



Episode 678: Trump and History: Were 1896 or 1848 Like 2016?

Guest: Brion McClanahan

WOODS: We're going to talk about some elections, or a couple of elections anyway or presidencies in American history that were transformational or that in some way affected the party system, because that whole idea's in the news, because it's being said that Donald Trump is going to affect the party system. He's going to maybe destroy the Republican Party or change it beyond recognition, so we want to look at some historical episodes in which that kind of thing has actually happened. Now, I actually am looking at an article from *Politico* that ran just a few days before you and I are talking here, and I know about it because you sent it to me. And it's called "How an Outsider President Killed a Party," but of course they're not talking about Donald Trump; they're talking about Zachary Taylor, who was nominated in 1848. And we're talking about the Whig Party, which never recovered.

So let's try and understand this first by understanding what the Whig Party is. I mean, initially the Whig Party developed in response to Andrew Jackson. So you had an ideologically diverse party that was united on the grounds that they don't like the executive style of Andrew Jackson and his what they would call executive usurpation by Andrew Jackson. But you could find people who were otherwise fairly laissez-faire; they just didn't like Andrew Jackson because they thought he was an imperial president, if I may use an anachronistic term. But then there were others who were against Andrew Jackson, because they wanted a national bank and internal improvements and so on and so forth. So the Whig Party was a pretty darn big tent. So tell us about that and what was the big problem with Zachary Taylor.

MCCLANAHAN: Well, sure. The article tries to illustrate that Zachary Taylor being nominated by the Whigs in 1848 destroyed the party, because you had stalwarts like Henry Clay and Daniel Webster who were very upset about this, and they looked at Taylor as this guy who was a bumpkin, he didn't know anything, he was just a general. The guy was not a politician. And so he gets elected in '48, and the Whig Party doesn't know what to do. They don't know what Zachary Taylor is going to be. Is he going to be an ideological Whig like Henry Clay? Is he going to be something else?

Now, it's important to remember that the Whig Party actually won the 1840 election with a guy who was just like Zachary Taylor, William Henry Harrison. And so, you know, he was a general too, and he wasn't ideological; he was just this war hero from the War of 1812, which is why Andrew Jackson called him a "granny general." But he's

there from this long ago war, and of course he dies, and then John Tyler, who I say is the best president in American history, becomes president.

So Polk wins in '44, beats Henry Clay, and so 1848 rolls around, and the Whigs dust off the old playbook. We'll just nominate this war hero, and we'll win the executive branch. And lo and behold it works. But Henry Clay is furious, because he doesn't think Zachary Taylor is going to be a guy that's going to lead the Whigs forward like he wants, and I think that's where this article misses the point. First of all, he says Taylor destroyed the Whig Party. He did nothing of the kind. The Whig Party destroyed itself after the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. It still ran a major candidate in 1852, Winfield Scott, another war hero. So they were using this playbook to try to get votes, and it worked two out of three times.

So I think that when you look at Taylor, I actually consider him one of the best presidents, and usually people say that because Taylor died in office. You know, it's the old joke: who are the best presidents? It's Harrison, Taylor, and Garfield, because they all died before they could do any damage. But actually Taylor did a pretty good job of using executive powers the way the Founders designed the Constitution to do it, and I think that's what this guy doesn't like it, because Taylor's not one of these go-out-there-and-ram-everything-through-the-Congress-as-a-king — he's not that kind of president. And of course he points out that Taylor didn't know what he was doing because of the slavery issue, but he misses that Millard Fillmore is the one who actually crafted the Compromise of 1850, and Taylor was against it. So it's interesting how this article really distorts the election of '48 for political gain, in other words, to try to denounce Trump.

WOODS: Okay, so you're saying that it's not correct for the author of this piece, who's a historian, to say that Taylor's approach to the bundle of provisions that eventually became the Compromise of 1850 after his death, that this alienated the Southerners to the point where it destroyed the party?

MCCLANAHAN: No, I don't think so. I mean, the Southern Whigs were starting to grumble a little bit, because Taylor was a slaveholder. You know, he's from Louisiana, and his career as a slaveholder is actually very interesting. Not a whole lot survives about Zachary Taylor's life, because during the war the Union Army burned his plantation, so all of his letters were burned and all of his records. But he was a fairly benign proponent of slavery. He thought it was okay for the South, but he didn't want it to expand out west. He actually advocated California coming in as a free state, and told Southerners quite frankly that, particularly in Texas over another issue, look, I don't support secession of Texas. But at the same time, he actually made a comment to James K. Polk, where he said I'm not so certain California should even be part of the United States; it's too far away, kind of echoing Jefferson that we should have an empire, a western government, a western confederacy and you have the old confederacy.

