



Episode 946: Lew Rockwell on CNN, Trump, Rothbard, and More

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: A lot of stuff going on. I'm interested in this whole unfolding CNN fiasco. So for anybody who somehow hasn't been paying attention or something or had the good fortune to go on vacation, what happened is that the president tweeted out a video, which was drawn originally from a wrestling event from years ago. But somebody patched on the CNN logo onto the head of Trump's opponent. And you see Trump outside the ring of this event, and he actually body-slams the guy. But now the guy has a CNN head. And everybody – well, by everybody I mean just people in the media – were up in arms because this is supposedly encouraging violence against the media. I mean, you've got to be kidding me. And of course, don't you all remember growing up and knowing the professional wrestling was fake? Just like their news. Why are they so worked up about this? What did you think about that whole thing, and then CNN's response?

ROCKWELL: Well, first of all, of course I loved it, and I thought it was a lot of fun, and I remember having seen –

WOODS: It was funny.

ROCKWELL: – having seen that before, and it was of course a setup. Nobody was actually body-slammed. That was the head of the WWE that Trump was having a phony feud with, as happens in professional wrestling. So it was just funny. And it was I thought especially funny that apparently a kid sent this out on Reddit with the CNN logo instead of the guy's head, and then Trump retweets it or tweets it maybe not as a retweet, but he put it out on his Twitter feed. And yeah, CNN absolutely flipped out, claiming that Trump was calling for violence against them, although at most he could be I guess charged with calling for phony violence against them, as you say like their fake news. But they flipped out.

And of course, these are the people who think it's charming and wonderful that they had a modern-dress version of Julius Caesar, they dramatically extended the assassination scene, and the guy playing Caesar looks exactly like Trump, dresses like Trump, talks like Trump. And I'm not for shutting that down. They have the right to do what they want. But I'm aware that if this had happened under the Obama administration with Obama as playing Caesar, CNN would have been the first to call for everybody being arrested and jailed.

So – I don't want to shock anybody – they turned out to be hypocrites, but very thin-skinned hypocrites, and I think for good reason, because who believes them, who trusts them, who likes them? You have their very strong fans who are among the left, but regular Americans, as well as of course right-wing Americans, despise CNN, but never look at it. So that's my own position, and they're aware of it. So they're aware that they're in a precarious position, but they just have to keep going. They have to keep making more openings for Trump and all the critics of CNN. And of course MSNBC and even Fox is not too hot and all the broadcast networks are terrible.

Really, Tom, I've never seen anything like this in my life. This is a more intense attack on a public figure than even I think Joe McCarthy. I mean, it's really quite astounding, but it's not working, because whenever Trump does something that bugs his base, which is unfortunately all too often, it only takes something like this – and I'm sure Trump knows exactly what he's doing – to bring the base back to him, because they can't stand CNN. I feel the same way. They hate CNN and everything CNN stands for.

So it's tremendous fun. We don't get much for our tax dollars, but the Trump tweeting is one of the few things we do get. So it's fun, it's entertaining, and it bugs all the right people. I enjoy it and I think plenty of other people do too.

I'm just going to say one thing about professional wrestling. I had gone to matches as a kid, and, in the last couple of years because of the wonderful libertarian wrestler, Kane, I was able to see some matches in Columbus, Georgia. And I was amazed and thrilled to see who the audience was. It was virtually all dads and little boys, maybe the friends of their sons or multiple sons, whatever. And they all loved it. And of course everybody knows this is make-believe violence, not actual violence. And I thought, you know, sort of – it thrills little boys in a way that's entirely harmless. I had a new appreciation for it. It's quite a wonderful thing.

So no wonder CNN doesn't get it. They don't get anything that's in the mainstream culture or certainly the culture of the deplorables. They're entirely separate, and I think and hope they're going down. I think that they're going to be in even more financial and other trouble than they are now, and there's a great rumor that AT&T, which may be buying Time Warner and therefore would have control of CNN, is concerned – they want to revise CNN. They want to revamp it. They don't like the way CNN is operating. So I hope that's true. And certainly they're worrying about that at CNN. And they should worry. I love to have them worry.

