



Episode 986: Lew Rockwell: Will There Be a “Private Sector” Assault on Dissidents?

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: Sometimes we have to break with tradition and talk about something happy, I think.

ROCKWELL: [laughing]

WOODS: You know, in the future? We've done at least one episode on Murray Rothbard. That was happy.

ROCKWELL: Yes.

WOODS: But there's got to be something else cheery we can talk about. But anyway —

ROCKWELL: Why don't we remind people of the celebration of your 1,000th?

WOODS: Yeah, sure, the 1,000th episode is going to be a very, very happy thing, TomWoods.com/Orlando. Very unfortunate that it's happening the same day as the great Ron Paul event in Washington.

ROCKWELL: Oh, I would have of course been there if I hadn't signed up with Ron first.

WOODS: And by the way, forgive me. I think I said Washington. I mean Virginia. It's in Virginia of course, right?

ROCKWELL: Yeah.

WOODS: Yeah, but no, it's totally understandable, but I apparently need to talk to Daniel McAdams. The lesson of this is I've got to keep in closer contact with my old friend Daniel McAdams a little bit more. And then we find out, by the way, that Milo is doing an event in Orlando the same night I am, if you can believe that. But it's at a thus far undisclosed location, and you've got to pay a pretty penny to get in, and ours is going to be a lot more fun for free, so you know, I think my money is on the 1,000th episode. So anyway, let's —

ROCKWELL: I know my sister is going. I know a lot of people who are going and driving long distances with glee to go to this great celebration, so, wonderful.

WOODS: Well, we're going to have fun, and I've got a couple of surprises cooked up for people. And I have to tell them right off the bat: no, it's not Ron Paul –

ROCKWELL: [laughing]

WOODS: – because everybody goes in assuming your surprise is Ron Paul. He's having an event somewhere else, so it's not that. But anyway, all right, let's talk about the gloomy situation I invited you on to talk about. I wrote something about this to my newsletter, and then I slightly revised it and you ran it on LRC, so I'll link to the LRC version of it at TomWoods.com/986 about what's been happening with extremely right-wing websites. Now, we can argue about, you know, are neo-Nazis left or right, and you can find – like this Traditionalist Worker Party is just outright socialist. They just say that we're socialism for white people, basically. This is not – hasn't got the slightest attraction for me.

ROCKWELL: [laughing] I know.

WOODS: But there are a lot of things in the world that don't have the slightest attraction for me, but I don't bother them. I have only so much time during the day, and a group that has 28 members in it is just not even showing up on my radar. Doesn't matter to me. In fact, it makes me think about in the old days when I was a college freshman and I used to debate the literal communists in front of the dining hall. That was probably a waste of my time too, but I couldn't just pass them by. I had to say something.

ROCKWELL: Hey, it honed your skills. It was not a waste of time.

WOODS: That's true. That is true. And it also prepared me for the fact that nobody ever changes his mind during a debate. I didn't convert one communist in all of those conversations. Well, anyway, what's been happening is we've seen a couple of what we might call extremist websites being shut down, or either their hosting service won't host them or the domain name provider isn't – whatever it is, their normal services have been disrupted, or PayPal has refused to do business with them any longer. But then that's spread out to groups that you might say are kind of just on the edge of respectable opinion. I don't want to insult them by saying that, but in other words, they're not quite Stormfront, for heaven's sake. VDARE.com, which is edgy but obviously is not any of these crazy groups they're talking about, that had nothing to do with Charlottesville, didn't even publicize or mention Charlottesville, PayPal cut off connection with the. There are other groups all over the place that are finding this happening to them. And this is an issue I think that's worth discussing.

And before we get started, yes, yes, I know. Yes, I know. PayPal can do business with anybody it wants to. I know. I get that. I know libertarianism better than anybody making that criticism. I know that. But aren't we still allowed to talk about it as people? Can't we still talk about it because it's interesting? Well, it is interesting, and it's something that maybe we have to prepare for, because the people, the extremists who are carrying out this purge of people from polite society are not known for making careful distinctions, Lew, between people who are Nazis and people who are – I don't know, the exact opposite of Nazis? They're not very good at making these distinctions,

so if you think to yourself, *Well, I'm safe*, then I don't think you really are getting the nature of what we're up against.