But no, I think Taylor, he was starting — he was not in line with all the Southern Whigs, but I think he looked at himself as a unifier. He was a Southerner who tended

to also agree with maybe a little more of the Free Soil position on the western territories. He was not as ardent as some of the Northerners at the time who formed the Free Soil Party, nominated Van Buren in the same election. So I think it's a stretch to say that Taylor destroyed the Whig Party. That came later.

WOODS: Okay, now let's shift gears for a minute. Let's talk about — this is a subject that came up on your podcast — so in fact, let's pause for a minute there. There is a podcast out there called *The Brion McClanahan Show*. How about that? And it's just you and a microphone, and I love the elegant simplicity of that. And as people can hear just from this episode, unlike a lot of people who do interviews, you actually have a decent audio setup, which I certainly appreciate, as the host. It's just you and a microphone, talking. At least up to now, you haven't had guests, as far as I can see, and you just talk about some topic, and you actually know a lot of stuff, so you can just do a bunch of episodes on a bunch of different topics. And people in my private Facebook group actually have been saying, hey, who knew there was a *Brion McClanahan Show*, and they went and subscribed, and they're all happy. So you are not allowed to peel them off into your own private Facebook group. Get your own people. But I'm glad that you have this show, and it is slow-going to get a podcast going, but you've been consistent in putting out content. I'm going to make sure and link to your podcast on the show notes page for today, TomWoods.com/678. But just first tell us something about the podcast, and then let's talk about 1896, which is another pivotal election year.

MCCLANAHAN: Sure. The podcast, you know, I had this idea to do it a long time ago, and I remember talking on the airplane about it: hey, I want to do a podcast. And you said, oh, that sounds good. And I said, how do I do this. So you gave me some pointers, and I went from there. But I try to podcast twice a week. That's really all I can do right now. And as you say, I talk about something that either a listener suggests I should talk about or something off the top of my head, and it is just me and a microphone. And you know, that's actually, the reason I do that is because, number one, I do this at about 4:30 in the morning, so getting a guest at 4:30 in the morning would be kind of hard to do, and number two, it makes for a quick little podcast. And you know, I hate to mention his name, but years ago Rush Limbaugh was a proponent of this: hey, I'm not going to have guests; I'm just going to do my own thing. And so I thought, well, I'll just try that and see how it goes, and we'll go from there. But it's been a lot of fun, and I've done 25 episodes. I'm doing another one tomorrow, on what topic yet I don't know, but I'll have to decide today. So it's a lot of fun, and I hope that your listeners will come over. I don't want to peel away your listeners, but —

WOODS: Well, you can peel away the listeners, just in terms of the private Facebook group, I'm very — I don't want to say "proprietary," because I don't own them, but I love the little community we've built up. And you know, look, the more the merrier. When I was thinking about guests for this week, I thought, I want you on to talk about these topics, but also because I want to give a boost to your show, because it's a show that people can listen to in good conscience. And you're going to say some things that they're not going to agree with all the time, but that's kind of what makes it fun. Maybe my listeners agree with me too much. You'll keep in interesting.

MCCLANAHAN: Sure, and I think that's the point. I do say some things that are not standard fare for the libertarian movement at times, but it's a lot of fun to do it, and I enjoy comments, and I enjoy people saying, hey, would you do this or would you talk about that, or I don't agree with you on this, and it's great. It's been slow-going, but it's been a lot of fun, so I do appreciate you give it a little plug here and helping get some people over to it.

WOODS: Oh, my pleasure, absolutely. So let's talk about McKinley versus William Jennings Bryan.

MCCLANAHAN: Right —

WOODS: Actually, you know what? Let me jump in before you answer and just say that I have almost 20% of the audience that is from other countries, and so when we talk about this stuff, assume people don't know anything, because I don't want to assume, oh, everybody knows who William Jennings Bryan was. They don't necessarily know who he is if they were in somewhere else. And don't they know that of course they should know about all the U.S. presidential elections, right, if they're going to be good citizens of the world? But maybe they don't, so let's make sure it's user friendly.