WOODS: Let's say a word about James O'Keefe and Project Veritas. Now, once this all dies down, I'm going to try and get him on. I discovered the other day that we're Facebook friends. I don't recall this, but I've been on Facebook I guess for at least ten years, so that's possible that could have happened.

But anyway, he's been releasing videos pretty regularly day after day, and they're undercover videos – or they're videos that were recorded without the knowledge, obviously, of people at CNN. And the one just yesterday – the first couple ones were the Russia story is BS and a nothing burger and all that, and then the other day, he got somebody saying a bunch of things, including that none of us can stand Chris Cuomo, but he happens to be the governor's brother and we're not. And he's so dumb, every time he opens his mouth we're all saying, Just shut up.

So stuff like that is also glorious to see. And I'm reading – you and I both read Bob Wenzel, and he absolutely insists that O'Keefe has so much more to come, and I wish I knew what that meant. But comment about Project Veritas.

ROCKWELL: What an astounding thing that O'Keefe has done. I think we all owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude for his showing up of Planned Parenthood and showing just what monsters these people are. I mean, they're really ghouls. They're vampires. They're of course communists and everything else evil. And he showed them up. The media of course kept saying, Don't believe what these people are saying. It's all phony. O'Keefe is a trickster. They're not actually saying these things. So really, if you want to know about the abortion industry in this country, O'Keefe exposed it as it never has been exposed before.

And now look what he's doing to CNN. He did the same thing to various left-wing groups that were on Obama's side in previous elections, showing that they were glad to enlist anybody as a voter even if they knew that they were illegals. I don't think there's any question there was a vast amount of bringing illegals into voting booths by the Democratic Party and George Soros' various foundations and nonprofits.

And so O'Keefe, now he's done this. It really is astounding to see these people speaking the truth. I mean, it's just a tremendous thing. And I know sometimes people imply this is illegal for him to do it. It's not illegal. Georgia, where this was taking place, is one of those states where only one person has to know that you're being recorded. And of course, by the way, the government claims they can record you even though – they can record two people talking even if neither one of them agrees. But anyway, in Georgia, you can record, and he's just – O'Keefe is a star. He's just an extraordinary guy, a great entrepreneur, and he's another Tom Woods, maybe.

WOODS: [laughing]

ROCKWELL: So this is just thrilling.

WOODS: Yeah, it is. And on that matter of Planned Parenthood and abortion, people tried to come back with, "Oh, it's not what it looks like," and all that. But I distinctly recall, there was one video where they've got these aborted babies sitting there on a table and one of the women in the room – I mean, normal people don't act like this. One of the women in the room pointed at one and said, "Oh, this was a boy," and they go, "Ohh." But not like, Oh, isn't it a shame this is a dead boy in front of me? They're not saying, Oh, here's an unidentifiable clump of tissue. They weren't saying that. They were saying – and it was just – ghoulish. Ghoulish is the word. I think I even used that word at the time.

Now, the funny thing about all this, Lew, is that given their insane opposition to Trump – and believe me, there are a lot of things – I didn't like the Syria bombing. There are plenty of things to say against Trump. But given that you could have said almost all those things – apart from his buffoonery, you could have said all of those things about any president and then some, so I'm not buying that that's the real reason they're upset at him. What's interesting about all this is that, really, when you look at his foreign policy, and as you told me before we went on, when you look at what he's saying in Poland – and maybe you could tell us what he's saying in Poland – he really

is just doubling down on the bipartisan foreign policy. So these people are paranoid. They're crazy paranoid. He's not really giving you a Pat Buchanan foreign policy, so what are they all so hysterical about?