ROCKWELL: It's funny. The left-libertarians absolutely will criticize you for criticizing what they say is the private conduct of a private company, even though of course these are people who do not believe in the right of free association or the right of free disassociation, as Hoppe always likes to say. So they're disingenuous, as usual. But it's also implied you can't criticize them. You're not calling for the state to do something to them, as if that would ever happen, but of course you're allowed to criticize if a company is doing something you feel is wrong, whether it's wrong from a political standpoint, from a religious standpoint, whatever. If a company decides that they want everybody to use birth control, let's say, well, yeah, a company can do that, but you're perfectly all right to say that's really not a good thing.

But I think all that doesn't quite apply here. It seems to me that we've got a brand new development in the history of fascism, and of course the U.S. has been a fascist regime – I hate to disabuse the Antifas. It first became a fascist regime pretty much under Woodrow Wilson during World War I. It permanently became one under FDR during the New Deal, where we have a corporate state. Government-business partnership in Roosevelt's day was – union partnership was part of that, which was the original Mussolini vision. It's since become just state and corporate. Of course, welfare state, militarism, imperialism, all the aspects of – planned economy and so forth – all the aspects of fascism. And by the way, Italian fascism was not anti-Semitic or racist or whatever. So those are not necessarily part of the original fascism, anyway.

But of course fascism is a disastrous, evil philosophy, and it seems to me that it's reached new levels in recent years. We actually see the fascist state erecting a public-private partnership for the police state, which is also of course part of fascism, a police state. So you have companies like Google, like Twitter, like PayPal and GoDaddy and many, many other companies that seem to be working in cahoots with the government to suppress dissent. And yes, of course they start with the easy ones.

In the days of the Cultural Revolution in China, which sometimes I think this is beginning to resemble, when the Red Guards would demand at, say, the university that all the professors come to a self-criticism session, which was mandatory – of course these were all communists, members of the Communist Party. They were not regular people. And they would pick one guy to wear a dunce cap, a literal dunce cap and to be especially beaten – that might be the best of what happened to him, because he could go to the gulag too and be taken around the campus afterwards. And what the Red Guards called this was killing a chicken to scare the monkeys. Apparently, if you have a band of marauding monkeys, which is a problem in some countries, you can chase him away by killing a chicken that you're going to eat. They run away screaming. And so they knew they only had to do this to one guy, maybe the worst guy from the standpoint of their alleged principles, in order to terrify everybody else.

So that's what's happening now, and if everybody else calms down, shuts up, doesn't say anything politically incorrect, is very careful to abide by what we're now told, as our judges and *ProPublica* and the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center, then maybe if people – They always like voluntary compliance with the state. Whether it's

the IRS or anything else, they like it for evil and psychological and moral purposes as well as getting the cash and getting regulatory compliance and so forth. And also because they can't actually supervise every single person, every single enterprise.

So here we have a situation where they're killing the chickens to scare the monkeys. Yes, these are maybe not chickens you'd want to put in a stew, but I don't know, I think we have to see where this goes. But I think many of us, this might happen to, whether PayPal shuts you down or you have GoDaddy cancel your Internet registration. That's what's put sites off the air. I did hear one funny – and I'm not remembering which site this is. I think there are several of these sites that begin with the word "storm" and then it's something else, so I'm not remembering which one of those it is. But they were able to get registered in Algeria, so now their site is Storm-blank.al. So that strikes me as funny.

But as I mentioned to you off the air, there are other ways to register your site besides going through GoDaddy, which has already shown that it's an active proponent of this stuff, or for that matter, anything else that's based in the United States. There are plenty of companies who will register your site in other countries, and that's a little bit of protection. There's other things that can be done, and I would urge everybody who has a site and might be concerned, talk to their tech people. There are things that you can do to prepare. PayPal you can't do anything about. There are other services, but that's of course the dominant company, and so that's another story. But to keep your site from being taken off the air –

And I don't think it's a good idea to take anybody's site off the air. Maybe the government's sites. Maybe the CIA site, take that off the air. But private sites, even though they're saying things, adhering to things that you and I think are absolute not only disasters, but morally wrong and just don't make for human flourishing. But to have to fascist state, the government in cahoots with these huge corporations starting to do this, I think it's chilling. And of course it's intended to be chilling, so one thing we should not do is be chilled.

