



Episode 831: Why Christians (and Everyone Else) Should Be Capitalists

Guest: Jay Richards

WOODS: You've had an interesting career change since we last talked, and you've been doing all sorts of other stuff, but yet I still want to talk about a book of yours from 2009. It's evergreen. And I really like it, and I'm sorry I kind of overlooked it for a while, so I'm going to rectify that injustice right now. So it's called *Money, Greed, and God: Why Capitalism Is the Solution and Not the Problem*. I never really got what it was – I never realized how much I needed this book until I started reading it. I feel that way about a lot of my books, by the way. If only you'd start reading them you'd know how much you want to read them.

RICHARDS: Yes, absolutely.

WOODS: Can you tell me what it was that made you say, especially given that you've written on completely different topics in the past, "I've got to drop everything and write a book on this, or I'm going to lose my mind." By the way, that's the reason I write most of my books. If I don't get this on paper I'm going to lose my mind.

RICHARDS: Tom, that is the perfect summary of what got me into this. I was working at the Discovery Institute writing mainly on science and faith issues. I was also doing some stuff with Acton. And I was talking about evidence for fine-tuning in physics. But I was on a lot of Christian college campuses and realized all the really bad ideas I had about economics in 1985 and '86 were alive and well in the late '90s and the 2000s. I had grown up, gone to a small, very liberal liberal arts school in Texas as an undergrad, read the *Communist Manifesto* – you know, was sort of transfixed by it, as freshmen often are – and thought that Christians ought to be socialist. And it took me four years of college and a lot of reading by people like Thomas Sowell and Friedrich Hayek to realize, well, of the live alternatives, free enterprise and economic freedom, that's by far the best that we can do.

But I graduated from college in 1989; the Soviet Union collapsed, and I thought, well, okay, the big argument between communism and capitalism or between command and free economies has been settled by the verdict of history, so I won't focus on that as an intellectual question. I ended up doing a PhD in philosophy, but that put me back on college campuses, even though I was writing on other stuff, and I realized that socialism is a perennial issue, I think because it appeals to people's untutored moral intuitions. It sounds nice to people as an aspiration as long as you don't look at it in too much detail. And frankly, I was just distressed that conservative evangelicals at

conservative evangelical colleges were still toying with what should be a completely dead idea that does terrible things whenever it's tried.

And so that's honestly what got me focused on it, but I thought there's so many good books written by people like you and others on free enterprise, I thought what I want to do is write a book that addresses what I thought were the key issues that people had. I think just speaking of Christians, Christians usually if they're well-tutored, if they have a properly formed conscience, their moral intuitions are right. But very often what they do is they wed their moral intuitions to an utterly flawed understanding of economic reality, and it's usually a result of some or another intellectual myth, like the zero-sum game myth or what I call the materialist myth, which just assumes that wealth can only be transferred and not created. And so if you assume that, if you assume that, well, if Peter's richer than Paul, the only way he could be richer is if he'd stolen from Paul – if you believe that, then you're going to see inequality, for instance, differently than if you understand how the economic realm actually works.

And so I wrote the book structured around these eight myths that I identified, and so each chapter focuses on one of the myths. And I thought if we can dismantle this – dignify the moral intuitions, dismantle the misconceptions about economics and replace it with something better, I thought that might be a productive way to help Christians think about these issues.

WOODS: You mention – the one thing in the book that I might have changed slightly is you refer to the book by Ronald Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* –

RICHARDS: Yes.

WOODS: – but I'm not sure you referred to the brilliant reply, David Chilton's book, *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt Manipulators*.

RICHARDS: [laughing] That's right.

WOODS: That is probably the best book title I have ever heard.

RICHARDS: It is, and I've read that book actually, and I just decided – I think I read it when I was working on *Money, Greed, and God*, and if I recall correctly it was so grouchy that I thought maybe it wasn't the best way to go [laughing].

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah, I mean, with a title like that obviously it is grouchy. But that title just kills me.

All right, yeah, of course, it's interesting for the two of us to talk because we've both written books that are in this sort of genre. I took a different path from you. I was sort of arguing here's why Austrian economics is a good way to look at the world, and I was reaching out speaking to really the whole world. You can read *The Church and the Market* as an intermediate step between *Economics in One Lesson* and *Human Action*. But I had in mind a particular audience. It was traditionalist Catholics – not left-wing Catholics. I can't reach those people. But traditionalists who kind of felt like, well, this

new-fangled free market of yours, as it's so-called, it comes out of the Enlightenment, and we know that's bad. And it was very frustrating because none of them had read any of the relevant stuff, so I couldn't even have an argument, and meanwhile I'm being excommunicated. That was the most bizarre thing I've ever gone through. So I wrote that book with them in mind.