ROCKWELL: Well, I think what they fear, what they are hysterical about is the people who support Trump, the idea that that many Americans, despite all the attempts to prevent this from happening, voted for somebody who they thought was happy to overthrow the entire system, who wanted – at least if you could believe him during the campaign – a foreign policy of peace, who wanted to be friends with other countries, and wanted a sea change and didn't like the deep state and didn't like the whole apparatus in Washington, didn't like the Republicans any more than he liked the Democrats, and wanted – I think it terrifies them every moment of their lives now that that many Americans agree with the Trump they saw during the campaign. That is why they're – that's why they flip out.

So it doesn't matter if Trump's doing stuff they like if it were anybody else besides Trump doing it. They can't stand the thought of: is this the beginning of a revolution? Is this not the end of these sorts of ideas? But regardless of what Trump does or doesn't do, is this the beginning of a very significant change in American foreign policy, and maybe other policies of government, maybe in the entire Western world's foreign policies could be? So we can hope and pray that's the case, but they're terrified of it, and that's again why they flip out, why they're constantly on a hair-trigger alert.

And of course, these shows, I myself have a very hard time watching, say, *Morning Germ* – as I think of that show. But every show, so far as I can tell, is nothing about – it's a hate Trump. And this morning there's a tremendous amount of time that the media is devoting to why are Trump and Melania holding hands now, why aren't they holding hands then? "Look, they didn't hold hands going up the staircase to the airplane." By the way, it's not easy hold hands walking up the staircase to the airlines. But anyway, you can't believe how petty, how focused, how crazed these people are.

But at the base of it is they're worried about the deplorables, not only the deplorables here, the deplorables in Europe, deplorables in other countries besides Europe. This is a worldwide movement of, you could call it populism, right-wing populism, and that's what terrifies them. They want to suppress it. They want to kill it. They're afraid they're not going to be able to.

WOODS: All right, I've got a bunch of other things I want to talk about. We'll do that after we thank our sponsor.

[Sponsored content]

Lew, before we go any further, I want to say a word about an event coming up in October of this year, 2017. It's the 35th anniversary event of the Mises Institute. I distinctly recall the 25th anniversary event, which was also held in New York City, and how wonderful that was. And here we are at 35 years, and there's a very, very compelling theme for this year's event. So can you take just a minute and tell us about it? And I will link – today's show notes page is TomWoods.com/946. I'll link to the event page for anybody who would like to attend, which should be everyone listening, by the way.

ROCKWELL: One of the reasons you should be there is Tom Woods is going to be speaking for us.

WOODS: Oh, well, naturally. That goes without saying. But there are a couple of others I know are hard to – are unusual to be able to see in the U.S.

ROCKWELL: No, so this is going to take place October 6th and 7th in New York City. Go to Mises.org, go to the link on Tom's site to see all about it. We're going to have tremendous fun, be with great friends. You'll get a chance to hear some very great people. As I mentioned, Tom is speaking. Hans Hoppe is speaking, which is unusual for Hans to come to this country. But he's coming to speak, as many others are coming to speak, because of the theme of the conference, which is The Life and Work of Murray Rothbard.

This great man is still to this day constantly under attack by all the people funded by the Kochs and Soroses and similar kinds of people. They fear him. And there's a reason they fear him, and there's a reason they should fear him. I would say he's the best-read economist – may be the best read economist in the world. He's certainly better read than Keynes. He's certainly better read than Marx. Is Krugman or whatever better read – to pick a favorite of yours, Tom. I don't know. But I remember when I made this point once before in writing. Some friends and relatives of Milton Friedman got very, very upset at me and were denouncing the very idea. And my favorite reaction was a commenter on somebody's blog, and he said, Look, this is an unfair comparison. The Mises Institute has put all of Rothbard's works for free on the web. Milton Friedman's works are only in print and they're very expensive, so you can't compare the two of them.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: [laughing] Give me more unfairness like that.

WOODS: Yeah, exactly.

