sure of that. They'd rather have a bird in the hand.

KERWICK: Exactly, yeah.

WOODS: All right, there's a lot more I want to talk about here, because I also want to talk about the Sam Francis analysis and stuff like that, but before we do that, let me pause for a quick message.

[Sponsored content]

All right, I want to raise with you a concept that was developed by a guy named Sam Francis. That name is probably familiar to you.

KERWICK: Yes.

WOODS: It may be familiar to some of my listeners, and more so because his name has come up over the past few weeks, because he's been resurrected, because his analysis is so useful in understanding the Trump phenomenon. And people say, huh, isn't it funny this obscure conservative writer seemed to predict this. Well first of all, the only reason he was obscure — he was a newspaper columnist, syndicated across the country.

KERWICK: Yeah.

WOODS: The only reason he was obscure is the neocons destroyed him and pushed him into obscurity.

KERWICK: Right.

WOODS: I love how they say, hey, congratulate us everybody, we found this obscure guy. Yeah, the guy whose face you crushed under your boot? Yeah, you found him?

KERWICK: I know.

WOODS: With a boot print on his face? Well anyway, what he was arguing back in the '90s — and I remember reading him at the time and feeling like the analysis was right but it wasn't corresponding to reality. He was arguing that what you have out there in the heartland are a lot of what he called MARs: middle American radicals, people who are not really ideological, who really don't care who's a "real conservative" or a real this or that. They don't think that way.

What they think about are pocketbook issues, and they think about things like American sovereignty; they think about free trade and protectionism. They think about America first-type issues. They think about their own particular well being. They don't think about abstract principles, and they are going to respond to a candidate who says the politicians have totally sold you out with their abstract theorizing, and what I'm going to do is implement policies aimed at improving the material standard of living of the middle class. And that is what these people — and these are anti-multicultural people by and large, and they're going to respond to that. And Trump has tapped into that, and meanwhile *National Review*, tone deaf as always, is saying — and I'm not saying it's great that this phenomenon exists. I'm saying it exists.

KERWICK: Right.

WOODS: The *National Review* people, tone deaf as always, are responding by saying, but he's not a real conservative, and they can't understand why that doesn't stick. It doesn't stick, because these people don't care about that.

KERWICK: That's right. Yeah, I was going to say, not only do these people not care about whether Trump's a real conservative — because there are still a lot of people who are Trump supporters who still self-identify as conservatives — what they've seen is not only eight years of Barack Obama, but also what they've seen is those people who are carrying the conservative label have really given it a bad name. These — I mean, they call them RINOs. I have my own problems with that term, just because I think it presupposes that a real Republican is a conservative, and I just think that's a wrong presupposition. But these same people, what they've seen is, listen, you people at *National Review*, on Fox News, you continually support the Republicans; the Republicans have regained the Congress, at least regained the House back in 2010, Senate back in 2014, and nothing has really changed.

WOODS: Yeah.

KERWICK: And then they can think back to George W. Bush, Republican control then, everyone recognizes the mess that Bush made of things. So it's like, anymore what does conservative mean?

WOODS: I think that's exactly what's going on, particularly, as you say, among people who do call themselves conservatives.

KERWICK: Yeah.

WOODS: People say I cannot understand why you would possibly be supporting Trump. It isn't that they say, well, I've looked at his platform — because he doesn't really have one.

KERWICK: (laughing) No.

WOODS: Their thinking is, how could it be worse, that the people that you people have been putting up have been horrible. They have accelerated every bad trend in the country. How could it be worse to have a guy who basically just has a kind of pragmatic philosophy? And by the way, I can't stand a pragmatic philosophy, because his view of eminent domain is, well, we need it to build the roads.

KERWICK: I know.

WOODS: There's no depth there. It's very frustrating. But my point is I can understand why somebody says a machine that has given us Dole, Bush, McCain, and Romney is not in a position to lecture us about our support for Trump, so we're partly supporting Trump as a way of sticking it in their faces and saying it's not going to happen that way anymore. We've decided you wanted to give us Jeb Bush or Marco Rubio, and we've decided that's not happening. It is the most stunning rebuke of the conservative movement that I've ever seen. Now, I wish it were in the form of a Ron Paul being the stunning rebuke to these people.

KERWICK: Right, me too.

WOODS: That would be more rebuke to these people. That would be more emotionally and intellectually satisfying to me.

KERWICK: Me too.

WOODS: But it is very interesting to me as an observer to see that this is a revolt against everything, even against the columnists who may really be conservatives and who may actually believe in the free market and so on and so forth. These are the people who would sell out their own grandmothers to be on the right side of an election, to make sure that they are endorsing Romney, even "with reservations," none of which ever amount to a hill of beans.