MCCLANAHAN: Sure, okay, so we have this 1896 election, and it's a really interesting election for a lot of reasons. First of all, you have the Republicans nominate a man named William McKinley of Ohio. And McKinley was seen as a conservative Republican. Now, this is important, because you had this push in the late 19th century of progressivism, meaning it was really starting to take hold, and there was a thought in 1896 that had finally been crushed because of this election. There were people talking about, well, we've finally defeated progressivism; it's done; it's never going to come back; we've beat these people. Of course, just five years later you have Teddy Roosevelt become president after McKinley's assassinated, and you have this now over century-long plunge headfirst into progressivism. So it was thought that maybe this thing is done.

One of the reasons why they thought it was killed was because the Democrats nominated William Jennings Bryan, who was only 36 at the time, if my memory serves me correctly. And he was a progressive Democrat, and so the Democrat Party actually moved a little left. They were breaking away from Grover Cleveland, who was a very conservative Democrat. They're moving away from that, and they're going more left. And one of the major issues in '96 was bimetallism, and this was — a lot of people when you say that, the "zzz"s will come up, and they'll start tuning out. Oh, bimetallism, we're going to talk about monetary policy? Isn't that great that actually it was a major issue in an election? People actually talked about monetary policy. But so you had Bryan saying we need to have bimetallism, which is silver, and he made this very famous "Cross of Gold" speech, where the imagery was the farmer being nailed to the cross of gold.

Well, the interesting part of the election was not that; it's the fact that conservative Democrats broke away and formed their own party, called the National Democratic

Party, the NDP. And they nominated a man named Palmer for president. He was actually a former Union soldier, a Union general, in fact. And they nominated a former Confederate general for vice president, Simon Bolivar Buckner. And this was kind of this North-South ticket. It didn't get a whole lot of votes. It did have some votes in Alabama and some other states, but it didn't have a whole lot of electoral success, but it showed that the conservatives were not happy with the fact that the Democrats were going left, and they weren't certain that McKinley would be their guy, so they splintered off.

And this is actually the first thing I ever wrote for LewRockwell.com. I wrote an article about the NDP a long time ago — well, almost 10 years ago now — on the NDP. And actually, Larry Vance emailed me right after. He said, I didn't know anything about these guys. And there's a little handbook out there talking about how their main platform is gold. I mean, what they wanted to do was ensure that workers received 100 cents for every dollar they earned. And this was a huge issue in 1896. Also you had of course foreign policy coming about, because in two short years we're involved in the Spanish American War.

But a listener wanting to know where are the parallels between the current election cycle and that, and I don't think there's a whole lot to it. I mean, you have the possibility of a splinter party, but Trump is not McKinley. And one thing you said early on is, you know, people are talking about the Republican Party will die, well, I think that's a great thing. I'm not going to shed any cheers if the Republican Party goes down the tube, and I don't think anybody else should either. But you know, we are talking about third party runs. Maybe you'll have a Libertarian Party out there, maybe a split in the Republican Party, maybe even a split in the Democrat Party. If that happens we're looking more like 1912 than 1896, to be frank.

WOODS: Yeah, so let's say something then about current day, you know, the current election here, because I know you've had some stuff to say about Trump. And I just saw a tweet the other day from Bill Kristol saying something along the lines of, what does it mean in the age of Trump to be a Republican? Does it mean limited government? Does it mean fiscal sanity and, whatever, personal liberty and all that? All these things that Bill Kristol hasn't been concerned about in years, if he ever was. So I wrote back and said, well, why didn't you start a Never McCain campaign or Never Romney or Never Bush. I mean, these people were horrendous, horrifying people. And the differences between then and Trump I think are cosmetic. I mean, they're not — in other words, if there's something about Trump that outrages you, then these other three should have outraged you 50 times more, but generally they don't. So there's something fishy going on in that whole thing.

So do you think that — I mean, to an extent it depends on whether Trump wins the election or not, to the extent to which the Republican Party is going to be affected in the long run. You could see Trump being a flash in the pan, and then the party establishment is very strong and has been around a long time. This would be a tough storm to weather, but I think they could weather it; they could pick up. But if he wins, then all the patronage is his, and he can appoint the chairman of the party and all that

stuff. So what do you think is likely to be the result for the Republican Party? I mean, like the Republican Party or not, the point is, what's likely to happen to him?