Your audience here, are you – I mean, if you mention Ronald Sider, then you're talking to the left, but at the same time I feel certain that there are people in more mainstream and even conservative evangelical communities who have absorbed some of these, I think, faulty ways of thinking. So who's your audience here?

RICHARDS: The audience here was essentially all Christians. What's funny – you may not know this, Tom – I was an evangelical when I started this book and a Catholic by the time it was published. I'm an adult convert. So being at Acton I was conversant with a lot of evangelical and Catholic thinkers. I really wanted to reach every Christian that's interested in the question of economics and poverty but doesn't know very much about economics, and so I wanted to write it in such a way that it wasn't obvious – it was very broadly Christian. I didn't want it to be pigeonholed as an evangelical or a Catholic book.

But I'm definitely thinking of not the leftists, but of Christians in general that get influenced by left-wing things. I noticed – Sider I cited; I also talked a lot about Jim Wallace, who's a progressive evangelical, but he's –

WOODS: Oh, geez.

RICHARDS: – but he's read by evangelicals. He's read at conservative evangelical seminaries in colleges. And so a lot of people don't realize that. They think, I'll send my children to Calvin College or to Wheaton or some place and they'll be fine. They don't realize, actually if you talk to the faculty, a lot of them are leftists, at least on economics. They may be orthodox theologically, but definitely not when it comes to politics and economics.

So that's a huge market, and what I discovered is that a lot of Christian colleges and econ professors who are frustrated about this ended up using the book alongside a principles of economics textbook in intro econ courses – which is kind of what I wanted. I thought, okay, this is not – most kids, it's not that they've had several economics courses and didn't understand how supply and demand works. They don't understand anything about it, and so they're just led astray by the misconceptions. And so that's who I wanted to reach. I think at least initially the book is used largely in evangelical colleges in terms of actually being in a curriculum, though I know a few Catholic colleges, including my own, that they've used it in different classes – which honestly, that's the greatest hope I could have had for the book.

WOODS: All right, let's get into some of the specifics here. You in eight chapters are dealing with eight different misconceptions. Let's pick the one you think is the overwhelmingly overriding one.

RICHARDS: It's definitely the piety myth. You could in fact reduce it to that one. The piety myth is just confusing good intentions with consequences, with outcomes. And of course, *Economics in One Lesson* by Henry Hazlitt, the whole book is about that. The art of economics consists, he says, in tracing the consequences of a policy not merely for one group but for all groups. It's confusing what we intend to do, what our aspirations are, with the actual effects of a policy or an action. And to prevent confusing that, you've got to learn something about this realm.

And I describe: think of the created order as a set of concentric spheres that overlap and intersect, and they have their own internal logic. And so you can study chemistry; you can study physics; you can learn rules that can be discerned by studying this realm, and it's the result of an interaction of theories and observations. You can hopefully get closer and closer to the truth. I say to think of the economics realm as something like that. It's the realm of human existence in which humans buy and sell and exchange goods and services and information, often in a context of scarcity, and by studying that – first by analyzing that, as you've done in many of your books, analyzing what human action is like and understanding incentives, and also just looking at the empirical details, you can discover principles and laws that hold. It's not exactly the same as physics, but you can use them to predict what's going to happen when gasoline becomes scarce in Florida. Those are things you learn. They're empirical and theoretical questions.

And so I say all Christians that want to think clearly about economic policy and economic issues need to take on board the theoretical insights and the empirical discoveries from economics. And if we don't do that it's just as if we decided we're going to be a good, Christian plane builder, but we're not going to bother to learn anything about lift or gravity or aerodynamics or Bernoulli's principle. You've got to know the realities of the things you want to talk about if you want to talk about it reasonably.

And honestly, it's that confusion between good intentions and sound outcomes that I think is at the base of all the problems. And so sometimes I'm often asked to give talks on this question. I call it the piety myth, because piety has to do with the state of our hearts, and as Christians we know God cares both why we do something and what we do. Both of those things matter in the realm of morality. Both of those things don't matter when it comes to economics. It's what we do that matters, and the what isn't affected by whatever our motivations are. And so we don't want to focus on our piety, on the sort of warm feelings we have in our hearts. We want to focus on the real likely or known consequences of economic actions if we actually want to help people rather than hurt them.