WOODS: No question about that, and one instrument of this – we could do a whole episode on this and I don't want to right now – is this group, the Southern Poverty Law Center, that comes up with a list of hate groups. And when you look at it, okay, there are some groups you say, *Yeah, wouldn't want my kids being involved with those people. No, sir.* But on the other hand, I find the Tenth Amendment Center? Are you kidding me? That alone, that one inclusion blows up the whole list. The Tenth Amendment Center is run by the nicest guy in the world, Michael Boldin, who is as far as you could possibly be – I mean that. Literally as far as you could possibly be from the people on that list, and they put him on there, even though half the time he's promoting causes that historically you would associate with the left. But he's a dissident, and that's what gets him on the left. He's not funded by anybody they can control, so he's on the list.

And the conservatives, to their credit, are catching on, and some of them are no longer saying – like Max Boot would say, "Well, the Southern Poverty Law Center says this group is not acceptable to me, so therefore, it is not –" Okay, there are people like that who are going to act like that and be the state's minions. I get that. But there are regular conservatives who are waking up and saying the SPLC is a horrible

organization that is just lining its pockets by smearing, in many cases, perfectly fine people. It smeared Ron Paul. It smeared Judge Andrew Napolitano.

ROCKWELL: Murray Rothbard.

WOODS: Murray Rothbard. And even these basically harmless conservative family groups, for heaven's sake. Yeah, that's the big threat, Lew. I'm worried about a conservative family group taking over America. Let me find my bomb shelter so I can save myself.

ROCKWELL: And —

WOODS: Anyway, let me just finish before I forget on this. There are some of them fighting back on this, but what's interesting about it — and I don't mean to keep coming back to this; it's just that I've had so many bad experiences with these people lately. It's very rare these days to find among, let's say certain libertarians, any concern whatsoever about the Southern Poverty Law Center. They're very happy to just look at the SPLC and say, "Well, they said that's a hate group, so therefore, it is." Wait a minute. Whose side are you on? The SPLC and the state are very closely intertwined. State law enforcement takes these group designations very seriously. They're destroying the careers of good and decent people, but all for the sake of signaling to the world that we are respectable and we don't belong on any of these lists — and of course, none of them have ever had a challenging thought in their lives. They're all bores, I suppose, those people. But they're so determined to make sure everybody knows how feckless and boring they are that they're willing to throw their own people, particularly — like Judge Napolitano. If you have a problem with Judge Napolitano, there's a problem with you. They're willing to throw him under the bus to make sure everybody knows how respectable they are because they support the SPLC.

ROCKWELL: Of course they don't like Judge Napolitano, they don't like Michael Boldin, they don't like other good guys for the same reason, because what you're especially not supposed to hate is anything the federal government has ever done to expand its powers. In this case, the abolition of states' rights, and so anybody who advocates for secession, for decentralization, for what used to be called federalism is a hater. And anybody who advocates traditional Christian, historical Christian doctrines on moral subjects is also a hater. And I was glad to see — I think his name is James Kennedy, he's got a big church in Florida — suing the SPLC and the ADL and *ProPublica* for wanting to put him out of business because of his views on marriage. Of course this is hate. If you disagree with it and if you disagree with the transgender business, you're a hate-monger and you ought to be at the very least expelled, as you say, from polite society.

So this is — there is some fighting back. I was amazed when — you mentioned the pro-family groups — when one of these, which had been designated as a hate group, there was some whacko following the SPLC line who went in with his rifle to kill them all. Thank goodness he didn't kill anybody. He did unfortunately shoot the security guard, who then was able to — the other people were able to disarm this man. If that had been happening on the other side —

WOODS: Oh, we'd still be talking about it. There'd be a day on the calendar.

ROCKWELL: Well, there'd be entire college courses dedicated to it. So it's – but it's just of course like all this stuff, when it's the other side, it's just –

WOODS: It's almost like there's a double standard, Lew, isn't it? It's almost like there's a double standard.

ROCKWELL: Or like the shootout of the Republican congressman playing baseball. That was big news for a day or so, and then gone.

WOODS: Yeah, no. Imagine if it had been Maxine Waters.

ROCKWELL: [laughing] No –

WOODS: Oh my gosh, the documentaries, the feature films about Maxine Waters. We wouldn't be able to escape them.

ROCKWELL: I've always been convinced that – and I'm not a fan of Bill O'Reilly, by the way, in any sense, but I've always been convinced that what actually finished him was not the moral accusations against him, but was the fact that he had Maxine Waters frequently on his show, and the last time he said – she had changed her look – she looked like she was wearing a James Brown wig.

WOODS: [laughing] Oh, geez.

ROCKWELL: So that's not polite. I mean, he shouldn't have said it –

WOODS: No, it's not, but he's a shock TV guy.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, so I think that was the end of him right there, even though it took a little while.