MCCLANAHAN: Well, I think that the best thing that I could think — you know, the reason that all these guys hate Trump is because of his foreign policy statements. I mean, that's it. It comes down to that. Trump has made some statements where he's not as much of a warmonger as they are, though you could — I mean, he's not an *anti-war* guy; he's just not as much of a warmonger as they are. So that's really what it comes down to. They don't like that. And it just shows that really the Republican Party has become the War Party, and if there's no war then they don't know what to do.

So that said, I think if Trump wins, I was actually talking to Don Livingston about this, and I think that one thing that may happen, you might have to look at 1981. You know, when Ronald Reagan won in 1980, there was a lot of talk just like with Trump. I mean, you've got this blue-collar coalition; this guy's going to come in and he's going to change the Republican Party. He's going to bring back kind of this old, long forgotten Right back into the fold. And people like M.E. Bradford were discussed for the National Endowment for the Humanities. Here's a paleoconservative; this guy's not, you know, one of these neocons, like a Gerald Ford-type Republican; he's a real, old school right-wingers. And of course Bill Bennett and others got word of this, and they blocked this, and that split the Old Right off again. And so Reagan was listening to all the neocons.

Now, I'm not certain if that's going to happen with Trump, but I think there is still a threat with that. The neocons are very strong. The Republican establishment has got a lot of vested interest in this, and they don't want to see their entire career go down the tubes in one election, so they're going to try to influence Trump, and I hope that he has the backbone not to have it happen, but I think it's more likely that it would happen than not — though Trump's statements against the establishment have been so nasty that I'm not certain he's really going to accept them. I don't know, though. I think that in the short term, Trump might do some good and try to weed out some of these people, but I mean, they're like cockroaches. They're a cancer; they always come back. So I don't see Trump having a lasting impact on the Republican Party, other than maybe an election or two, because we saw that already.

Reagan, for all of his faults, was kind of an aberration, and then the establishment was back. You had George H.W. Bush, and then you had Bob Dole — I mean, come on. Then you had George W. Bush and John McCain and Mitt Romney. That is the Republican Party. These other people are just aberrations, and they'll go away. So I think they're just going to bide their time and wait to come back in another four or eight years.

WOODS: Yeah, that's what I think. I don't think this is like the destruction of the Federalist Party, never to be seen again, and the destruction of the Whig Party. I just don't see it. I mean, these people have wormed their way into these positions by hook or by crook, and they're not going to let some blustery guy take that all away from them. I at times have been heartened by some — frankly, some of his insults, because he often insults the right people. Like, he said about Bill Kristol the other day, "Here's

this guy, Bill Kristol" — he said this at a rally. "All this guy wants to do is go to war with people and kill people." (laughing) Like, that is what he said. I don't remember anybody — certainly Mitt Romney never said that about Bill Kristol, so I thought that was pretty good. And then I turn around, and he's got Chris Christie on his transition team, and he's got Giuliani playing a role, and you think, ugh — on the one hand, you say, all right, well, he's got to have some people in the establishment in there, but you know, it makes you think after all this, he'll wind up being a somewhat more blustery — like a more blustery Dwight Eisenhower is what I think he would — I don't think he would — people are afraid he's going to throw people in camps or whatever. I think you would actually be, if you were a journalist you'd be disappointed in how boring, in my opinion, how boring his administration would turn out to be. I think the antics are for the election cycle. But that's my opinion.

MCCLANAHAN: Yeah, I think so too. I mean, you're right. He's got Christie and Giuliani. Now, that's homegrown. Even though he will insult Chris Christie right to his face on the stage —

WOODS: Oh, about eating Oreos, yeah (laughing).

MCCLANAHAN: (laughing) Yeah. That's the one thing that Trump has provided. Everything he does is so very funny. I mean, I can't help but laugh at the stuff that he does. It's great, and that's refreshing. And that way, I actually wrote an article for *Breitbart*, where I said that Trump is elevating public discourse, because there's this, ah, Trump is so awful; he's doing things that nobody has done before. This is so untrue. Just go back and look at early 19th century politics, and what these people said about each other, it was hilarious.