WOODS: Just the other day I got an email from somebody who said, I used to be a libertarian, and then I found Christ, and I now believe that you, Tom Woods, are teaching something at odds with what Christ teaches. He clearly is opposed to capitalism, as you're describing it, and I believe you, Tom Woods, wittingly or not are part of a dark conspiracy going back hundreds of years, like at least back through the Illuminati – like, this was a whole thing. It was a whole thing. He had gone from libertarianism to the craziest, nuttiest, weirdest possible version of Christianity that has ever existed, and then he demanded that I explain and justify myself. And you know, this is why the delete key exists. That's why there's a delete key.

But let's give credit where it's due. He raises a legitimate question for discussion, which is: we look through the biblical texts, and what do we see? We see a lot of verses about the rich and the poor. But what do we see about the welfare state or about antitrust law or about business cycles — I ask rhetorically.

RICHARDS: Right, or any of these things, environmental regulations. Even the sort of locus classicus for the Christian who thinks that Christianity is communism is the early chapters of Acts where the church in Jerusalem sells their possessions and shares everything in common. People look at that and say that's communism. The problem is, just look at the details.

I mean, first of all, the Roman centurions aren't confiscating the means of production. This is a small group of Christians voluntarily sharing their goods and sharing amongst themselves. In fact, when Peter comes in and judges Ananias and Sapphira, he quite explicitly says these are the people who claim to have sold their stuff and given it to the Church, but in fact they had held it back. He didn't say the stuff didn't belong to you. He said, in fact, it did belong to you, but what you did is you lied to the Holy Spirit.

And so people, when you're looking at this, if you look at biblical text superficially and impose economic misconceptions on it, you see something that's not there. This wasn't an early form of communism. First of all, we're dealing with a unique situation in Jerusalem. Pentecost has just happened. You have thousands of Jews that have come from around the civilized world descended upon Jerusalem, and then suddenly become Christians. And so you have local Christians saying, What do we do with these new brothers and sisters?

So it's an emergency situation in which they decide to sell some stuff in order to provide for their new Christian brothers and sisters. This was never treated as a norm. Paul doesn't tell the church at Thessalonica or Corinth to arrange things in this way. And in fact, it's likely that many of those new Christians eventually returned to their homes and their jobs. And so all of this is right there in the text if you look at it, but if you think, Oh, I see sharing; they're sharing stuff in common; that's communism — if you think at that level of generality, you're never going to quite understand what's going on in biblical text.

Now, I would never say if you read the Bible you're going to automatically be a free marketer. It's not that simple. I think as Christians what we want to do is we want to draw on everything from special revelation, everything that we know as Christians, but we also want to learn things about the economic realm, which just simply aren't addressed directly in Scripture. That's no more crazy than saying, Look, if you're a good Christian chemist you don't expect to get the periodic table of the elements from the Bible. The Bible is going to give you information and knowledge; it's not going to give you everything you need to know to be a chemist.

WOODS: And the thing I've had to deal with, of course, with the Catholic angle in particular, is people will wave this or that document from the U.S. bishops or something at me, and they'll say, "Well, what about this?" And I'll say there's a difference between proposing moral principles to be observed and proposing the technical means to best try to advance those.

So for example, you might say, "Our moral ideal is a society where the family is supported." Okay, well, sure. Family is very important. But then to say, "Now we've also gone and looked into what the best way of going about this is, and we think a living wage for a head of household is the way to do it." Now you're way, way, way away from faith and morals.

Now you're just talking about the — it would be the same thing as if a bishop said, "Our churches should last hundreds of years as a testimony to the timelessness of God." Great. Wonderful to say that. But then if he says, "Now, the way to do that is you need the following building materials and this technique," we would think, I guess he can have an opinion if he wants, but it's not very informed, and I certainly don't have to listen to it in that respect — you know, try to be respectful. But you see what I mean? So it's the same sort of thing. If he wants to say, "Here's a general principle," fine with a general principle. But the specific implementation of it requires knowledge of a secular discipline just as much architecture would.

