

Transcript for Roger Stone | Everyone Hates Roger Stone (Episode 655)

Full show notes found here: <https://theartofcharm.com/655/>

ROGER: People have aspirations but people also have dislikes and that is not going to change. It's how people are made up.

JORDAN: Welcome to The Art of Charm. I'm Jordan Harbinger. On this episode we're talking Roger Stone. Stone served as an advisor to the 2016 presidential campaign of Donald Trump. He's also been banned from appearing on CNN and MSNBC, so I figured we could bring him here for a conversation because I want to hear about Stone's Rules. These are psychological concepts that have been in play and are currently in play at the highest levels of government, especially when it comes to campaigning. Today, we'll become aware of what these are and see them play out before your eyes in the media now that you can spot them. This is an unapologetic look at the political machine from someone on the inside. I would definitely describe Roger as Machiavellian. The ends always justify the means and his mission appears to be just getting his agenda brought to life.

He's kind of a Batman villain, honestly, in this one. In politics as well. And as he says, "I revel in your hatred because if you didn't hate me it would mean that what I'm doing is not effective." Of course, fittingly, there is a Nixon for Governor poster in the background of his office as we do this show. People are going to cry because I had someone on the show that they may dislike. I don't care, we're not here to debate politics.

So before you warm up your email fingers at the end of this one, we are not here to talk about politics. Lots of people don't like Roger Stone, in fact, Jason we can call this episode, "Everyone hates Roger Stone," if we really want to. But without further ado, here is Mr. Roger Stone, just days before he testifies in front of the House Intelligence Committee. Enjoy.

Roger, you describe yourself as an agent provocateur. Let's define that. I think a lot of people probably don't know what

that is. They just say it's French and then it goes over their head.

ROGER: Yeah, in politics -- really in life -- there are two kinds of people. There are men of action then there are men of thought. Revolution requires both. You need thinkers but you also need doers. Sometimes the thinkers can't get out of their own way. Sometimes the doers aren't sure what they should be doing. But I would still put myself in the former category. In other words, being a successful political strategist revolves around understanding the ideas and themes that motivate people to do things, i.e. vote or show up at a rally or whatever action you're asking them to take, write your U.S. senator -- And therefore understanding how to motivate people for your political cause is what I do. A number of people pointed out to me that agent provocateur implies the sales of false information. I'm not sure I completely agree with that. I understand the role of political rhetoric in politics.

The next question always is, "But do you tell the truth?" Well, George H. W. Bush said, "Read my lips. No new taxes." Was he telling the truth? Barack Obama said, "If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep your health care plan. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor." Was he telling the truth? I would argue at the time those gentlemen said those things, they believed them. They believed they were the truth, they just didn't turn out to be the truth. The good news is, caveat emptor for the consumer, for the voter. The great thing about alternative media, the great thing about shows like this is, people can watch them and then make up their own mind about what they believe and what motivates them or does not motivate them.

JORDAN: So believing something is the truth at the time you say it, this is obviously distinctly different than -- Let's say your first foray into politics and disinformation back in elementary school. Can you tell us about that? That, I thought was hilarious.

ROGER: Well I come from a non political family. My parents never had any particular interest or involvement in politics. They were good citizens and they voted. And because my grandparents had been fairly strong Republicans, my parents tended to be Republican but with some kind of an independent bent. For example, in 1960 I know that my mother voted for John Kennedy over Richard Nixon because we were also devout Catholics and my parents felt strongly the idea of our first Catholic president was a good idea. I was in the first grade. The elementary school that I attended was in a fairly upper middle class suburb of New York City -- a Republican stronghold-- and the school scheduled a mock election in order to teach kids about democracy and the American election system. I favored John Kennedy over Richard Nixon quite simply because Jack Kennedy had better hair. It was kind of the depth of my political knowledge at the time. But I was a pretty ardent Kennedy supporter. I was wearing Kennedy buttons and so on. So I went to the school cafeteria on the day before the vote and I waited in line, and as each kid would come down with his tray of food, I would say, "By the way, you know if Nixon is elected, we're going to have school on Saturdays." Well this word spread exponentially and lo and behold, within the first grade Jack Kennedy scored an upset victory over Richard Nixon among those voters. That was, as I said, my first experience with the concept of disinformation. And of course I have never used it again since.

