



Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Card of Allowable Opinion

Thomas E. Woods Jr.

[Download now](#)

[Read Online ➔](#)

Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Card of Allowable Opinion

Thomas E. Woods Jr.

Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Card of Allowable Opinion Thomas E. Woods Jr.
WITH A FOREWORD BY RON PAUL

Nothing makes traditional left and right kiss and make up faster than when they're faced with an articulate libertarian. Avert your eyes from this dangerous extremist, citizen! Government is composed of wise public servants who innocently pursue the common good!

In Real Dissent, Tom Woods demolishes some of the toughest critics of libertarianism in his trademark way. In doing so he strays beyond what he calls the index card of allowable opinion, the narrow range within which the media and political classes permit debate to take place in America.

Should 40% or 35% of our income be taxed? That's the kind of debate the New York Times prefers. Should our income be taxed at all? Now that's out of bounds, citizen!

In foreign policy, Americans are permitted to choose between bombing a despised country or starving its people to death. You favor peace? Why, you must be an "extremist"!

On the Federal Reserve, the debate is over which policy the Fed should pursue. But what if the Fed is itself the problem? No answer, because the question isn't raised.

Real Dissent is organized into ten parts:

Part I: War and Propaganda

Part II: Capitalism and Anti-Capitalism

Part III: Libertarianism Attacked, and My Replies

Part IV: Ron Paul and Forbidden Truths

Part V: End the Fed

Part VI: History and Liberty

Part VII: When Libertarians Go Wrong [on people who don't quite get their own philosophy]

Part VIII: Books You May Have Missed

Part IX: Talking Liberty: Selected Tom Woods Show Interviews

Part X: Back to Basics

Afterword: How I Evaded the Gatekeepers of Approved Opinion

The index card of allowable opinion forces Americans into narrow and pointless debates, and closes off discussion of plausible and humane alternatives. For the sake of American liberty, it's time we set that thing on fire.

This book is a match.

PRAISE FOR TOM WOODS:

"During my presidential campaigns, Tom Woods wrote some of the most effective replies to some of my

unkindest critics....

"Real Dissent is great fun to read, but also filled with useful debating points that will come in handy as you make the case for the free society with friends and family. Over the years I have worked together closely with Tom, one of the libertarian movement's brightest and most prolific scholars, and I am delighted to commend his new book to you. You will enjoy it, and profit from it."

Ron Paul, former U.S. Congressman

"The smartest guy in the room."

Judge Andrew P. Napolitano, Senior Judicial Analyst, FOX News

"Tom Woods is one of my dearest allies in the struggle against wrong-headed and dangerous economic policy."

Peter Schiff

"Tom Woods has written some great stuff over the years, and he's contributed to the education of a lot of people, including myself."

David Stockman, director of the Office of Management and Budget, 1981-1985

About the Author

Thomas E. Woods Jr. is a senior fellow of the Ludwig von Mises Institute and host of The Tom Woods Show, a Monday-through-Friday podcast (at TomWoodsRadio.com). He has appeared on CNBC, FOX News, MSNBC, C-SPAN, FOX Business, Bloomberg Television, and many other outlets, and has been a guest on hundreds of radio programs.

Tom is the New York Times bestselling author of 12 books, including Meltdown (on the financial crisis) and The Politically Incorrect Guide to American History.

Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Card of Allowable Opinion Details

Date : Published October 14th 2014 (first published October 9th 2014)

ISBN :

Author : Thomas E. Woods Jr.

Format : Kindle Edition 347 pages

Genre : Politics, History, Nonfiction, Economics



[Download Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Card ...pdf](#)



[Read Online Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Ca ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Card of Allowable Opinion Thomas E. Woods Jr.

From Reader Review Real Dissent: A Libertarian Sets Fire to the Index Card of Allowable Opinion for online ebook

Dave says

This book is an interesting collection of speeches, writings, and interviews that truly does dissent from allowable opinion.

Shane Hawk says

A collection of articles, blog posts, and interviews from Tom Woods partitioned into 54 easily navigable chapters. At around 350~ pages this was an easy read within two days. Woods holds four academic degrees--BA from Harvard, master's, M.Phil, and Ph.D from Columbia. He's written about a dozen books both published through large houses and by himself. His podcast has over 1,000 episodes. He's also appeared on just about every political channel you can think of. He's very well-researched and possesses the "seven C's" of communication needed to be an exceptional communicator. Suffice it to say, Tom Woods is the real deal.