WOODS: I was going to ask you about things people can do to have a backup for themselves if something like this should happen, but before I do that, let me bring up something that was in that article I submitted to you. You keep mentioning a site called *ProPublica* that some people might not be familiar with. It's supposed to be a site promoting independent journalism, but – yeah.

ROCKWELL: [laughing]

WOODS: That's about as Orwellian as it gets. I want to mention the letter that they sent out to a number of groups that I guess are on the SPLC list, and they did no further investigation for themselves to see if they belonged on the list, of course. Why would you bother? Who needs to? The SPLC is infallible. So they sent a letter saying, *Hello, we see you are designated a hate group. We would like to ask you some questions. Do you dispute this characterization? We notice on your site you appear to use the following online services: PayPal and whatever else. How inconvenient would it be for you if those services were terminated?* And then it's just so obviously extremely threatening.

So it so happens that one of the places getting this nasty letter was *The Remnant*, which is a traditional Catholic newspaper, 50 years old, that I used to write for. And then as it turns out, I turned out to be insufficiently right-wing for them, so I can't –

ROCKWELL: [laughing]

WOODS: I'm on this weird balancing act, Lew, so I've not been welcome in their pages for quite some time. But obviously, they shouldn't be so stupid to call them a hate group, for heaven's sake. I mean, these are people who think the Catholic Church is a hate group, so of course they're not going to like *The Remnant*. Well, anyway, *The Remnant* happens to have more or less on staff Chris Ferrara, who's a lawyer, who fired right back at these people about how, if you are going to carry this vendetta out against us – He said, first of all, that's ridiculous that we're a hate group. Here's our response to that idiotic, Orwellian notion. He said, "But look, if you try to engage in tortious interference with the contractual relations we have with these companies, then we are insisting that you maintain all documentation of all notes of telephone conversations, correspondence you have with them, and if you do not, we will consider this to be spoliation of evidence." They hit back hard on this, and I think that *ProPublica* probably decided, *Well, we won't go after that one.*

But honestly, *The Remnant* is pretty harmless. I'm sure – for crying out loud, I'm sure you could dig out something. I don't read them anymore. I don't know what they publish. It's not my thing. I'm just saying that, of all possible things to be worried about in the present context, the idea that a very small, somewhat marginal, traditional Catholic newspaper should be a bother to anyone is hysteria of the most preposterous sort. But as we've said, Lew, maybe people listening to this could get a letter like that someday, and it's not easy to find another payment platform at this moment. So what would you do in that case?

ROCKWELL: Well, I did think that – so glad you put up that letter, because it smacked of the NKVD. I mean, it was quite – it was like a communist letter –

WOODS: Oh yeah, it was right out of East Berlin. It was perfect.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, it was really something. And also, I believe they got this email either in the late morning or early afternoon, and it said, "You must respond by 5 pm."

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah, I know, exactly.

ROCKWELL: And of course there was one funny typo in it, as Gary North pointed out. Instead of saying – the other group, by the way, whose list they're using besides the SPLC is the Anti-Defamation League's, but they called this group the American Defamation League. That is, *ProPublica*, their ally, called them the American Defamation League in this letter. So a little bit of humor among the threats.

WOODS: Yeah, that's right. So he had insert a little "sic" next to America. That is not the name of the group.

ROCKWELL: So I think — I wish I were a tech person, but I've been consulting with people and I'd be glad to come on in the future and talk about it, or maybe I could recommend somebody who would really know these sorts of things as a guest for you. I'm sure you know people like that too.

WOODS: Oh, no doubt. I would say, first of all, this is going to be a boon to cryptocurrencies, because you can send bitcoin to anybody you want.

ROCKWELL: Yes.

WOODS: There's no guy standing there in the blockchain saying, "Now, wait a minute. I think that's a disreputable person. I think I read an article about that guy." So that's one thing. Another thing is I know that over at Gab, the alternative to Twitter, Gab.ai, they are intending to have their own cryptocurrency so that you can easily support somebody through Gab in a currency that can be instantly converted to dollars and you don't have to worry about PayPal or any of these others.

But wouldn't you think, Lew, also there would just be a market opening for some entrepreneur who comes along and says, *You know what? My service that I'm offering, whether it's payment processor or web hosting or domain registration or whatever, I'm not here to actually be your mom. I'm here to provide you with payment processing and a domain name. That's what I'm here for. I'm not here to scold you for being bad. That's not my job. Other people in society can do that to you. I'm just here to say, anybody who would like these services, you can have them.* At some point, somebody is bound to do that and make a lot of money doing it.