JORDAN: You mentioned the word non sophisticates in the documentary as well, and I thought that was a really interesting word that describes a lot of the people that I certainly grew up with and that I speak to about topics like these as well.

ROGER: Well first of all, not enough people vote. That's a problem in a nutshell. People complain, people are unhappy about all kinds of things, then when the day comes around when they might actually do something about it, they don't show up. I don't really understand that. Not only the elections but the primaries and the party sub primaries and so on.

There are two different kinds of voters. There are those voters who tend to be party primary voters in both parties who are intensely plugged into the debate, who know the candidates, know the issues, have strong opinions, and they have regular tendency to show up. Presidential elections tend to bring out a larger number of casual voters. These are voters who don't vote in state or local elections because they couldn't be bothered, feel some civic pressure to vote in a presidential election because it gets so much publicity and coverage, and they tend to make their decision late. They tend to be undecided, sometimes right up until the time they go to the ballot box. There are many of such voters in a presidential year. And they can have a definite impact on the turnout. So, those casual voters also tend to be less educated -- not in terms of their overall education but less educated on the issues -- but it's still an important and nonsignificant subset of the voting electorate.

JORDAN: And is it important then to appeal to those people's casual-ness in terms of the fact that they're going to be voting based on a lot of that, as you'd mentioned, non-sophisticated issues or lack of understanding or basic understanding of some of the issues.

ROGER: See, I'm not sure that the average person or even sophisticates in our society understand the role of the political consultant and the role of the political strategist and how these things work. We don't guess about anything. Every successful campaign begins with a benchmark survey -- a poll of voters -- with a very large sample, so that the subsamples within your poll are large enough to be meaningful. And you put a very substantial amount of time into crafting your questionnaire. They tend to run as long as 20 minutes. You may have to call 10,000 people to complete that project. Maybe 20,000.

Voters, easily bored, they get half way through the questionnaire and they say, "Oh, I've got to go shopping for groceries. Bye," and they hang up. That doesn't do you any good. That instrument, that initial benchmark survey, which is not designed to tell you who's ahead and who's behind -- that's kind of the least important number in the poll. Oh, is Clinton leading

Trump; is Trump leading Clinton," or whatever. That's the least important number.

What you are looking for is themes and ideas when introduced within the laboratory have the tendency to move voters from undecided to your candidate or from the opposition candidate to your candidate or from the opposition candidate to undecided, and you try to be as creative as you can in terms of depicting in a motivational way, as many issues as you can think of to try to find those two or three hot button issues that motivate people, that change their minds, that move them from one place in the electorate to another place. So, to go back to your question, the causal voter is taken into consideration because one of the things the poll is supposed to do is to help you decide who's actually going to show up and vote.

Primary voters, both Republican and Democrat, almost always have a greater tendency to vote, a greater intensity, greater knowledge of the issues, greater interest in the overall question. You generally can project with some certainty who's going to vote. General election voting is an entirely different thing. One of the great mistakes of Hillary Clinton's campaign, was an assumption that the makeup of the electorate would be identical as it was in 2012, that the same people who turned out to elect Barack Obama over John McCain would be coming out for this election. And if you step back from that, you realize that was never likely.

Barack Obama is an iconic historic figure among people of color, among African Americans. Hillary Clinton was never going to get the same turn out nor the same percentage of those voters as Barack Obama. She would win among them but she was never going to duplicate exactly what he got. Rural areas turned out for Trump in a way that they did not for Romney and that was in many cases not taken into consideration. So it's not that the polls were wrong when they showed that Hillary was going to run, it's that their sample was wrong. They reached the wrong conclusion.