The criticisms and counterarguments to left-wing positions, right-wing positions and the Libertarian movement itself were much appreciated. In my state I've been a registered voter of the "no party affiliation" variety since the age of 18. I've always been a contrarian, instigator type of person. Even with a liberal mind, Woods caught me off guard in a few instances throughout this book which I crave. I love getting knocked on my ass by a new perspective because I reject it immediately, then proceed to mull it over and wring it through my moral/ethical/philosophical lenses. The abundance of historical fact inserted throughout the book kept me going.

One's opinion of Tom Woods and this book are wholly contingent on one's political views. We all know dogmatic partisans and how obdurate they can be when anything challenges their ideology.

Brian says

Thomas Woods does a relatively thorough job of debunking many common beliefs from the "Index Card of Allowable Opinion." It is interesting to see how he links his presentations from various public forums. The book includes transcripts, for example, from his Tom Woods show, and other essays he has published, not to mention references to his other various undertakings. It feels a much like a mosaic of his already published ideas rather than a novel tome.

This is a book for libertarians in the most traditional sense of the word - people who appreciate liberty. Woods as readily debunks Democrat policies as he does Republican. Despite that he openly admits his preference for Ron Paul's presidency over that of Libertarian party, this is a book based on core ideas rather than partisan preferences. It refreshingly avoids the temptation of wading through the minutia of partisan political mistakes.

Why only four stars? It eventually became a chore to finish it. The ideas, while consistent, were predictable after awhile. It may be antithetical to the genre, but more memorable stories and life experiences would make

the ideas more engaging and pleasant to read. Woods includes a 50% discount code for his Liberty Classroom at the end for those who make it all the way through.

Stefan Matias says

As a Libertarian, I really respect Tom Woods' diligence and dedication. 12 books, over 1200 podcast episodes, frequent lectures, etc. In this book, he puts together a variety of his texts and interviews over the years according to its themes. He outlines his stances and how they stray from the so-called "index card of allowable opinion". Such stances are anti-war, anti-state, pro-market, nullification (on what it means and his answers to objections can be found here: <https://www.libertyclassroom.com/obje...>), and others.

I learned quite a bit from this book:

- The Spanish-American war of 1898 where America took over Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and that the Anti-Imperialist League was formed because of that war. Mark Twain was among the latter's most notable members and was the vice-president of the league from 1901-1910. (I could even bring this topic up in class as we have about the imperialist era in history class these days.)
- Important court cases like *McMullock v. Maryland* (1819), where John Marshall declared that the "Necessary and Proper" clause gives the federal government "implied powers" not directly enumerated by the Constitution. Also, *Cooper v. Aaron* (1958), where it was declared that Supreme Court precedents have the same significance as the Constitution and that states are not only obliged to follow the laws stated in the Constitution but whichever the Supreme Court implements.

There's also a lot of other things to learn from the book, but those were some of the main takeaways for me, as well as further motivation to keep self-educating and figuring out how the world and its history works, whether that knowledge is the same or contrary to what many of my contemporaries believe.

Brad Harris says

this book was very thought-provoking informative about many subjects that I felt I already knew about as well as ones that interest me greatly. dr. Tom Woods does a wonderful job at assembling the information into bite-size chapters that are thorough in their information yet digestible and their length. the variety of topics is wide although I wish it were a little bit wider. I'm already a fan of Tom Woods and I know that I already like his writing style in his opinion but this book especially shows his fiery character which I admire so much it is actually quite funny while at the same time not diminishing the effectiveness of the arguments or lessons. I've been listening to his podcast for quite a while and in fact just watched his Thousand episode, and I will certainly continue to read more Tom Woods.

Stephen Ferguson says

A great primer on Libertarian issues.

Enjoyed the book very much. Informed me of where to look for more information on this important topic. We are also now looking into Ron Paul Homeschool. Thanks so much for the book!

Jeremy says

Quotes:

Among the worst aspects of the collapse of traditional conservatism is that my children will grow up in a world in which vulgar and belligerent nationalism will be presented to them as the alternative to leftism.

To the extent that the market plays less of a role in society, to the very same extent do arbitrariness and force take its place. If the free interaction of property owners is not permitted to determine the terms on which individuals will interact with each other, the barrel of a gun must do so instead. Then we'll see which system treats everything as "an object to be used."

There is no connection between higher education spending and higher SAT scores. In fact, some of the highest scores are earned in states that spend the least on education. Washington, D.C., which spends the most, is dead last.