ROCKWELL: So we're going to be celebrating Murray, not only with talks by Hans Hoppe, by Tom Woods, by Judge Napolitano, by Guido Hulsmann, who'll be coming from France. Many other speakers – Paul Gottfried, of course a frequent guest of Tom's too. Take a look at the site. You'll see some great names there. We're going to have fun. The police of the Mises Institute is to try to do good and have fun doing it, so this is a perfect example of that. We're going to have great meals. We're going to be with great friends. We're not guided by any political correctness. It's just going to be tremendous. One of the things is a tour of Mises' and Murray's Manhattan with some extremely funny tour guides who know everything about – We're going to have also a panel telling stories about Murray. We're going to have some of the young Rothbardians talk.

We're going to just emphasize what an important man this was, also what just a great guy he was. I mean, he was the greatest guy you can imagine, as Tom knows, if you were going to have a beer with him. You just sit down and talk over a cup of coffee, there's nobody in the world you would want to do it more with than Murray Rothbard.

He was not arrogant, unlike a lot of top economists. A very sweet guy, a humble guy, unbelievably brilliant, a creative genius. One of the great geniuses of the 20th century, I would argue. Just an amazing man, so we want to try to give him some credit. We want to extend the knowledge of him and have a lot of fun doing it. We're even going to have a late night — Murray was a famous night owl, so we're going to have a late night Rothbard night club after the main dinner.

And so it's just going to be tremendous fun. New York was the city of Murray, also the city of Mises in this country. And we're just going to do good; we're going to have fun; we're going to spread the word. We're going to have students there with us, as well as Mises Institute donors and supporters. And I urge everybody: look into this, think about coming. If you do come to join us, I'd love to shake your hand and meet you if I don't already know you, and even of course if I do know you. But I can promise you you will have a great time.

WOODS: The closest I came to seeing Murray on his home turf, so to speak, was I saw — I know what building he lived in in Manhattan.

ROCKWELL: Yes.

WOODS: And it so happens that it's right across the street from — I don't know if it's still there, but there was a restaurant that used to have all-you-can-eat ribs, and then back in the day when I used to do this sort of thing, all-you-can-drink Rolling Rock. And some grad students and I used to go there, and I used to think, much, much more interesting than this particular restaurant is that building there across the street. So yeah, I can't wait. I'll be there for every bit of it. I'm going to see if I can somehow finagle my way onto that bus, too, because I would really love to see what that's all about, especially with, as you say, the particular tour guides you guys have chosen. It sounds like a great —

ROCKWELL: [laughing] Walter Block and, you know — yeah —

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, oh, it's —

ROCKWELL: It's going to be a lot of fun.

WOODS: Yeah, absolutely hysterical. And let's say another just quick thing about another event, but this one goes on every single year and it's coming up in a couple of weeks, and that's the Mises University program, where I first really learned Austrian economics back in 1993, if you can believe that. And I bring this up because Joe has asked me to kick off the event this year with a Rothbard theme, given that that's also the theme of the event we just talked about. And so he's asking me to talk about what I learned from Rothbard, whom I did get to meet several times, but of course beyond that, in general, from studying his work and observing his life, what can we walk away from that with. So that's going to be — I'm really going to enjoy putting that together, actually.

ROCKWELL: Tom, I'll never forget the first time, at least to my knowledge, that you met Murray was at Mises University.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: And I believe I introduced you to him. But anyway, I had already told him about you. He knew about you. He wanted to meet you. And so you two were talking, standing together and talking animatedly, so I walked away. And it seems to me it was a couple hours later I come back, and you're still there just talking, talking, talking, talking, both of you enjoying it so much. And it was very moving and thrilling, especially in retrospect. It was a great moment. And the fact that Murray had an influence on you, as he did so many of us and continues to have it through his writings, is just tremendous. He's one of the hopes for the future: for the future of freedom and for the future of Austrian economics. And he's already contributed so much for so many people, so many books.

And if you've not read Rothbard, by the way, just let me mention he's an unbelievable writer. If you're under the impression that economists write like John Maynard Keynes – who's actually a pretty good writer except in *The General Theory*. But if you think of them as being difficult to understand and the writing's full of irrelevant formulas and reading like some bad sociologist, Rothbard is so clear, so interesting, so comprehensible, whether he's writing about American history or he's writing about economic history or he's writing about libertarianism, whatever is the topic. Many of his works – I think about his work, his monograph on the state, when you read Rothbard, you are never the same again.