RICHARDS: Absolutely. Absolutely. And it bears directly on human well-being. That's what got me interested in this. These are not sort of abstract questions. If you support a policy and actually give it theological imprimatur and it harms people, you're not only harming people; you're also bringing disgrace and disfavor upon the faith itself. And it is frustrating — I know as a Catholic I'm very interested in the principles of Catholic social teaching. I think they have a great deal to do as far as insights into the human condition and can be used to develop a kind of fuller understanding of the political economy. But unfortunately, churchmen and bishops and popes often don't know when their analysis of the faith and morals ends and their assumptions about economic reality begins.

And so this frustrates me in some papal encyclicals. It's not like you get, Okay, here's the section on the faith and morals, and then here's where the pope gives his considered opinions on these things based upon his understanding of technology and economics. It's not that way. Most Church documents, they mix these things together. So even Pope Francis' recent encyclical, *Laudato Si*, even though in the encyclical it says the Church doesn't specify and prescribe certain economic theories, nevertheless the pope very frequently in the same encyclical has all sorts of economic and scientific opinions. And so it's left to us to sort of separate the chaff from the wheat or to say, okay, what is core magisterial teaching here and what is a pope or a pope's advisor's opinion on these things.

And it's tough, and we've got to make clear that making those distinctions is not the same as sort of picking and choosing fundamental Catholic teachings and deciding where to take some and not take others. That's not what's happening here. What's happening is that we have to distinguish between prudential and empirical questions on the one hand and core faith and morals questions on the other.

WOODS: I have to keep this person as anonymous as possible, so let me just say he's a theologian who had a hand in drafting an encyclical by a certain living pope who is not actually reigning as pope right now — if that helps narrow it down.

RICHARDS: [laughing] Yes.

WOODS: And he contacted me to tell me he thought my book was excellent. So I take that as okay, I am not breaking any rule by believing what I believe. It ain't no problem. All right, we've got a lot more myths to address. Let's first thank our sponsor.

[Sponsored content]

All right, let's get back to this by looking at a question that I have faced quite a bit as somebody who is right-of-center and deals with people who are right-of-center. And their complaint is not that capitalism oppresses me in this way or that way; it's things more like capitalism gives us this ugly, debased culture that we have and this consumerist kind of culture, where we're just addicted to material things.

RICHARDS: Right. That's sort of toward the end of the book, and it is honestly the position – it's usually traditionalists who make this objection. You will get leftists, people like Jim Wallis, that will kind of use this argument. It's essentially that capitalism or the free economy debases us morally and culturally.

Now, what's amusing about this objection is it's sort of the opposite of another objection you'll get from the same person. So you'll often be told that, well, there's so much poverty that's caused by capitalism. You've got the rich and the poor. And then when you point out that no, actually the poor even in free economies tend to do much better than even the rich in poor economies, then they switch to the other side and say, well, it makes everybody so rich and there are so many choices, we can buy everything as commodities, that it debases us. Well, I mean, which is it? Either it causes most people to be poor, or it makes us so rich that we become materialists.

Well, of course, what they're doing is they're looking at two different partial pictures of the system. I agree that consumerism as an ideology is bad, simply because it's a form of idolatry: the idea that we should treat our material possessions, put them in a position that they ought not to hold, that we should have a loyalty to them that ought to be reserved for God. Obviously that's a bad thing. I would just simply dispute the idea that a free economy – that is, an economy that has private property rights and rule of law and economic freedom – is it that itself that leads to consumerism or materialism? I don't know any argument for that.

I certainly don't know of any argument that it leads to kind of a debased aesthetic. All you have to do is visit, as I did in the 1980s, Eastern European countries or have a look at North Korea if you can or the former Soviet Union. These were the most dedicated socialist countries, and you'll never find a more impoverished aesthetic environment.

I do think what's essentially going on in a lot of these, kind of what I'd call these aesthetic critiques of market economies, is that a lot of people, especially a lot of intellectuals, they don't like the choices of ordinary people. Intellectuals – like ourselves. I'm speaking about the two of us, Tom – we sometimes get this kind of aristocratic attitude. We're poor; we're not rich like the aristocrats, but we sort of imagine ourselves in this way, and so we disdain the ordinary choices of working class people that are perfectly happy to go to Domino's Pizza. They think that's a nice meal. And we complain about that, and we complain about a lot of the junk that gets put on YouTube.