In fact we don't need Hillary Clinton or John Edwards, Rudy Giuliani or John McCain, to "run the country" (to use an infelicitous if unfortunately common phrase) or to make us prosperous. A free and responsible people can manage its affairs without the platitudes and paternal custodianship of a Great Leader, and exhibits no superstitious reverence toward the occupants of political office.

Opponents of laissez faire have spooked public opinion with a combination of bad history and worse theory. The average person, although in possession of few if any hard facts in support of his unease at the prospect of laissez faire, is nevertheless sure that such a dreadful state of affairs must be avoided, and that our selfless public servants must protect us against the anti-social behavior of the incorrigible predators in the private sector.

Merchant law developed in medieval Europe without the involvement of the state. This is particularly remarkable given that it sought to provide dispute resolution and basic legal standards across a wide territorial expanse that included peoples who spoke different languages and practiced different customs

The ratifying conventions, according to James Madison, are where we look for our understanding of the Constitution. Even before the Tenth Amendment codified the principle, we find one ratifying convention after another saying that the federal government would have only the powers "expressly delegated" to it. This was the basis on which the Constitution was ratified. At Virginia's ratifying convention, skeptics of the Constitution were even told that if the federal government took one step beyond the expressly delegated powers to impose "any supplementary condition" upon the states, Virginia would be "exonerated."

Depositor losses amounted to only 0.1 percent of GDP during the Panic of 1893, which was the worst of them all with respect to bank failures and depositor losses. By contrast, in just the past 30 years of the central-bank era, the world has seen 20 banking crises that led to depositor losses in excess of 10 percent of

GDP. Half of those saw losses in excess of 20 percent of GDP.

If the market is freely allowed to re-price assets, which was the phenomenon we were terrified into not wanting to occur, that doesn't change the amount of physical stuff in existence. The assets themselves may be redistributed to new owners in bankruptcy proceedings, but the world has just as much stuff as it did before. Ownership titles are transferred, and a leaner outfit with more competent leadership moves the economy forward. An important lesson is learned for the future.

The Austrian School argues that manipulation of interest rates causes discoordination across the structure of production, that this disfigured structure is unsustainable, and that the inevitable result is the bust.

Americans are faced with a choice between the Stupid Party and the Evil Party. And that once in a while the two parties get together and do something that's both stupid and evil, and that's called bipartisanship.

Since the Fed was established in 1913 the dollar has lost 95 percent of its value. The Fed has given us more financial bubbles than we can count. When it inflates the money supply it lowers the value of the dollars in Americans' pockets and hurts society's most vulnerable. It redistributes wealth from the middle class and the poor to the politically well connected.

F.A. Hayek won the Nobel Prize in economics for showing how central banks like the Fed create the boom-bust business cycle in our economy. When the central bank manipulates interest rates, it causes massive discoordination. The interest rate is supposed to coordinate production across time, but it can do so only when it reflects an aggregate of voluntary choices, not the whim of the Fed chairman. Entrepreneurs are misled into making investments that make no sense in light of current resource availability. The Fed's intervention starts the economy on an artificial boom that ends in an inevitable bust.

The very existence of the central bank institutionalizes the problem of moral hazard. Moral hazard involves an actor's willingness to behave with an artificially elevated level of risk tolerance because he believes any losses he incurs will be borne by someone else. Since there is no physical limitation on paper money creation, market actors know the paper money producer can bail them out if things go terribly wrong. They have been vindicated in this belief time and again. They will, therefore, be more reckless in their investment activity and speculation than they would in the absence of such a system.

It's sadly amusing to observe progressives functioning as shills for well-connected banks and businesses, but that's precisely what they're doing by mindlessly supporting the Fed and assuming all its critics to be cranks and fools.

The Fed doesn't just benefit the well connected; it also harms those who aren't so well connected. We know inflation hurts people on fixed incomes (since their incomes stay the same while the prices for the goods they buy go up), but what people usually overlook are the distribution effects of inflation. More money in the economy normally means higher prices. But when the government spends billions of dollars created out of thin air (yes, the Fed can do this) on the defense industry, for example, defense firms get the money at the very beginning of this process, before prices have commensurately risen. In effect the economy doesn't yet know how much the money supply has increased, and prices have not yet adjusted accordingly. By the time the new money makes its way through the whole economy, prices will have risen throughout most if not all sectors.