Now, some people read Rothbard and hate his guts, leftists. But people who are open, who have inquiring minds – something that's not much encouraged these days in academia or any level of education – but those people who do read Rothbard, they're never the same. Doesn't mean you agree with him on everything, but you find him so compelling, so interesting, so logical, so fun, funny. I don't know of anybody like him in the history of economics and in many other academic subjects.

So come in October, join us. Help honor him. Help spread his message. It's essential, as Ron Paul points out, for the future of freedom and for the future of prosperity, if we are to have any prosperity. Ron Paul, by the way, a close friend of Murray's, colleague of Murray's, he'll of course be there to speak too. We're going to have a great time.

WOODS: I'm going to make sure also at TomWoods.com/946 that I add your piece, "Read Rothbard," where it's kind of a guide to his writings and you can get a sense of what's more academic, what's more popular, maybe the order you should start in, because it is a little bit intimidating when you look at his corpus. So I'm going to add that.

And I remember – before we get back to the other stuff, I remember thinking to myself, Here is potentially – now, I couldn't have known I was going to meet him later on other times, but I thought, This is potentially the only time I'll ever be able to talk to this guy and I've got to get everything out of him that I can. So I did pick his brain quite a bit because I had been doing a lot of reading, and I said, I know that it's your opinion that the Eisenhower forces stole the nomination from Taft in '52 and I want to know where I can read about this. And so he said, Oh, read a book called *The Twenty Year Revolution* by Chesly Manly. So I was like, Oh okay, I'll write that down.

So of course I go back to college and at their library, nobody has taken out Chesly Manly, *The Twenty Year Revolution*. It's sitting there collecting dust. In fact, I don't think anybody – literally, I don't think anybody had ever taken that book out, written in the '50s. By the way, that's the beautiful thing about being a dissenter on a college campus. All the books are available. Everything's sitting there on the shelf and there's no competition for them. And I just remember thinking, In a million years, I would never have known to look at this book or find it or have heard of it, and here it is because – I mean, it was just crazy, just crazy.

Okay, well, I'll save these stories for that event. Anyway, let's get back to the Trump thing. He's in Poland as we speak, and what's he been saying there?

ROCKWELL: Well, I've not read everything he said, of course, and I'm sure there are not transcripts of it. I'd like to think that maybe he's congratulating Poland on not accepting all these welfare migrants who are all anti-Catholic and would like to destroy the traditional culture of Poland, among other questions, and they have had no terrorist incidents in Poland because they've accepted none, of course outraging the EU bureaucrats. I don't think he's talking about that anymore than he talks about such things at home.

But he apparently has condemned Russia for its so-called aggression in Ukraine and in Syria. Of course the idea that the U.S. is condemning anybody for their aggression is – I guess there's no sense of irony anymore. But you know, it's very disappointing. He's got a meeting coming up with Putin. I would like to have thought that maybe something could be said in accord with what he said in his campaign. He said, What is wrong with being friendly with other countries? Well, as we know, whether it's CNN or the CIA or Obama or *The New York Times* or John McCain or everybody evil in the culture – who apparently want a war with Russia, which could of course bring about the end of the human race, among other unfortunate side effects. So I'm disappointed to see, but maybe he doesn't mean this anymore than he's meant some other things. Who knows? But it's a very unfortunate thing.

On the other hand, the Poles are not exactly pro-Russian, and who can blame them? They were of course occupied by by Tsarist Russia, and they were occupied much more horrendously by Communist Russia. And still, stoking war fever is not a good thing, and we see that going on on the other end of the world with the North Koreans. The U.S. has been at war of course technically with North Korea since the early '50s. The U.S. occupies South Korea. It wants to keep trouble going because it justifies the occupation and the control of South Korea and justifies the occupation and its control of Japan. But is the dictator of North Korea as crazy as the CIA portrays him to be? He may very well be, although it seems to me basically what they want is they want not to be attacked, which is where all this crazy missile stuff and so forth comes from. And as usual, the U.S. is putting out lies.