ROCKWELL: Well, I know there are a number of sites that have popped up already that will mirror your YouTubes for you in a place that will be a little more difficult to get to, because of course they're taking people's YouTube sites down. Already, they've demonetized — and have done this, by the way, for quite a while — all of Ron Paul's YouTubes because they're questionable. I mean, it again shows who they're actually after, who are their actual targets. How many actual Nazis are there in this country? 129? I mean, come on.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: So that's not who they're after; that's just the chickens they're using to scare the monkeys. So it's — Absolutely the market will respond. Things will also be located maybe — who knows? Maybe Algeria will become the Switzerland of the Internet. But there will be countries that will not be taking orders from the U.S. about this sort of thing that maybe will be open to — It's hilarious to think of Algeria, not exactly the freest country on earth. Although given the speed with which the U.S. is moving away from freedom and towards totalitarianism, it's a little — I don't believe those Heritage Foundation lists anymore of who are the freest countries, because while the U.S. is not by any means the first on that, it's way up at the top. Really? I mean, it's — I don't know. I once asked one of the guys who was doing that, did they ever think of including police state and militarism questions when they did the freedom of the government and how free speech was, and they said no. It was just from an economics standpoint. Well, those properly considered could be economic questions too, but I don't want to be an economic imperialist, but —

And also, we should never forget, as you've long pointed out, there is no difference on the important issues between the liberals and the conservatives and the Republicans and the Democrats. They all agree on everything important. They have rhetorical differences. During elections, they may talk about it's evil to burn the American flag or whatever, but the issues that actually impact people's lives, that actually have to do with how we earn livings, how we run our homes, our communities, our businesses, our churches, these people don't have any disagreements. And the left-libertarians are right in there too.

So it's up to us. You're such a great leader in this, Tom. It's up to us to try to set a different kind of example, not to give in. And it's of course – there was an article in Bloomberg the other day, of all places, that was pretty good on mob rule and the Internet, and that everybody's living in fear, that the self-correction brigades from the Red Guards are going to be visiting you next. So these are difficult times. They may become more difficult. But haven't we always been in difficult times? I mean, for example, has Christianity ever really had an easy time of it? Certainly not now when we see it being denounced as hate.

I don't think there's any question that we're going to see hate speech laws in this country. *Don't you dare say that. You're going to go to jail.* These laws exist in many somewhat free countries already. They'd love to install them here. And in some practical sense, it seems the First Amendment maybe already has been eliminated, because if you can say something on your own property and the Red Guards, the Antifas come to beat you up and the cops stand aside, well, there are ominous questions. But liberty has never had it easy, ever. The preponderance of people seem not to care.

But then again, everything good or evil is determined by minorities, by dedicated minorities. We have to be a dedicated minority for freedom and against the state. So we have our work cut out for us, as we've always had our work cut out for us. And Tom, you're such a bright light in all this, so we all look to you for leadership. And it's the kind of leadership that Ron Paul also is an exemplar of. Not the leader who says, "You do this. You do that," you know, the sort of Leninist leadership, but leadership by example, which is the most powerful form of leadership in every aspect of any human endeavor. So I must say I'm fundamentally optimistic, because, by the way, we do have the truth and the right on our side. That has to count for something, even in a dangerous era. So we can't give in. We have to keep fighting, but we see what happens – you know, we were going to talk about what happened with Google, a classic example of killing the chicken to frighten the monkeys when James Damore – I wonder, is that an Italian name? I wonder if it's pronounced Da-more-e.

WOODS: Yeah, I don't know. That's a good question. I don't know.

ROCKWELL: I don't know. Who by the way, if you read his memo that got him fired, which I highly recommend –

WOODS: It's too left-wing. That's the problem.

ROCKWELL: That's exactly right. This guy's a liberal. I also noticed of course he had it thoroughly documented, and when BuzzFeed put up the – maybe they were the first

one to put up the memo – they deleted all his citations to make it – and then condemned him for saying this without any evidence. So that's of course our friends on the left.

So this is interesting that the high-ranking person at Google who runs YouTube, former wife of one of the founders of Google – in fact, I think she may have rented her garage to the founders of Google to start to do their work. Smart decision. And then she ended up marrying one of them. And it's funny, in terms of – now, this is only a rumor, so I may be doing her wrong. She's a very left-wing person, of course. But the story is that when they had the meeting about what to do about James Damore, she reacted very emotionally, took it very personally, his memo. And of course, when that happens, no guy can say boo, even if they might not have thought it was wise to get rid of him. But the memo's interesting. It says things that are – how shall I say? – settled science about various aspects. It was the same thing that got the president of Harvard fired.