We don't notice that, look, 200 years ago virtually no one had access to music, and so the few people that had access to wonderful music were the aristocrats who could actually gather together at an estate somewhere and listen to an orchestra play Chopin or Bach. Now it's practically free. Anybody can access music, and anybody can create music and upload it to the Internet, upload it to YouTube. And so as a result, when everybody's able to do something, the sort of average thing that's produced is not going to be especially good.

But my argument is, look, there's surely something to celebrate in that more people if they want to – everyone if they want to as long, as they have an Internet connection – can listen to all of the most beautiful music that's ever been written. They can see scans of the most wonderful art that's ever been made. I don't begrudge the system that allows that to be possible, even if it also allows ordinary people to produce some things that maybe those of us with refined tastes wouldn't prefer. Every kind of economic system and every change is going to come with both some costs and some benefits. I would much rather have the costs of a free society, including its benefits, than to suffer the costs of one in which these things are excluded.

WOODS: Let's do like a lightning round-style now. I'll give you a topic, and you take 60 seconds, let's say, to address it. So let's start with what you call the Nirvana myth. And I'll – so you won't have to spend part of your 60 seconds explaining it, it's the idea – this is a fallacy that – I don't know if it was Harold Demsetz? Some Chicago has also used this to say that – socialists sometimes use this fallacy. They look at capitalism. They see that it's not perfect. They then posit an ideal society that is obviously unreachable by any system, and then it's so much the worse for capitalism. So that – and you're saying that's also to be heard in Christian circles.

RICHARDS: Absolutely. Very often, again, we focus on our aspiration. And what this does is if you focus on an unrealizable ideal rather than the live alternatives, what it does is it flattens the real option. So if the Kingdom of God in its fullness is your ideal, and then you compare, say, 2016 in the United States with North Korea, well, the difference between North Korea and the United States in 2016 is trivial compared to the difference between the United States and the Kingdom of God, where there's no want or crying or death. But we can't access the Kingdom of God in that way. We aren't able to establish the Kingdom of God in its fullness.

And so what you want to do when you're saying – of the live alternatives, things we can actually bring about by our own power, what's the best of those? When you frame the question in that way, it's obvious what the answer is, that free economies, for all their problems, for all their non-utopian qualities, are vastly superior for doing the things you'd want an economy to do than any of the alternatives that humans have ever been able to come up with. If you frame it that way, you make the argument I think really clear, certainly for Christians that are willing to look at the evidence.

WOODS: All right, second one: doesn't capitalism foster unfair competition? And you refer to this as myth number three: the zero-sum game. Trade requires a winner and a loser.

RICHARDS: Yes, and this one is common because it's intuitive that if you look at, say, I go out and I'm going to buy a flatscreen TV I would want to look at Walmart and

Target, and if I buy it from Target Wal-Mart's going to get my business. And so you see that as a competition. And people that don't understand market economies will think that's the whole story.

What they don't notice is that free exchange, if you analyze it carefully, is actually a win-win. It's not a win-lose or zero-sum game scenario. And I tell this story of the trading game, which is a game I played in the sixth grade, in which a teacher hands out toys to everyone and then essentially allows them to freely trade amongst themselves. And she has them say how much they like the toy at the beginning, the toy they started with and then how much they liked the toy that they got at the end. And they almost always liked the one that they got in the end better, and the reason is because she set up a system with the rule of law and then said, "Now, all of you can freely trade," and so no one trades a toy with another person unless they want the toy the other kid has. And it's the same from the perspective of the other kid: they don't trade unless they want the toy the other kid has. That's a win-win. And what's amazing about that is just a system of a rule of law and free exchange by itself, even without adding anything new to the system, can actually lead to people being better off, to perceiving their situation as better than it was in the beginning.

This happens every time we go to the grocery store or go to the barber. We engage in this kind of mutually beneficial exchange. But people who haven't thought about it aren't used to actually analyzing that, so we only notice the competitive part of a free market. We don't notice the mutually beneficial exchanges that happen as a matter of course every single day.

WOODS: And finally – I don't want to do the one on capitalism being based on greed, because I feel like I've handled that so much. There's no reason that the idea that people should have voluntary exchanges with each other has anything to do with greed whatsoever. This is just a complete red herring and a misconception. But what about the, "If I become rich won't someone else become poor?" I think that speaks to the guilt manipulators aspect –

RICHARDS: It does.

WOODS: It actually makes people feel like if you have a lot of dough, that's probably because you stole it from some guy in the third world or something.