For example, they said just recently North Korea sent out an ICBM and it can easily strike the moon or Saturn or Manhattan or whatever. Well, it went 600 miles. The U.S. government's definition of an ICBM is it has to be able to go 3,450 miles, 5,500 kilometers. The most recent Scud missile – that's what this is – went 600 miles. That's unfortunate. Nobody should be shooting off these things, as the U.S. of course shoots them off all the time, and we're supposed to applaud that and be thrilled by it.

So to be ginning up war fever rather than what Trump said was going to be his foreign policy – He even said at one point he'd like to sit down with Kim Jong-Il and try to see if things couldn't be worked out. I mean, maybe the U.S. could offer stopping its anti-civilian sanctions, which have been on for such a very long time. Maybe the U.S. could stop blocking friendly relations between North and South Korea, family visits and that sort of thing. But in order to keep war fever high, the Pentagon and CIA and all the various institutions that make money off war and the run-up to war of course are very opposed to that.

I mean, it seems to me sometimes one can think Trump is being belligerent towards China and Russia and North Korea all at the same time. It seems to me that's not smart. It's not smart; it's not – I mean, who is he catering to? The neocons love it. The CIA loves it. The Republican Party loves it. The Democratic Party loves it. But the deplorables don't like it. All the studies after the election show that one of the key things for the deplorables was Trump not wanting to be a warmonger. So I'm not giving up on him. Good things can happen despite these unfortunate actions in Syria and Yemen, this unfortunate stuff going on in Somalia too. No American of course cares that the U.S. is killing people in Somalia. That's just an everyday thing. That's just what the government should be doing.

Trump said in Poland that the West will never be broken. Well, I don't know if it's Irving Kristol's ghostwriting this stuff for him. What that means is the empire will never be broken. Well, the Romans thought that, the British thought that, the Assyrians and the Babylonians and the Egyptians – many people have thought that their empire was never going to be broken. No empire is unbreakable. Every empire, because of all of the various economic effects that it starts – the vast spending, the vast debt, the vast surveillance of its own people, whom of course it fears the most.

You want to know who the U.S. government fears the most? It's not ISIS. It's the American people, because ISIS can't actually do anything to them. We can do something to them if we ever wake up and want to do it. The Trump election, whatever's wrong with Trump, his election was a very good step forward. We just have to hope that – and maybe there's going to be somebody better than Trump. Maybe there'll be somebody who actually means what Trump said the next time, because I think the Democrats are not going to be able to bring back Hillary or, I don't know, Chuck Schumer or whoever they might think they're going to bring back.

So this is a scary time. It's an interesting time. It's a time for putting forward what Murray Rothbard always said was the key libertarian issue: that is war or peace. War is what gives government the most power, the most control, the most sway over the minds and the hearts of its own people. And of course a lot of people are killed. Tremendous destruction of property, families destroyed. The U.S. has probably killed, since George W. Bush started his wars, a million people. So we're supposed to think Saddam Hussein was a bad guy. How about that? A million people. Their families destroyed, homes destroyed. It's amazing what governments think they can do.

I remember when George W. Bush first started his war in Iraq, and his first action was to bomb a restaurant in downtown Baghdad because they had some of that great U.S. intelligence that Saddam Hussein and his sons were dining there. Well, of course they were not dining there, typical U.S. intelligence. Somebody dropped a gigantic bomb on

this restaurant. He killed the customers; he killed the owner; he killed the chef; he killed the waiters; killed people in the surrounding area. Nobody said, Wait a minute, why isn't that murder? Didn't he just commit an act of murder?