JORDAN: It seems like you saw that coming because you have such a zoomed out timeline. You've been doing and thinking about this since you were a kid. I read a story about how you built all these alliances and put all of the serious challengers for your senior year of high school presidency on your ticket. All the people who might take your seat are on your ticket and then you recruited, somehow, the most unpopular guy in school to run against you, which was super sharp and brilliant in a way that -- Some people might think that it's mean. That we can leave up to people to decide. But, even further, when you were the junior and you were a vice president of that same student government, you actually manipulated the ouster of the president and succeeded him in that. So, it's almost like House of Cards -- Either they're asking you questions about your stories or they're reading all your books. I don't know which one it is. It seems remarkably similar and you can't really make that stuff up.

ROGER: Politics is about addition not subtraction. Everybody in politics, by and large, is looking for something for themselves. Just because they can't be the candidate for president, maybe they can be the candidate for vice president or maybe they can be the candidate for secretary or treasurer, or maybe they can be the new chairperson of the party or maybe they can be the campaign spokesman since what they really like is to read their name in the newspaper. I really think that one of the first steps is to look at others who aspire to the office that you aspire to and determine how they can be co opted and how they can become beneficial to you.

JORDAN: So you've got these Stone's Rules that you live by, you advise your clients to live by I assume, and I'd like to get through some of those because I think that's where the psychology of what we're dealing with is laid out here. How did you come up with Stone's Rules? Where did these originate?

ROGER: Over the years I would just come up with observations or statements that have generally speaking, held me in good stead. And I would just kind of say them as a rhetorical advice.

If you hang out with me for three days, you're going to hear them. I just kind of spit them out. If you're wearing a white suit, don't order the spaghetti.

JORDAN: Okay.

ROGER: A lot of them are common sense based. Not all of them, obviously, are political. They're rules of combat. They're kind of like Sun Tzu, they can be applied to a career in business or advertising or marketing or politics, and then there's just general rules, what I call style rules that are uniquely mine.

JORDAN: One of them that stuck out to me was, "It's better to be infamous than never famous at all." That sort of dovetailed into this question about so called dirty tricks and things like that. And you have a great quote from this which was, "Look, politics ain't beanbag and losers don't legislate." Does that mean that it's in theory okay to use pretty much anything, no matter how dirty, as long as it'll get to victory? Of course as long as it's not illegal.

ROGER: No I think that it is the legality that is the bright line. That's the line you do not cross. But it would be unrealistic to think that our American politics is some uplifting civic experience. One of our presidents was accused of being a crossdresser. Abraham Lincoln was accused of fathering multiracial children. Grover Cleveland was ridiculed for having an illegitimate daughter while in the White House. This list goes on and on.

It is -- I'm reminded of that rock song Dirty Laundry. People like the prurient. They like the rough and tumble. They like the interesting. Put it another way. Run for office, release a 50 page white paper on the environment. See how many people read it and how much press coverage it gets. None. So the same voters who tell you, "We're interested in issues. We're not interested in these personal attacks." Well, they absorb all the personal attacks because combat is like a prize fight, it's fun. It's a contact sport. Always has been, always will be.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

JORDAN: You seem to be quite fine with a lot of folks saying, "Oh, that Roger Stone, he's a dirty trickster. He's got all kinds of things up his sleeve." You have no problem with that from the look of it.

ROGER: Well, one man's dirty trickster is another man's freedom fighter. One man's dirty trick is another man's civic participation. Everything is via the eye of the beholder.

JORDAN: The only thing, of course, worse than being talked about negatively is not being talked about at all in that case because the power comes from being talked about, whether it's good or bad, right?

ROGER: Well I think that all publicity is good publicity. Controversy breeds opportunity. I admit that my approach to politics is controversial but in truth, dirty tricks -- Appellations aside -- I have practiced my craft within the rules of the way it is practiced at the time. So there is a norm. If your strategy involves tactics or activities that cross a line in the voter's mind of fair play, you're going to do more damage than you are good.