We don't do that anymore. You can't even yell out at an address, "You're a liar," and then, oh my gosh, the thought police come out; you have to be hushed and thrown away in the Gulag for making a statement about the president. How dare you do that? I mean, we've gotten to the point where we're a bunch of wusses, so Trump is actually doing something that is so fun and refreshing. And I don't think people know what to think about him at this point. They just don't know how to react. Some people have said it's kindergartenish. I think it's great, and I hope it continues.

But you're right; he's going to get some of the neocons in there, and I think he'll tone down eventually, and it will become rather boring. Every now and then he'll probably throw in an insult, like he insulted that reporter the other day and called him sleazy. That was fantastic too, because they are, but I mean, this is — I don't think at the end of the day that you're going to see this continue if Trump is elected. He's definitely going to tone things down and be much more manageable, and I think the establishment is going to have their way with him ultimately.

WOODS: My understanding is that when he was getting questions about legal issues and about Supreme Court nominees that he reached out to the Federalist Society to brief him and give him names. Well, you know, I'm not necessarily 100% on board with everybody in the Federalist Society, but that's where I would look if I really didn't

know what I was doing. I would ask them, and you know, for Heaven's sake, I'd bet Kevin Gutzman and I — I don't know if you've — have you ever spoken at a Federalist Society event?

MCCLANAHAN: I have, yeah, once.

WOODS: Okay, yeah, so we've spoken for the Federalist Society, so if he's asking people who would have the gall to invite you and me to speak, if he's asking them for advice, well, that's better than I expected. That is at least something.

MCCLANAHAN: Sure.

WOODS: Is there any kind of — I mean, you've written books on the presidents, right? You've done *Politically Incorrect Guides* that have focused in on the Founding Fathers and on real American heroes; you've done *The Founding Fathers' Guide to the Constitution*. You have this book, *Nine Presidents Who Screwed Up America and —* what is it, "Four Who Tried to Save Her?"

MCCLANAHAN: Right, mm hmm.

WOODS: Okay, so you know a lot about the presidents. Can you think of a nominee who led to this much dissension within the party, while at the same time generating so much popular enthusiasm?

MCCLANAHAN: Wow, that's a good question. I mean, people have mentioned Jackson. I think that you could make a case for Jackson. He did arouse a lot of popular support, and there were a lot of people who didn't like him, even within — you know, Jefferson called him a very dangerous man. Of course Jefferson was already dead by the time Jackson was making waves. But Jackson, maybe. Other than that it's very hard to find someone. Unless you're having a really divided election, like 1860 or 1912, where you had this major split, I think that Trump is pretty unique in this way, that he's been able to manipulate the popular media so well and garner so much enthusiasm at the same time so many people hate this guy. I mean, it's really amazing how this has — I think looking back 50 years from now, people will look at this election as a very interesting election cycle. First of all, not just Trump, but then you have the felon running for the Democrats, and it's just amazing how far we've come in a couple hundred years. And I'm not certain if either one of these people would have been nominated years and years ago. But I really can't think of anyone, to answer your question, honestly, other than maybe Andrew Jackson.

WOODS: Yeah, that's what I thought. Now, why do you think, is it money alone that explains — and celebrity and name recognition — that explains why Trump has gotten away with this with the Republicans but Bernie Sanders hasn't been as successful with the Democrats, even though he has tremendous grassroots support?

MCCLANAHAN: I think so. I mean, look, Trump is a television star. He's a movie star; he's a television star. You know, you and I both grew up in the '80s. I can remember

back in the mid '80s there was the Trump board games and all this kind of stuff. I mean, he's had this longevity as this cult of personality for a long time, and I think that's part of it. I mean, the fact that there was even some discussion about Mark Cuban being nominated as vice – wouldn't that be amazing if Mark Cuban and Donald Trump – Mark Cuban, who is this guy? I mean, he's a businessman; okay, great, but he's on a television show. I mean, that's (laughing) – and he owns a basketball team. I mean, these people aren't the typical candidates. Trump's not going to pick Mark Cuban, but I mean, his name floated around as kind of the anti-Trump candidate for a time.

But you know, I think it's amazing how this cult of personality has really factored into this election. It's something that I haven't ever seen before, and I think people don't know what to think about it. Trump is just that unique in American political history.

WOODS: Well, let's remind people; what was it like to so-called "run for president," let's say in the year 1820? What did that look like?