WOODS: Right, right, who was, again, himself also a liberal.

ROCKWELL: And this is not a – he was sort of through. This is not just a rumor; this is what actually happened, the senior woman professor who was denouncing him for not having more women in STEM teaching in STEM areas. After he gave his answer, she ran crying from the room. Well, sort of that was the end of that too. It's like she slit his throat and he was out.

WOODS: Let me run back to the anti-fascist people, so called, the Antifa people, because I know that obviously an exchange on Twitter doesn't mean anything, but nevertheless, I'm sure for every one tweet, there are a million people who agree with them. And I somehow saw a back-and-forth the other day of somebody taking the now fashionable line: look, if you're against fascism, you have to be for these people because they're fighting against fascism. They are literally fighting against fascism.

And so people have said but the trouble is there, they're cracking skulls, they're destroying property, and they're attacking people who aren't really obviously or frankly in any way fascist. So that's kind of a problem. People clearly are not white supremacists or anything else, and the person gave the example of Milo and Dinesh D'Souza. Now, I don't – if you don't like Milo, fine with me. I'm not going to lose any sleep. You can like anybody you want. But he's obviously – by only the most hysterical definition could you possibly call him a white supremacist. And certainly Dinesh D'Souza is Indian, so highly unlikely that you would be able to call him a white supremacist. But the person responded, when confronted with this: look, they've tried to shut down these people and they're obviously not white supremacists – the person said, Well, I guess we'll have to agree to disagree." So that's the point, that people who by no rational, normal-person definition are white supremacists are being shouted down by these people we're supposed to cheer.

And there's an insight, Lew, that I just got from Jordan Peterson, who I think just gets better and better all the time.

ROCKWELL: Yes. Tremendous.

WOODS: I think he's being radicalized by his experience. But he was talking about people who fall for totalitarian schemes that promise a utopian outcome, and he says, you know – and I think about this when I think about these anti-fascist people, so-called, out there in the streets. And he says, they claim to have these wonderful intentions and this utopian outcome they're hoping for. And he says the utopian outcome is always cover for what they really want to do, which is simply to do horrible things to other people. That's the fundamental driving force. They want to do bad things to other people, but if they can give it a beautiful, utopian veneer, all the better. But it's not that they are actually driven by the utopian vision. They're driven by a desire for violence, but they know that that's not acceptable in our society, so they have this cover. And suddenly, Lew, the world became much more understandable.

ROCKWELL: You know, it's interesting. The communists held out that after communism was fully established, the state would wither away and everybody would just be free. That was their actual doctrine. Of course – how shall I say? They didn't believe in the withering of the state. But the first use of "fascist" in this sense, as this sort of epithet, really begins with the communists. It started after Mussolini took power. So under Lenin and under Stalin, to be a fascist was to be an anti-communist. That was how the epithet was used. And it had tremendous currency, unfortunately, in those days.

It sort of went away, and now our current communists or neo-communists, whatever we'd call them, are using it in exactly the same way. They do not mean the political system, the economic system of fascism. I'm not even sure they know what it is. They would find out that they of course are advocates of virtually all of it, and while they would not be advocates of the corporate state, they would be happy to get money from Mr. Soros and other wealthy oligarchs. So I think it's important for those who have ears to tell them about what fascism actually is, and these people are either some variant of fascist, communist. I'm not actually sure they've got a theory. I think it's just, as you and Peterson say, it's just hate. And of course they call us guilty of hate. They are the haters.

And I still think if we go back to the ceremonies at the opening of the tunnel through the Swiss mountains, that magnificent railroad tunnel, only *RT* recorded this clearly satanic service. So are they just doing it to sort of outrage the bourgeoisie, or is it more than that? I don't know. But this same thing goes on at the Bohemian Grove and all these kinds of gatherings of the oligarchs. So again, it may just be intended to outrage the normals, or maybe it's something more, but there's no question these people are evil. And Murray Rothbard was always criticized for using the word "evil." Of course he was right. And these people are evil, and they are only beginning. When are they going to start shooting people? When are they going to start lynching people? I think it was Steve Sailer, who will I guess maybe be under the gun too, who had what a *New York Times* editorial would look like after the first person hated by the Antifas is lynched, what they would say. Well, of course it's not actually a good thing, but really, it's the person's own fault for being an advocate of hate. And really, we really can't – but it's wrong to sympathize with the victim in this case, because –