JORDAN: One of my favorite characterizations of you, you have the, "Sinister Forest Gump of U.S. politics," and I think what they mean by that is wherever there's intrigue, you seem to be there. You had this minor role, if you will, in Watergate at age 19, all the way up until now where it's been that it was your idea for Trump to run for president and you've been bugging him for 30 years to do so. Is that true?

ROGER: I'm just like a bad penny, I just keep popping up.

JORDAN: Well this dovetails nicely into the past is prologue. This is diving into the value of disinformation, the mock election with Kennedy's hair, your obsession with Goldwater early on. Let's take a little detour on that one.

ROGER: Others far more learned than me I think, said, "Those who do not study the past are determined to repeat it." I think studying

political history, studying the presidential campaigns of the past, studying successful elections even in the modern age, is an invaluable tool to understanding how things will work in the future. That said, there's a tremendous tendency by some political consultants, some political strategists who try to relive their last race when the situation and dynamics of their last race is not the same as the race that's before them. In other words, the same cookie cutter campaign does not work twice because you never have the same socioeconomic aspects of the district, the same media influences -- Every campaign is entirely different.

JORDAN: The Nixon tattoo on your back -- You've got to be a member of a single digit number of people that have a giant Nixon face tattooed on their back.

ROGER: I think the only person on the face of the country that has a dick on the front and the back.

JORDAN: Probably.

ROGER: This is easily explained and it's not even an ideological or a political thing. I wrote Nixon a letter telling him if he ran again that I was in, that he could count on me -- I went to New York City for an interview, they found that I was quite a bit younger than they expected but I got a job as a gopher driver. Fast forward to many years, I was in Venice Beach California, and I decided to get a tattoo of Richard Nixon on my back. It's about the size of a grapefruit kind of halfway between my shoulder blades. What it is for me is a daily reminder that in life when you get knocked down, when you're defeated, when something you're really counting on doesn't come through, when you strive but you fail, when you're ready to give up, well that's the time to get yourself up off the canvas to dust yourself off and get back in the game. The story of Nixon is a story of resilience. It's a story of persistence.

JORDAN: Back to Stone's Rules. Attack, attack, attack, and never defend is something we're seeing a lot in the current landscape if you

will. This is negative publicity in massive doses to win elections. The NCPAC ads, Super PACs and things like that -- Where is this, "Attack, attack, attack never defend," from? Is this something you use in every area of your life or is this very specifically political?

ROGER: "Attack, attack, attack," of course, is borrowed from Winston Churchill. The point of this is in politics, you never win on defense, you only win on offense. That's why the current Russian collusion delusion, as I like to call, is taking its toll on the Trump White House, because they have been consistently on defense. Yeah, I understand that 17 intelligence agencies like Pavlovian dogs repeat over and over again, "It is our assessment that the Russians interfered in the election."

Well first of all, there's a tip off. Any time they use the word assessment, they're lying. Assessment means, "We don't know. Here's what we'd like you to think." Or, assessment means, "It is our guess that this is what's happening." Instead of spending your time defending and denying, I don't understand why all of those national security figures involved in this illegal surveillance have not been brought before a grand jury to explain what they know and when they know it. Or on the Russian question, all we have is assertion, allegation, rumor, and claim. Still no proof.

JORDAN: Now you've got the attack part down pretty well. Some of your books slam the Clinton family, some slam the Bush family, so you're at least an equal opportunity character assassin when it comes to that. This works. I mean, Ted Cruz stated, "I would note that Mr. Stone is a man who has 50 years of dirty tricks behind him. He's a man for whom a term was coined for copulating with a rodent." Is Ted Cruz trying to call you a rat***** without saying rat*****? What is his deal? He's got it out for you.