The dollar has lost over 95 percent of its value since the Fed was created. Now had the value of our money declined by 95 percent under the gold standard, the progressive would cite that as evidence against gold.

When the government is responsible for debasing the currency to that extent, on the other hand, the matter is passed over in silence.

Now it's bad enough that the federal government loots rich and poor alike. Much worse is when its victims, too bamboozled by state propaganda to know any better, cheer on the looting, and solemnly warn their fellow citizens about how frightening and perilous life would be without it.

Thomas Jefferson was not unaware of, and did not deny, the Supremacy Clause. His point was that only the Constitution and laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land. Citing the Supremacy Clause merely begs the question. A nullifying state maintains that a given law is not "in pursuance thereof" and therefore that the Supremacy Clause does not apply in the first place.

The Constitution is supposed to establish a federal government of enumerated powers, with the remainder reserved to the states or the people.

The very structure of the system, and the very nature of the federal Union, logically require that the principals to the compact possess a power to examine the constitutionality of federal laws

We are asking under what conditions liberty is more likely to flourish: with a multiplicity of competing jurisdictions, or one giant jurisdiction? There is a strong argument to be made that it was precisely the decentralization of power in Europe that made possible the development of liberty in Western civilization.

Alleged supporters of "diversity" are the ones who most insist on national uniformity.

Local self-government was what the American Revolution was fought over, but we're told this very principle, and the defense mechanisms necessary to preserve it, are unthinkable.

The inhumane system whereby a single city hands down infallible dictates to 310 million people is not a fated existence. Jefferson and others proposed an alternative, one we might wish to revisit in light of how obviously dysfunctional the present system has become.

I'm not entirely sure why the old America is so unpopular, though part of the reason is that few Americans have been allowed to discover it. When they do, many want to recover it.

What emerged from the Philadelphia Convention was a federal government with enumerated powers, not a national government with plenary authority.

Madison took a more honest route. Although he preferred a national government, he acknowledged that such a thing was neither what had been drafted in Philadelphia nor what the people ratified in the conventions that followed. So he defended not what he wished had been ratified, but what had actually been ratified... It was this Virginia understanding of the meaning of ratification that Madison defended in the famous Virginia Resolutions of 1798 and the follow-up Report of 1800, where the states as the parties to the federal compact were said to possess the sovereign right in the last resort to prevent the enforcement of an unconstitutional federal law.

Jefferson was a principal architect of the compact theory of the Union, which conceives of the United States as a collection of self-governing, sovereign communities (the states). (More precisely, it is the peoples of the states who are sovereign; no government is sovereign in the American system.)

When the Constitution was to be ratified, it was ratified by each state separately, not in a single national vote. This simple historical overview establishes a very strong *prima facie* case that the states remained sovereign and were never collapsed into a single whole.

When a conflict arises as to whether a particular power was delegated to the federal government or reserved to the states, the states must be the ultimate judges; they are the proper disputants in such a case. It would be logically backward for the principals to ask their agent whether that agent was intended to have a particular power.

Zero money market rates are the mother's milk of gambling and speculation in the financial markets, and the Fed is massively empowering people to speculate. That's why we get the bubbles. That's why we get the busts. That's why we get the destructive cycle that we're in today.

Those who possess great wealth – especially those who inherited that wealth – may in fact prefer to inhabit a system of intervention, which is more likely to keep existing patterns of wealth frozen. Little wonder that American business magazines during the Progressive Era are replete with calls for replacing *laissez-faire* – a system in which no one's profits are protected – with government-sanctioned cartel and collusion devices.

There is no stable, long-term substitute for the free economy. Interventionism, even on behalf of such an ostensibly good cause as social welfare, creates more problems than it solves, thereby leading to still more intervention until the system is entirely socialized, if the collapse does not occur before then.

With the unfunded liabilities of Social Security and Medicare in excess of twice the GDP of the entire world, this has to end badly.

Discussing state nullification in front of progressives is, unfortunately, like waving a crucifix before Dracula. Despite its horrific persecutions of minorities, its totalitarian revolutions, and even its genocides, they demand we believe the centralized modern state is a wonderful, progressive force.

A single city hands down infallible decrees for 310 million people, and we are to believe this is the most humane form of political arrangement. The old progressive slogan question authority is long, long gone. Practically no conventional belief is ever seriously questioned by progressives.