MCCLANAHAN: It didn't look like anything like – now first of all, there were no party conventions. You were nominated because of who you were. I mean, you look at 1820, and – that's probably a bad year to pick, because you know, James Monroe was basically elected unanimously.

WOODS: Right, because that was between two party systems; that's true.

MCCLANAHAN: Right, yeah, so go back to – well, look at 1800; that would be a good one. Or even 1796. John Adams and Jefferson were the presumptive leaders because of who they were. Any of those founding generation elections are a lot different, because you don't have party nominating processes. The only people that were chosen was because they had a name – because of what they did or who they were as a person. And they were really nasty elections at times. I mean, even going to 1824 when the press called out Andrew Jackson for his wife being a bigamist – and I've written about this before too. The comparison when there was that battle over the wives between Ted Cruz and Donald Trump and all that kind of stuff, that has precedence. You know, you have 1824 where that happened.

And then, you know, it's – I think that when you look at those old elections, they were nasty, but they didn't pick somebody because of this kind of celebrity status. You look at the candidates that were running for each of those – as the frontrunners, and first of all, no popular vote. So it was drastically different. These people were nominated because they were great men, not because they had had some position as X, Y, or Z or something like that.

WOODS: Then also, what did campaigning look like?

MCCLANAHAN: Oh, well, I mean, you didn't campaign for yourself.

WOODS: Right.

MCCLANAHAN: You know, people campaigned for you. You never said a word. Even in 1896, you know, when we bring up the '96 election, William McKinley didn't campaign for himself. He sat on the front porch of his house in Ohio, and he welcomed people to come over and talk to him, but he never went on one campaign stop.

WOODS: Yeah, I wanted you to say that, because it's so utterly — I bet there are a lot of Americans who didn't realize that.

MCCLANAHAN: Right, I mean, people didn't campaign. That was considered beneath the candidate to actually go out and stump for yourself and try to raise money. This is what you had to go do. They went out and they tried to gather and bundle and get people to support them. The presidential candidate was supposed to be above all of that, so we look at elections much differently than we did back then, and I think it's downgrading the presidency the way we elect presidents now. And in so many ways — you know, I've said this before — you have to be suspicious of any person that wants that much power and is willing to raise that much money for themselves and how they're going to get it.

So in that way, Trump in his first speech that he made for president, he said, look, I'm rich, I'm filthy stinking rich, I don't need any money, I don't need anybody to give me money, I'm just going to run. And I think that's why in some ways Trump is refreshing too, because it's kind of a throwback. He's not out there begging for people to give to his campaign. He doesn't have to make promises to anybody; he can just say what he wants, and if it doesn't work out, oh well. Whereas anyone else would have to go out and get this guy to give him money and this lady to give him money and this corporation to give him money and this PAC to give him money, and then you make all these promises and it really creates a disaster when you start looking at how policy is formed off of those promises.

WOODS: I'm looking at BrionMcClanahan.com, which I haven't been to in a while. I'm going to be linking to this, in case Brion McClanahan is too much of a mouthful for you, at TomWoods.com/678. But this is where you can find out about Brion's podcast and his books and things of that nature. Brion, of course you teach courses at Liberty Classroom, which is where all the cool people are learning the real history that they didn't get in school. That's LibertyClassroom.com. And on here you've got your books, you've got the podcast link, and you've got a great opt-in right at the top, just like you're listening to me when I badger people about things they're not interested in, which is how to build an email list. You darn well should be interested in that, and you're doing it exactly the right way. So it's right in your face. You're giving away a free eBook called *Forgotten Founders*, and you're even giving away the free audiobook version that they get when they opt in to your email list. And I'll tell you, I read your emails, and they're good emails. And people who delete your emails should be, I don't know, should be sternly lectured, because they're getting good stuff. It takes them three seconds to read it. But I like hearing from Brion McClanahan.

Now, here's my one piece of advice, slightly inside baseball stuff, but when I was just doing an email search for "McClanahan" to see — because I wanted to find

the *Politico* article you'd sent me, I noticed that you sent me an email some time ago about an article you'd written, and I could tell write away it was a personal email to me and not an email to your list, and the way I could tell was you only capitalized the first word, but when you send out an email to your list, as I used to do, I always do it in headline form, you know, with the capitalization. But then just the key thing that I discovered from learning from other people is that that looks like a mass email, because when you send an email to your grandmother you don't capitalize that line. So try it out. Just do it — because these days I don't do that anymore; I only capitalize the first word, just like I would to a regular person.