And of course he did commit an act of murder, but we're supposed to believe, as Murray always said, that the government is above the law, that the government is above the moral law, that the moral law doesn't apply to the government, that whatever – if it's killing people, why, that's war; it's not murder. If it's drafting people, that's not kidnapping. And if it's stealing people's money, that's taxation; that's not theft. So Rothbard showed us the way, and we need him now more than ever. So read him, and it helps you interpret exactly what is going on, what the U.S. government is doing, the U.S. empire, what its satraps and vassals are doing, what its opponents are doing.

I'll just mention one last thing about North Korea. Communist countries tend not to be belligerent. The reason is not because they're good guys. I mean, the government of the Soviet Union was probably the worst thing ever to exist in the history of the human race, in terms of governments. These are very, very nasty operations. But they're also very poor operations. They're always economic basket cases. North Korea's an economic basket case. They couldn't actually sustain a war. They don't want a war. They're just very stupidly and irrationally sending off these missiles in an attempt to keep from being attacked. So why not negotiate? Why not offer a lifting of sanctions? Why not oppose trade with South Korea? Many things that could be done that would be in the interest of the poor people of North Korea. Nobody cares about them.

We should never forget that the first Korean war was started by the U.S.; it was not started by North Korea. Millions of civilians in North Korea were killed by the U.S. in the Korean War. Does anybody know that in this country? If people even remember there was a Korean War, they know nothing about the deliberate bombings of dykes in North Korea to flood villages, all the deliberate killing of civilians. This of course is the U.S. way of war, despite their baloney about collateral damage. They actually seek collateral damage. That's – and in fact, in every modern war, the casualties and the dead are always civilians. It's far more dangerous to be a civilian than to be a soldier. They go after the civilians.

This is of course against just war doctrine. I have my own problems with just war doctrine, but one of the things it says – and Mises upheld this too. He said if you're going to have a war, it should be a war of the soldiers, in the 18th century phrase, not against civilians. And there had been tremendous progress made in that direction over the centuries, and then, unfortunately, along came Mr. Lincoln and took us many steps backwards and really presaged everything that's happened in terms of the war, the democratic wars of subsequent times.

So we need to know about war. We need to watch what's going on. We need to educate ourselves. As you mentioned that article, Tom, people should read Rothbard. He is the most fun, most interesting – and again, you'll never be the same, in a very, very good way.

WOODS: Lew, did you see that, speaking of North Korea, that *The New York Times* had to issue a correction Because their reporter reported something from a parody North Korea account as if it were fact coming from the North Korean regime?

ROCKWELL: Well, the KCIA, which is the Korean Central Intelligence Agency, has a huge division, and they're no different from other countries, making up stuff about North Korea. And my favorite example is – maybe this was two years ago. But it was all over the American news and of course South Korean news that Kim Jong-Il was requiring every young guy in North Korea to cut his hair exactly as Kim Jong-Il did. He has of course a very odd-looking haircut. Well, you only have to think dictators don't do this kind of thing because it undermines them, not because maybe they wouldn't like to. But they're always very concerned about keeping on top and about what might affect, as all governments are. They don't trust the people. They don't like the people. And the idea that even a crazy dictator would force everybody to cut his hair in a strange way would just cause all kinds of trouble he doesn't need. And of course it wasn't true. He didn't order everybody to get their hair cut in – what looks to us maybe doesn't look weird in North Korea, but looks to us as a very weird hairdo.

So really, you have to take everything we hear about countries that are being demonized, leaders who are being demonized – all the stuff they said about Saddam Hussein, a lot of it wasn't true. All the stuff they said about Noriega in Panama, a lot of that wasn't true. They always, the U.S. style – this was the British style too, the Romans did it. You always first demonize the other side, and then of course it's okay to kill them all. So it's – we just have to be careful.

For example, I'll just mention one thing. There's free growing and use of marijuana in North Korea. Now, that's not the be-all and end-all of issues, but it seems to me it tells us there might be some things we don't know about this country. We know nothing about this country. Why do some people want to destroy that country and kill millions of people in the process? There's something wrong with that. It goes against the teachings of Jesus Christ. It goes against rationality. It goes against the interest of human flourishing. It goes against everything good, and yet we're supposed to think it's perfectly okay to just kill them all.