Mark Geise says

“Real Dissent”, the latest offering by Tom Woods, is a disparate collection of articles, speeches, and transcripts of interviews that Woods has written, given, and conducted over the past ~7 years. Woods, as usual, projects a pure version of libertarianism and is not afraid to disrupt the status quo. His work to publicize the Austrian view of the 2008 financial crisis and nullification is extremely important; he has presented here plenty more information on these topics. What holds this back from getting five stars from me is the lack of cohesion. It is separated into sections, but the sections only do so much to really separate all of this information on different topics from different mediums.

Woods has been extremely prolific in recent years despite not publishing a book since 2011. He has put out his podcast five days a week, worked with his Liberty Classroom for a libertarian adult education, and produced curriculum for the Ron Paul Homeschool Program. Understandably, he has not had the time to produce your typical book on a new topic. What he has done is release a collection of a lot of his recent

work. Some are responses to Twitter critics, some are transcripts of interviews from his podcast, and some are articles he has written. I almost always enjoy what Woods puts out there, so I found it nice to have a lot of this content in one easily digestible volume.

While I appreciate that all of this was made available in one place (and that Woods offered the Kindle version for free!), it also was not your typical work. Woods does not have a thesis that he lays out in the beginning and continually reinforces throughout the book. He did not take time to write nuanced transitions to make the chapter changes more seamless. Like I said, I appreciate the content, but I can see how this would disappoint some readers. Also, Woods's sarcasm can sometimes be a bit much. I keep thinking of his constant allusions to "oh, dear New York Times reporter, sir!" Once you read "Real Dissent", you will know exactly what I'm talking about.

Anything Woods puts out is worth reading, so I recommend "Real Dissent". He is one of the most brilliant libertarian minds out there, specifically from a historical and economic perspective. I am glad to see that his podcast has done so well and I'm excited to watch his other projects progress. I hope he comes out with a unified book sometime soon, but "Real Dissent" will tide me over until then.

Stephen says

In most presidential elections, 2016 being an obvious outlier, Americans are presented with that most exhilarating of choices: a career bureaucrat-politician wearing a red tie, and a career bureaucrat-politician wearing a blue tie. Coke or Pepsi, behold the variety! Tom Woods contends that the range of media-approved opinion available to Americans today is small enough to fit on an index card -- one that should be set fire to. Real Dissent is written as the match. The book collects over a decade's worth of Woods' political debate and writing, organized into categories on war, markets, monetary policy, and other material, chosen with an eye for conversations and opinions that push the envelope -- and addressed to Americans of all political stripes.

Although the political parties gamely put on a show every two years about social issues and spending, in practice little changes regardless of who is in power. Both parties reliably support military excursions abroad, resulting in a state of permanent war and an omnipresent surveillance state. Both are enthusiastic proponents of regulating every facet of American lives, increasing costs and frustration, but despite their track record will still announce themselves champions of the people. The problem goes beyond politics, however, as the traditional media tends to walk hand in hand with DC. The wars which have permanently mired American lives and resources in the middle east were promoted by the media, and views outside the establishment are only mentioned to quickly dismiss so the grey-suited grownups and go back to whether DC should bomb the Iranians or just starve them.

Woods' declared goal in destroying imposed restrictions on thought implies that he isn't merely writing to libertarians. He frequently highlights books that transcend party lines, and gives special place to Bill Kauffman, whose screenplay of *Copperhead* saw a community stressed and destroyed by a feud between two good if disagreeable men. The tragedy of *Copperhead* was born because those men placed ideology above their relationship to one another as neighbors. Woods' section on the Federal Reserve includes many overtures to progressives, as do his writings on the problems of centralization in general. He also attempts to appeal to conservatives' better angels, using the anti-war writings of the traditionalist godfather, Russell Kirk, to offer reproach..

Although the last American election saw two populist candidates challenge and -- in Trump's case, rout -- the establishment candidates, neither of the populist figures is particularly promising for the future of American politics given the short-lived nature of populist movements. Personally, as much as I dislike the establishment, I don't like its present challengers much better. In a culture flooded with toxic politics, the peaceful clarity of libertarianism, rooted in as sensible and humane a conviction as we can ask for -- the golden rule -- would be welcome.

Elijah Thompson says

As someone who has recently developed a desire to learn more about political philosophy, government and economics, there are a handful of libertarian thinkers to choose from.

As a listener of Woods' podcast, I always appreciate his approach to complex issues and hard questions, and this book is exactly what I expected. Answering tough questions and criticisms concisely and effectively, Real Dissent offers a more in depth look at the libertarian political perspective from a philosophical side (discussing things in somewhat abstract, conceptual ways) to the concrete (Woods gives many, many real life examples of what he refers to in the abstract).