ROGER: Well, I mean Ted Cruz is phony from day one. I find the illegal loans that he took to finance his U.S. Senate campaign from Goldman Sachs, loans that he did not report as required by law,

give you some idea of his operating style. In fact, the Appellation "rat*****" does not apply to me and had nothing to do with me. It's a term that was developed in the southern California fraternity politics as practiced by Bob Haldeman, and Dwight Chapin and others who are much older than I was in the Nixon entourage.

They tend to be sophomoric, meaning if your idea of a dirty trick is ordering 30 pizzas and sending them to the Democratic headquarters, what would be the point of that? To aggravate the Democrats? You didn't move any votes. You didn't do anything that changed any votes. That's harassment. That's stupidity. I don't understand the point of that but they thought that kind of stuff was hysterical. I thought it was a waste of time.

JORDAN: Right, this is all about the Machiavellian, "Get it done. Better to be feared than loved." I did that in middle school. I actually pulled that similar stunt, ordered pizzas to the school. Again, falls in line with one of Stone's Rules, which is, "Business is business." You've represented some pretty shady governments, Somalia, Zaire -- In Washington they call it, "The Torturers Lobby." What do you say when people say, "Hey man, what's the deal with the Torturers Lobby? Why do something like that? Why is that necessary? Is that not over the top?"

ROGER: During the time of Black, Manafort, and Stone, we represented governments and movements that were pro-western, pro the United States. We represented the Angolan Freedom Fighters. There were liberals in the United States who were opposed to the resistance in Angola. These are very sharply partisan divided questions but the Reagan administration, the Reagan State Department, the Reagan Defense Department, was providing aide to the Angolan rebels. I never worked for any country or any political movement that was antithetical to the United States, ever.

JORDAN: Yeah, it's hard to criticize that. I struggled with that when I was researching you and prepping for this interview, which is -- A lot of people say, "Wow, he represented Somalia and Zaire and

UNITA and all this stuff," and I thought, "Well, yeah, that is something where a lot of people might say, 'I'm not doing that,' but on the other hand, there were U.S. weapons and consulting and money going to some of these groups. It's not like they weren't allowed into the United States. It wasn't like we weren't connected with them in some other way." It is kind of a touchy subject because it's really hard to say, "Shame on you," and then say, "Well if our government does it then it's different." It really is tough to make that moral decision in some way.

ROGER: Well I also think if you went back and looked at those individual governments that were represented by Black, Manafort, and Stone, in many cases the same time they were represented by a Democratic based firm, and we worked together because policy is bipartisan. In other words, you have Democrats in the decision making process in Washington who you must also influence in their thinking to get the assistance or focus on the problems that your client has. Lobbying is very much a bipartisan endeavor, the only difference is that the party in power usually takes the lead. But look, the Saudis I think have 40 different lobbyists, Republican and Democrat. Is that stupid? No, that's smart.

JORDAN: You play the game as the rules are written is something that you'd mentioned in Get Me Roger Stone on Netflix. So when they change the rules, you change the way the game is played. So essentially, as long as you're within the rules of the game, all is fair. So wouldn't it then make sense within the current rules, which may allow for this type of play as you put it, make it harder to change those rules so that everything you do is above board? In other words, if some of this stuff is considered dirty tricks but it's still within the rules, isn't it also within the rules to change the rules and make sure that the so called dirty play continues to happen? Or do you think that it's better to clean it up and make sure that you can't do this type of thing, you can't do as much Machiavellian maneuvering inside the government?

ROGER:

See, I think the U.S. constitution is what allows it. It's very hard to change the constitution. The constitution guarantees us free speech, it guarantees us free assembly, it guarantees us free expression. The other thing that will not change is human nature. Human nature does not change. People have aspirations but people also have dislikes and that is not going to change. It's how people are made up. You can change the campaign finance laws but as we have learned the hard way, whenever you change them the system will find some legal way to circumvent those changes. Order always seeks its own level. In 1974, as a reaction to the excesses of Watergate, the rules became much tighter, anonymous money became impossible to move around, limits were put on how much money could be donated, prohibitions later blown off by the courts were put on corporations who were excluded from politics, money from foreign nationals was made illegal, but everybody played under the new rules.