Anyway, I don't think there's any question if people start to be lynched for their views and the cops stand aside or are ordered to stand aside. I think the – I'm not a fan of

cops in general, but sort of the old-fashioned cops might not have gone along with some of this, and the old-fashioned cops today, the ones that still exist are certainly upset at being ordered to do this. But there are a lot of them who are PTSD veterans of various wars of U.S. aggression and who tend to think of everybody in Afghanistan or Iraq or whatever poor place they were attacking was either a terrorist or a potential terrorist. They look at us like that too.

So we have to be on the — And when this stuff starts to happen, and I hope to God it never happens, we have to be prepared to really try to step up appeals to the good people. And certainly there are very few people in America or any other country, for that matter, who would go along with such conduct. So we need to stimulate them, organize them. We need to change hearts and minds, raise consciences, as they used to say in the feminist days. And we have a very good chance, but these people are a genuine threat. It's just not a bunch of kids marching around on a college campus shouting obscenities, which is, I must say, bad enough. But they really love the violence. They love bloodshed. They enjoy it.

And already the state is too useful an employment opportunity for people who have those kinds of feelings in their hearts, but it seems to be organizing all these kids who can't get a job. I'm not excusing that, obviously, in the sense that the murderer didn't have a playground when he was a kid, so therefore, don't convict him. Not that sort of thing. But still, it's interesting that the fascist economy, the federalized economy, the Federal Reservized economy is failing everybody except the tenth of a percent or whatever at the very top. So it's all kinds of bad things happening.

We have to uphold the right. We have to — I hate to quote Ronald Reagan, but raise a flag of bold colors and not be milquetoasts. Plenty of milquetoasts in the world. We don't need to be among them. And we're certainly going to have an opportunity to do right. It's like — if you were to make a religious analogy, you don't want to be a martyr. It's not a good thing to want to be a martyr. You should do everything morally possible not to be a martyr. But sometimes you can't get out of it. So thank goodness none of us are being martyred. It could happen, from a political standpoint and a libertarian standpoint.

WOODS: Lew, before I let you go, let me take a couple of minutes just to say something about what fascism actually is, what the features of it are.

ROCKWELL: Please.

WOODS: Because when we — first of all, nationalism is necessary but not sufficient, because there are plenty of places in the world that have had nationalism without being fascist. But that would be a necessary ingredient. But under fascism, nationalism becomes outsized, let's say. And there can be a desire for territorial expansion in the name of the people and the people's destiny, and at the head of the fascist state, you have the charismatic leader who is said to embody the will of the people to the point where his actions are the will of the people, that he represents them, he is going to lead them into their historic destiny. So you have that kind of principle.

And then in addition to that, there is an impatience with an opposition to political decentralization. We can't have a bunch of states, because then how could our wise

leader be leading us uniformly according to the will of the aggregated people? We can't have that, which is why Hitler complains in *Mein Kampf* about the arrangement of the U.S. – or at least the way some people understand it. He said the American states can't have independent existences, and that was his view in Germany as well. So centralization.

The economy – I mean, for a lot of people, believe it or not, even on the left, will say, *Well, say what you will about Hitler, but the economy did well*. It was basically military Keynesianism, is what impresses them. Yeah, you have a big military buildup. There are ways the state can make things look pretty good. They can prettify things for a little while. But beyond that, there's the idea that the – this principle ought to sound familiar – the public wheel comes before the private benefit. Well, that's the principle that is knocked into the heads of ever elementary school kid in America, that we can't have you pursuing your own private interests while we have this public project we're all working on. So that is the fascist principle, as well, that what the state wants from you is much more important than what you want for yourself. What the state needs you to do for it trumps that. So that means that, as the Nazis put it, we don't need to socialize the means of production as long as we socialize the people. As long as we socialize their interior disposition, then we'll get them to do what we want them to do with their property. Yeah, you have your private property nominally, but you better not do anything with it that runs contrary to the state's plans.