I thoroughly enjoyed this book. The only reason I didn't give it 5 stars is because, like many books in the political realm, Woods certainly enjoys lacing fairly persuasive points in rhetoric. I'm simply turned off by rhetoric, especially when it isn't needed.

The libertarian position is strong enough, and a little rhetoric is expected. But, at times, Woods goes a little over the top for me.

That being said, I highly recommend this book for the libertarian who is moderately informed. This book may go over the heads of noobies. Some of it, mostly the narrowly focused historical stuff, went over my head.

Jack says

A truly bad book

I don't know what's so disappointing the content or the writing style. The topic seemed like something worth reading, but I was unable to gain any insight from the book. Read Walter Williams, or Thomas Sowell or almost anyone else. Don't waste your time on this book

AJ says

Tom Woods is a libertarian who is well credentialed and a vehement opponent of both the current political Left and Right. Some good points and economic concepts were offered in this book and even some which I will continue to further entertain and inquire. I admire his efforts rooted in philosophy, economics, and history (which is more to say than many other academic pundits) but this book, in particular, fell short.

Real Dissent is a self-published hodgepodge of interviews, speeches, and rebuttals that seems haphazardly thrown together for the only sake of publishing a book. This is the result of what paperwork is left over in the filing cabinets after the other papers have gone to press. The book lacks overarching substance even between the demarcated chapter-sections and subheadings. And as another reviewer mentioned "Woods sarcasm can be a bit grating at times."

Patrick S. says

As a fan of Tom Woods and his podcast, this is what I would expect from him in a book that gives some brief glances into libertarian/classic liberalism stance with a mixture of Austrian economics for funsies thrown in.

If you've listened to Wood's podcast there won't be anything really new or groundbreaking depending on how far back you've listened. However, having the material written down and able to be referenced alone makes this worth it. The book follows in the footsteps of Ron Paul's "Liberty Defined" with more of a focus on hitting the high points that libertarians tend to hear about the most. Things like how awesome the federal reserve is and how it's a great savior. How the New Deal was the best thing and how government intervention both foreign and domestic is a savior to us all.

The thing I enjoy about Woods is that while he is well read and studied and can talk on a myriad of subjects, his desire to encourage and inform is front and center. And he just doesn't preach to the main choir but encourages introspection from the left and the right. Like Woods, this book is still entertaining while being very informative even on such things as state nullification intended by the ratification conventions in the early days of America. One of my biggest joys with Wood, other than those already listed, is his desire to maintain a consistent worldview foundation without having to rely on name calling, appeal to only emotions, or being unwilling to admit to being wrong and having to shift slightly to where the evidence points.

I would highly recommend this book for anyone looking into libertarianism or really any subject that Tom Woods speaks on. Mr. Woods is a pleasure to read and to listen to and to study from. Final Grade - A-

Patrick says

Fans of the Tom Woods Show podcast would be doing themselves a great disservice by not reading Real Dissent. Reading this book will give you the firepower to combat your neocon acquaintances with the true facts of conservative and libertarian thought.

Emily Domitrovic hamburg says

First, I love everything that Tom Woods is about these days. Namely, the subtitle of this book: Burning up the tiny index card of allowable opinion.

You should never be afraid or lose your curiosity of where the truth may lead you. Tom guides you down that path with this collection of essays that tackle some of the hot topics among libertarians (like auditing/ending the Federal Reserve) as well as ones that may be less familiar (such as nullification).

As a Christian who holds libertarian political views, I especially appreciated the portions of this book where Tom (1) criticizes "pro-life" Christians that mindlessly endorse every ridiculous war and act of aggression around the world that spills so much blood and demonizes other peoples that we are to hate without a second thought because our overlords declared that we must and (sort of indirectly in chapter 42) (2) this popular streak within libertarianism that views being a Christian or holding any form of religious faith as incompatible with libertarianism.

I could see how one could get to the end of this book and go, "Wow, that was random. I think Woods just wanted to get double mileage out of all of this work he has done and so jammed it in a book together." However, that was the fun of this book for me. It was a primer on a lot of issues that gives you a jumping off point for deeper study. And, as he's stated, he wanted to collect all of his work on these big topics and put them in one easy-to-find place so it could be referenced easily to defend these ideas or refer critics to.