Well, under the new rules, you also had disparities. In other words, if you wanted to run for the U.S. Senate, you had to finance your campaign -- let's say it's 1975 -- by going out and finding as many \$1000 contributions from U.S. citizens as you possibly good. Unless you were John Heinz or some millionaire, in which case, perfectly okay for you to write a \$10 million to yourself to run for the Senate. How is that fair? Why would Mr. Heinz not be limited to the same \$1000 limit as any other candidate?

And it gave rise to a number of millionaire candidates, John Warner, Herb Cole, Howard Metzenbaum -- These guys purchased U.S. Senate seats for themselves in a way that the average citizen could not. Citizens United would ultimately change all of that. A wealthy person can still put as much money in his campaign as he wants, individual contributions to a campaign are still limited, but at least the Super PAC now exists so that if someone wants to make an unlimited contribution, candidate X in order to even the playing field, they can do so.

JORDAN: Do you see playing at a certain, let's call it moral level as a synonym in some way for weakness or are the morals completely dictated by the laws and the rules themselves?

ROGER: Do I look like a Catholic priest to you?

JORDAN: Not with that shirt.

ROGER: Politics is about winning. And you do whatever it takes to win within the bounds of the law. If you are, as I am, accused of being over the top or being outrageous or being controversial, in our fast moving society, with thousands of cable TV channels, with hundreds of talk radio stations, with millions of websites, you have to be provocative, you have to be interesting to get anybody's attention. The only thing worse in politics than being wrong, is being boring. And when you bore the voters, they start looking elsewhere for a candidacy that is not boring.

JORDAN: Do you ever feel like you go over the top with it at all?

ROGER: No.

JORDAN: I'll take that.

ROGER: There's a lot of things you could do that would be provocative but would backfire, that would hurt you. I do think it takes some judgement. Something that Bill Clinton once told me about his friend Dick Morris, he says, "Yep, Dick's brilliant. This guy will come up with 10 brilliant ideas, 9 of them would blow you up immediately if you tried them, 1 actually genius." I think that kind of sums it up. Not every strategy that you concoct on paper or in the laboratory of polling will work in reality but losers don't legislate. You'll have no impact whatsoever on the tides of history if you don't win public office, if you lose. Being known as a good loser is still being known as a loser.

JORDAN: Doing anything to win, the ends justify the means within the bounds of the law, do you think there's any fundamental limits to that or is the limit what is legal and what is illegal?

ROGER: Well no, I think it's self limited because there is such thing as taste and that has to be taken into consideration. You have to introduce information to voters in a way that is palatable. I'm pro-life at this point. I do not think going to a public building and holding up photos of bloody fetuses helps the pro-life movement. I think it's counter productive. It doesn't mean that I don't understand the frustration and anger of the person holding the sign but I think there are better ways to achieve their goal, that's all I'm saying.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

JORDAN: You had a scandal a few years back. Did that scandal in some ways help create who you are today? Did that cause you to reinvent yourself into the Roger Stone that we see today instead of maybe some other goal that you had had at the time?

ROGER: I don't think so. You see, there's this assumption that if you're a conservative, that you must be some kind of an evangelical Christian moral majority Republican. I never thought that social issues was the way to build either the Republican party or the conservative movement because within the movement, social issues divide us, they don't unite us. What does unite us? Economic issues, less spending, a muscular national defense. If you look at polling, those are things that all Republicans -- more libertarian Republicans, more social issue Republicans -- can agree on. I have always been for gay marriage. It is now the law of the land.

The legalization of marijuana -- I'm involved with the United States Cannabis Coalition -- coalition of Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives -- and we seek to hope to persuade President Trump to stick to his pledge to allow the states to decide whether marijuana should be legal in some form in their states. Twenty-nine states, as you probably know, have taken this position. This is creating hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars in state revenue. It's probably balancing

the budgets in Colorado and California. Millions of people are counting on this for their medicine.