WOODS: The thing about the particular error I had in mind is that if you actually go to this parody Twitter account, which is @dprk_news, it is so obviously a parody account. Every single tweet is a joke. And *The New York Times* reported it like it was an actual tweet and then had to take it down. And this is all happening at the same time we're –

ROCKWELL: But isn't *The New York Times* itself sort of a parody site?

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah, of course, indeed it is, indeed it is. But I'm so glad that all these glaring errors are coming out all at the same time. But let me say just a quick thing on this whole Russia thing. That was the best thing about Trump, was his favoring deescalation with Russia and deescalation in general. That was the reason that I thought, well – because I thought to myself the only way this foreign policy, which the whole establishment has a vested interest in maintaining, is every going to be changed is if you have some independent, headstrong person who gets in there and just says, "Over my dead body," and these things are going to change. And I thought

maybe this guy is that guy. I mean, I don't know. Now, at the time — and I've got plenty of examples of me in comments sections around the Internet saying, My concern about the guy is that he's such an unsystematic thinker that you may just get a bunch of ad hoc policies instead of a consistent deescalation, which is of course exactly what we have gotten.

And so what I've said for a while is what Trump needs: if he really wants to do the things he said he wanted to do, I'll tell you what he needs: he needs Pat Buchanan. He needs Pat to write a couple of epic speeches for him, and he needs Pat to be a strategist, who would be much better than Steve Bannon, by the way. Pat would be the strategist he needs. He should bring Pat into the White House right now if he really wants something other than the visceral enjoyment of some tweets. If he wants some successes, there's nobody who's been around the block more who's more in Trump's corner than Pat.

ROCKWELL: That's absolutely true, Tom. It's a brilliant suggestion. Makes me remember of course Pat worked for Richard Nixon. And there was much wrong with Nixon. I didn't like him at the time, and I certainly don't like him subsequently. But I'll always give him credit for being about detente with Russia and detente with China. I think that's, by the way, why he was taken down by the CIA and the FBI in the Watergate business: because he wanted peace with the traditional enemies. So that must be something in Trump's mind. Pat could advise him on what happened to Nixon, too.

But if you're — did Trump actually intend what he said, and then woke up with a horse's head in his bed the next morning, as Bionic Mosquito put it. Who knows? But whatever pressure's put on him, it doesn't justify his doing evil. And so talking about all this war stuff is sending in the ships and the planes and so forth, that's dangerous, but it's not irremediable. But actually what he did in Syria, what he's doing in Yemen, what he's doing in Somalia — admittedly on a small scale, just maybe a few thousand dead, so who cares about them except God and their families? But if he actually proceeds to do anything serious about North Korea, let alone Russia or China, there's no justification for it.

I don't care what he's been threatened with. We have to hope, we have to pray that he does the right thing, that he has the courage of his former convictions and tries to bring a little bit of peace to the world. We just have to hope. We have to encourage him. We have to criticize him when he's doing the wrong thing. We have to praise him when he's doing the right thing. And one thing I want to say: Mr. Trump, keep up the tweets about CNN.

WOODS: Yeah, that's right. That's right. Plus, in general, for any president, the more they tweet, the better. The more they're occupied with that stuff, the better, especially if it's going to entertain me, which is apparently all I'm ever going to get. But anyway, Lew, I guess I'll be seeing you — let's see, as we're recording this, what is it, the 6th of July? Yeah, so I guess I'll be down there in just over two weeks for the Mises University program, and I'm really thrilled. Every year it's my favorite week of the year. I'm really glad to be a part of it. And as I told you, Bob Murphy and I coined an expression: post-Mises U. depression. It's the official term for how you feel on

Saturday afternoon at the barbecue when it's all wrapping up and you know you have a whole year to go for the next Mises U. So looking forward to that, and thanks a lot.

ROCKWELL: Tom, thanks for starring in that and thanks for all you do.