So all this stuff put together combined with, you know, unquestioning allegiance to the state and the state as the embodiment of the people's destiny and the leader as the embodiment of that, what could this possibly have in common with anything you and I have ever talked about or stood for? What could this – This is so obviously the opposite of what Mises fought for, of what you and I believe in, that it is so ridiculous that – Okay, I expect people on the left – I *expect* people on the left to not necessarily be stupid, but to – you sure could have fooled me to act like they're stupid and to claim that they can't see a difference between us and Nazis. But I mean, for left-libertarians to be insinuating, *Well, you know, there may be* – And then this whole idea that there's like a pipeline. [Gasp] *There's a pipeline through libertarianism to Nazism*. You know, there are about ten times as many people who went through the Ron Paul movement who became Bernie Sanders supporters. But Lew, I didn't go out and beat my breast: "We haven't been anti-communist enough in the libertarian movement. Everybody sign an anti-communist petition!" People would have thought I was a lunatic if I had asked for that.

ROCKWELL: [laughing] Very funny. And of course, I think these people are not stupid. I think they're disingenuous, not that there can't be kids who are sort of carried along by emotions in a movement, which is something else the Nazis were expert. But no, it's entirely – And I'm glad that you said that nationalism – Mises was a supporter of nationalism, properly considered. Not aggressive nationalism, but that peoples should be able to be self-determining. He wrote this and talked about it otherwise, that if a people wanted to be independent, they should be able to be independent. So therefore, of course, secession was a great classical liberal point of view. That's again considered hate these days to think that. But he also talked about things that the left doesn't like in every single day. But maybe a job for you and some of the rest of us too to actually reprint some of the simpler to read Nazi fascist documents. Mussolini had some great quotes from our standpoint for proving all the things you just said, short

and pithy, about everything within the state, nothing outside the state, everything for the state.

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL: That's the way he summed up fascism.

WOODS: Whereas we want to abolish the state [laughing].

ROCKWELL: Well, that's not exactly us, whereas it is of course the so-called Antifas. So these are – But Aristotle talked about the attempts to change the meaning of words to bring about political tyranny, and this has been a very long-term thing the state does, so that fascism means being a capitalist. That again was the communist definition. So we just have to tell the truth, speak out as we can, and not only not let them get us down, but not let them sideline us, because there are huge numbers of people that either agree with us or certainly potentially agree with us, gigantic numbers of people, not only in this country, but around the world. And of course, leftism, as always, is an international movement, and they're active in Europe and everywhere.

So the real libertarians, whether in this country or Latin America, Europe, Asia, we all need to work together, not in the sense of a coordinated, being ordered to do something, but just be inspired by each other. We should learn about what other people are doing, what other people are facing. And we've got a fight on our hands, but when have we not had a fight on our hands? And it's a fight we can win, because the other side is crazy and evil, as well as wrong about everything. So if that's the Tom Woods debate, Tom, I'm going to put my money on you.

WOODS: I appreciate that, Lew, and by the way, your kind words are very meaningful to me, but I mean, really – and I know you're not going to accept this, but frankly I don't care. You've been the leader here. You've taken far more slings and arrows than I have from people who have never read a word you've written, or they read two sentences from 38 years ago or something. Every single day, you're publishing good content, and it's like it doesn't matter to these people. But first of all, let me also add, from your Political Theatre blog – everybody should be reading LewRockwell.com, but particularly the Political Theatre blog that's linked there. I love how instead of – because Antifa means anti-fascist, but you say, "more properly called Procom." It is. It's Procom. We should try and get that into general usage, Procom. But the other thing I just wanted to say before we wrap up is one of my favorite things to watch is when people say, *Oh, you people at the Mises Institute, Mises would be so ashamed. He would never think A, B, or C.* And then you just flip through some of his writings and you show him. You say, *He did believe – here it is.* And they say, "Well – " And then they don't really know quite what to say. They've got their hands on their hips and they're all upset about it. Well, you know, we actually bother to read Mises' books. So anyway.

ROCKWELL: I've had people say that Mises was a feminist.

WOODS: Yeah, I've heard that too.

ROCKWELL: So Mises was not a — or rather Mises was a feminist only in this sense: he says, if by feminism, we mean that a woman has a right to enter business, make contracts, inherit, make any kind of economic activity she's interested in, of course we're for that. It's just part of the great liberal movement. He said, on the other hand, if it means changing sex roles and carrying out what Marx had to say about the family, it's just communist.

WOODS: Yeah, so we leave out that part.

ROCKWELL: Yeah.

WOODS: Anyway, Lew, thanks so much for doing this. See, we went almost an hour, which goes to show it's been too long in between appearances, so I'll try and be better next time. Thanks again for your time.

ROCKWELL: Tom, thank you.