KERWICK: Yeah, absolutely. No, I agree. I agree with every word you just said, especially how, you know, this is a standing repudiation really of people clawing at the GOP establishment. I just refer to it as neoconservatism. And I've made this point in past articles too: for all this talk of "the establishment," I said in reality what we really have are just competing factions within one establishment. There are neoconservatives, and then there are other degrees of neoconservatism. That's what's going on.

Like I consider Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, these guys, they're neocons too, but just of later shades. I think they're just shades of neoconservatism, because they were huge supporters of the war in Iraq — still do. Still do support that war in Iraq. They supported Bush enthusiastically. I mean, Sean Hannity, if you'll recall, along with Michael Medved and some other radio hosts, were regularly invited to the White House to interview Bush there. I mean, so I don't let these guys forget their own track record. They were as much a part of this problem as anyone. They contributed to it.

And I think with the whole Trump phenomenon now, yeah, it really is a standing repudiation on the part of people who otherwise have felt that they have been bamboozled by the Republican Party in the past, finally saying no more. And if that means Trump's going to do some stuff along the way that we don't like, so be it. But you know, if it's going to get under your skin that bad, and it can't be any worse than what we've already had, it'd be an improvement.

WOODS: Yeah. Now, I am concerned that his personal style is such that he would be likely, like Teddy Roosevelt, to just override other power centers, to override the legislature and whatever and just enforce his will. But then I think, well, have these people — and that's one of my main concerns, and I've talked about that on my show. But at the same time, it's not like other presidents have been scrupulously observant of the separation of powers.

KERWICK: No.

WOODS: I think there's a Trump derangement syndrome that causes people to forget the actual experiences we're having now (laughing), which involve people doing exactly the things we fear Trump might do. So we have to bear in mind, your expectations have to be extremely low here. Now, you wrote this column — again, it's linked at the show notes page, TomWoods.com/580 — you wrote it at *Townhall*. Now, *Townhall* is a fairly mainstream, right-of-center news site —

KERWICK: It is.

WOODS: — and yet you lobbed a hand grenade at *National Review*, the flagship publication of the conservative movement. How do you think you got away with that?

KERWICK: Well, one of the editors at *Townhall* — she's a news editor, though — she was one of the contributors to the symposium. Her name's Katie Pavlich.

WOODS: Oh, well how about that. Well then I really credit *Townhall* for publishing your column.

KERWICK: I do too. I don't know, I've managed to get — and I've been writing for them — and I freelance write. It's not like I'm on a payroll or anything. But I managed to get a lot of columns accepted there, and I'd been doing this with them for the last couple of years. And I'm not sure how it happened actually (laughing), to be real honest with

you. You know, I'm very grateful for the fact that I am able to showcase my work there, because they do have a lot of readers, and as I say, it is a GOP-friendly outfit.

WOODS: Yeah.

KERWICK: But yeah, thankfully — I can't explain it, but for whatever reasons, they — I've been told before that they appreciate my perspective.

WOODS: Okay.

KERWICK: So maybe that explains it.

WOODS: All right, well, I'll take that; I'll take that.

KERWICK: Yeah, I'll take it too.

WOODS: Do you come up with the headline, the title for the column, or does the editor do that?

KERWICK: Usually I do, but I just have to make sure I submit it. If not, they'll put something there.

WOODS: Okay yeah, because I never want to blame authors — because I know half the time people come up with titles for me, and then half the comments are about how stupid the title is. Well, I had nothing to do with it.

KERWICK: Yeah.

WOODS: But your column is called "*Hey National Review, What's Conservatism?*" Let's finish up by having you account for that title for the column. What are you driving at with that?

KERWICK: Well, what I think I'm trying to drive at with that is that I don't believe that the contributors to *National Review* really know the first thing about what conservatism traditionally, historically has meant. Russell Kirk, for example, his name was on the masthead of *National Review* when Buckley first launched the magazine. Buckley implored Kirk to get involved. Buckley had said that without Kirk's labors, it's inconceivable that there ever would have been a conservative movement in America. So he really credited Kirk with almost single-handedly fashioning this conservative movement. Now that's an overstatement, but you know, Kirk influenced him greatly.

But Kirk was a Burkean, and as a Burkean, Kirk just disavowed these abstract, metaphysical ideals. He focused on tradition, on these culturally, historically specific traditions and what not. This was Burke's approach — at least, this was Burke's approach in the *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, and that's the one work of his that's regarded as the classic statement of what's since come to be called conservatism. But you never hear anyone from *National Review*, on so-called

conservative talk radio, on Fox News — you never hear anyone making any references to Kirk. Now in part I think that could have something to do with the fact that Kirk was what they would call an isolationist.