MCCLANAHAN: Oh.

WOODS: So that's the only — so in other words, you've got it 99.999% exactly right, but when you come on this show you get that .001% boost in knowledge (laughing).

MCCLANAHAN: That's great; I appreciate it. And I did, as far as social media, I did try to respond to that idiot you were —

WOODS: Oh, I know. On Twitter? I know; I know.

MCCLANAHAN: (laughing) Yes.

WOODS: (laughing) I was just toying with that guy. If you're not following me on Twitter — first of all, you've got to follow us on Twitter. I'm @ThomasEWoods, and you must be @BrionMcClanahan?

MCCLANAHAN: Right, yes.

WOODS: All right, you've got to follow us. I'm going to put the Twitter links also at TomWoods.com/678, because once in a while somebody will tick me off to the point that I respond to him long after it's become unreasonable to keep responding (laughing). I'm still responding, because I just wanted to show that I can out-progressive this progressive. You know, he wants to bring back the Civilian Conservation Corps from the New Deal, which is just, you know, rather an oddball position to hold these days. So I was trying to get his position on racial internment camps, just to see, you know, what he might think about that. Is his view that, well, on the one hand, FDR wanted us to plant trees and that's good, but then he interned people by race and that's bad? I wanted to know how does he balance that all out. And he wound up just trying to make sure we understood the distinction between internment camps and concentration camps, and I thought, is that what progressivism has sunk to (laughing).

MCCLANAHAN: Well, he didn't even answer the question. He couldn't.

WOODS: (laughing) No, of course. He never — he wouldn't.

MCCLANAHAN: He can't answer the question; he just started calling us names and everything else.

WOODS: Yeah.

MCCLANAHAN: You know, it was —

WOODS: Oh, and he called me a neoconfederate, so of course I played for him the Interview with a Zombie. Like, what's the matter? Who hasn't seen that video?

MCCLANAHAN: Right. It's a lot of fun with these wackos on Twitter, and I don't wade in there very often, but ever now and then it's fun to do it.

WOODS: Yeah, I think I've started to learn how to use Twitter the right way, which is precisely to, you know — because I would just use it; I would send out a link to the episode, and I've actually kind of forgotten to do that. That's the important thing.

MCCLANAHAN: Right.

WOODS: Send out the link to the episode. Instead, I'm having these ridiculous arguments with people. But you know, I'm thinking if some of them are really fun, I could actually make an eBook out of it and call it *Twitter Wars*.

MCCLANAHAN: Yeah, that'd be good.

WOODS: *Tom Woods' Twitter Wars* or something, you know, just for fun as an opt-in for people, because I've got to come up with more eBooks, because you've got a great eBook here. The problem is my eBook that people get to get onto my list is *Bernie Sanders is Wrong* —

MCCLANAHAN: Right.

WOODS: — so I've got that up at TomWoods.com; you've got to click on the "Notify Me" button; you'll get it. Or I've got it at BernielsWrong.com. But pretty soon, you know, that ain't going to have that much traction anymore, so I've got to come up with something else, so I've got to have some really fun — or you know, I've got to pay somebody, go back through — maybe I'll hire somebody. Go back through my Twitter feed — you'd really have to pay somebody to do this (laughing) — and find some fun confrontations that I had with people, send me the embed codes, let's make a book out of it. All right, you know, I do this to people all the time, Brion, when I know that they're doing email marketing and they're really getting the juices flowing, in terms of self-promotion. I want to talk about that the whole show. I've got to shut myself up, not do that. You and I can talk about that privately.

MCCLANAHAN: Sure.

WOODS: But I appreciate, especially at the last minute, you coming on and talking about these things. We'll link to — I'm going to link in particular to material related to these two elections that we talked about. I'll link to your podcast episode on 1896; I'll link to the *Politico* article we talked about. But most of all, I'll link to BrionMcClanahan.com. Give Brion's podcast a chance, especially if you like American History, because, you know, Brion is one of my handful of go-to guys on that. He was trained by the best of the best, Clyde Wilson, so you can't go wrong with Brion. Thanks again, Brion.

MCCLANAHAN: Thanks for having me. I appreciate it, Tom. See you later.