RICHARDS: That's right, and I distinguish between the zero-sum game, which I use that as a – that's a view of the nature of trade. This, what I call the materialist myth, I say that's a myth about the nature of wealth. And so if you think of wealth as just like a pot of gold – so our economy is, there's this fixed amount of wealth out there, and if some people get there too soon they get more than their fair share and they leave less for the rest of us. It's like a physical manifestation of the zero-sum game. I said that would make sense if the economy were like a pot of gold or like a pie. It's just like this pie, and the best we can do is try to slice it up equitably.

And of course that's nothing like what real, healthy economies are like. Nobody thinks that the late Steve Jobs got rich by stealing iPods and iPads from homeless people. No, that's not true. He didn't extract wealth from the economy and then just give it to somebody else. What he did is he participated in a process of wealth creation, in

which he created value for himself and many other people. That's what real economies do when they trade with each other, when they have the modicum of freedom and the rule of law that they need. Human beings, creatures made in the image of God, we create wealth and value that wasn't there before, and so that means Peter couldn't get fabulously wealthy, not by defrauding or stealing from someone, but by doing something that creates value for himself and for others. And that's a good thing. That's not a bad thing. As long as you understand that that wealth can be created rather than merely shifted around, that keeps you from making a lot of simple elementary mistakes you might otherwise make about economics.

WOODS: All right, Jay, before I let you go I know you have been running a website – it's not a personal site; it's well beyond that. There are a lot of contributors to that. And it's Stream.org. Take a minute to tell us about it. Of course I'm going to link to that, and I'm going to link to your book at TomWoods.com/831, this being Episode 831 – so it's been many episodes since you were on last. I'll link to that; that's the show notes page for today. All right, so tell us about *The Stream*.

RICHARDS: Absolutely. It's an effort that an evangelical named James Robinson and I launched about two years ago, and the purpose of it is to bring serious Catholics and evangelicals to talk not just about theology and apologetics, but also to be able to talk about culture and politics and economics. Because we noticed there are some publications and sites that do this, but we were distressed that Catholics and evangelicals tend to occupy sort of non-overlapping areas, except for a few kind of elite publications like *First Things*.

The other thing that happens is a lot of Christian sites don't focus on the details of economics and politics. They tend to avoid that. We wanted a site in which all of that stuff could be done together, where serious Catholics and evangelicals could come together, take our theology seriously and take seriously how it applies to the issues of the day. And so we've got a lot of great editors and contributors, including John Zmirak, who writes for us very frequently. He's one of our senior editors.

WOODS: You know what? Shouldn't I get John on the show? Why have I not had John Zmirak on the show?

RICHARDS: That's a good question, because you did that great book, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to American History*, and his recent book, also in that series, is a *Politically Incorrect Guide to Catholicism*.

WOODS: Yeah, that's right. Yeah, yeah, yeah. I should – But I mean, I have a limited segment of the audience that's interested in the Church, but I have done episodes like on the weekend as a bonus episode on the subject, and people have really eaten it up. But also John talks about everything under the sun. I could get him on – we could talk about names in the phonebook –

RICHARDS: Absolutely.

WOODS: – if people still looked in phonebooks.

RICHARDS: [laughing] That's right. And he writes actually a lot on these economic issues, and so yeah, he'd be terrific.

WOODS: All right, okay. I'm going to jot that down. Yeah, I got to know him back when I lived in New York in the mid '90s.

RICHARDS: Oh, yeah.

WOODS: Yeah, I've got pictures of — I have a picture of us with some brunch friends, and we're so young looking. I don't know what John looks like now, but I know I don't look like that anymore. So anyway, yeah, I've definitely got to have him on.

RICHARDS: Absolutely. He of course lived in New York at the time. He's a native of Queens. But he actually lives down in Dallas, Texas now, so he's more surrounded by people he agrees with.

WOODS: Ah, okay, because I know he was in New Hampshire — I can't keep track of that guy.

RICHARDS: Yeah, exactly. And so this is — yeah, he's one of our senior editors and one of our most popular writers at *The Stream*.

WOODS: Okay, all right, yeah, he's funny and smart. Okay, so anyway, Stream.org is for interested people to check out for sure, and of course the book we've been talking about is *Money, Greed, and God: Why Capitalism Is the Solution and Not the Problem*. Available on Amazon, and I'll link to it directly at TomWoods.com/831. All right, Jay, great job. Thanks for being here. Great talking to you.

RICHARDS: Great talking to you, Tom.