WOODS: Yeah.

KERWICK: You know, Kirk came out against George H.W. Bush's invasion of Iraq back in the early '90s. Kirk said to listen to — I might botch this quotation here, but to hear a lot of these neoconservatives speak, you would think Tel Aviv was the capital of the United States —

WOODS: Oh, ouch.

KERWICK: Yeah, yeah, so Kirk really fell out of favor with these people. So you never hear Kirk mentioned. You never even hear Burke mentioned. I mean, very occasionally you hear — and this is no coincidence, I'm sure you'll agree — you'll hear these neocons quote Burke, when they quote one line of his: "The only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."

WOODS: Yeah, it's attributed to him, yeah.

KERWICK: Right, and it's always quoted in connection with the War on Terror or fighting what they call Islamists, or you know, Michael Medved calls them Islamo-Nazis.

WOODS: Well, let me jump in, because there is one writer, and now I can't remember his name, but who I do believe contributed to the symposium, who actually a couple of years ago wrote a book on Burke versus Paine, in which he came out very sympathetically with Burke.

KERWICK: Oh, okay.

WOODS: So there is at least that. But that is very much the exception, because of course, the idea that the neoconservatives take for granted that the United States is a propositional nation dedicated to spreading human rights and global democracy is so ludicrously at odds with Edmund Burke or conservatism or what any of the Founding Fathers thought, that of course they can't dare to let anybody actually read Burke.

KERWICK: Right, yeah, exactly. Exactly right. Yeah, I was going to say, and I don't deny that references to Burke have been made, but in this case the exception proves the rule, really, because it is so exceptional that someone from this movement today would come out and spend time thinking at all about Burke.

But yeah, also it's not just that they're unfamiliar with the history of conservatism; I think it's also that when you look at their remarks now about Trump and you juxtapose their contemporary remarks with positions that they've taken in the recent past, you see the inconsistencies, and again, you have to ask yourself what does your

conservatism even represent. Because it seems to have no real reference. It seems to be just a functional kind of term that you're using to ascribe to any position that you happen to be taking at the moment. And so that's why I think it's just a big mess.

And what I was trying to do was use this symposium as an occasion to get a conversation going about the nature and meaning of conservatism. I thought it would be a nice opportunity to try to just inform readers that conservatism, in the original, classical sense of that term, had no association with a lot of the views that are associated with it by neoconservatives today. And in fact, neoconservatism is actually the antithesis of conservatism as it's traditionally been conceived.

In the first part of this two-part column that I wrote, I specifically reference Burke and Kirk, and I try to make the case that the neocons actually have a whole lot more in common with the radicals of the French Revolution, whom Burke despised, than they have in common with Burke. The French Revolutionaries traded in these abstractions, you know, the rights of man and what not, and sound eerily similar to what the neocons have to say about. You just referenced this about America being a propositional nation founded in a principle, and so forth.

WOODS: I want to give you a chance before we get going to say something about your new book, *The American Offensive: Essays from the Front*. Tell us what that's all about. I know what it's about, but tell us some of the — I mean, this is basically what you've been writing over the years, isn't it?

KERWICK: Yes, it's *The American Offensive: Dispatches from the Front*, and it's available at Amazon; it's available through Barnes & Noble. It's Stairwell Publishing. Yeah, it's just a collection of these essays that I've compiled from over the last few years. The oldest essay's probably only about three years old. And I've addressed a whole range of issues. The book, it's not a long read, and you can read it in the order that you'd like, but it's arranged thematically, and each chapter is devoted to a topic. You know, one chapter is on the academic industrial complex, i.e., higher education, the politicization of higher education, just some of the rot that you find there. Another chapter is on the mess that is our national immigration policy — or no policy, whatever you want to call it. Then there's a whole chapter on race and another on religion, particularly the tensions between Christianity and Islam. And then there is a chapter on essentially what you and I have been discussing for the last half hour, a chapter on Republican Party-neoconservative politics.

WOODS: Well, that will also of course be linked to at TomWoods.com/580. Well, I love talking about this stuff, and I would love to keep on talking about it, but I want to keep this of manageable length, give people something to chew on. Of course we have a debate coming up in a couple of days. We'll be doing a debate analysis here on the show. But Jack, I'm glad to welcome you to the show for the first time, and I hope it won't be the last. Thanks a lot.

KERWICK: No, any time. I appreciate it. Thanks a lot, Tom.