I think many voters took President Trump at his word. Now comes along Jeff Sessions, the attorney general, who seems to be planning a 1960s Reefer Madness style crackdown on people who are dispensing or utilizing marijuana for medical reasons as approved by the states. This is an enormous mistake in my opinion. I have always had that position. If you want to criticize my candidates lifestyle, well I guess that's your right, but my view is my life is nobody's business because I'm not seeking your approval as someone running for political office.

JORDAN: So, look, you're going to lose respect for me if I don't ask but, you testify in less than a week, what is going through your head about that? Are you going to be applying Stone's Rules to the testimony in front of the Senate?

ROGER: Well, I'm going to disappoint you here a little bit. We learned only days ago that my testimony before the -- It's actually the House Intelligence Committee, has been postponed until after the recess and will be rescheduled, as they put it, "Sometime in September." I'm very anxious to testify. A number of the members of the committee have made allegations against me in a public hearing which are flatly, demonstrably, provably not true. So for example, a congresswoman Speier says "Stone is on the Kremlin payroll, we know that." That's just not true. That's defamatory. That's a lie.

I never had any Russian client whatsoever, I've never been to Russia, I've never worked for any Russian enemy government or private, don't have any Russian friends that I know of, had no contact with Russians in the runup to this campaign. Now, unfortunately, although there are some loopholes, a member of congress can tell any lie they want about an American citizen, and by and large they're protected from lawsuit. There are exceptions to that as some members may find.

All I seek to do is to go before the committee in a public setting, since they smeared me in a public setting, I think it's only fair, it's only American that I should be able to respond in a public setting and read back actual words of these members, whether they were in the hearing on committee or on CNN and then addressed them on an individual basis. I also hope to clear up a number of the questions regarding John Podesta's emails being hacked.

No I had no advanced notice of that. No I never said I did, and no you have no evidence whatsoever to the contrary. So you can repeat, "Stone knew in advance, Stone knew in advance." Just because you say it does not make it true. Or the idea that I was somehow coordinating with Julian Assange on his release of data on Hillary. I reported it. That does not mean that I learned it directly from Assange and it does not mean that I was privied to a secret. It had already been tweeted for the world to see. They seem to have some fairy tale delusion that the hacking of the DNC by the Russians -- they can't prove that -- or by Guccifer 2.0 was done via a conspiracy that involved me. The problem with that is my one and only limited exchange with Guccifer 2.0 on Twitter comes almost six weeks after WikiLeaks has already published the controversial material. Therefore, for us to have conspired, I would have required a time machine. Not possible. Even Vladimir Putin has not yet perfected the time machine.

The sequence of events when laid out, Congressman Schiff has conflated a number of things that happened to create a false impression in his testimony, I think will demonstrate that there was no collusion with the Russians to help President Donald Trump get elected, at least not by Roger Stone.

JORDAN:

Do you think that the disinformation, as you say, or the misinformation that those people -- Schiff etcetera -- are using against you, is that fair? Given that they more or less follow Stone's Rules.

ROGER: Well, if they don't mind being corrected they're welcome to say whatever they want. I'm going to give them the benefit of the doubt. I'm going to assume in some cases that they're just mistaken, that they have been given information by their staffs which is incorrect and they go out there and repeat it. I'm going to try to believe that they are people of goodwill who have made an honest mistake. Others are just ambitious glad-handing politicians willing to say anything to try to get to the next step, the U.S. Senate. Therefore I was disappointed that they want to have this hearing behind closed doors, that they will not make a transcript immediately available -- It will become available at some time but they won't give you a copy of the transcript, you've got to go to Washington while they'll let you look at it.

If I were a member of the working press instead of just a syndicated columnist doing a syndicated radio show with a weekly show on InfoWars, I would be pretty angry about that. It just seems to me that the answer should have the same circulation as the accusations. That's only fair.

JORDAN: Why are you not working with the Trump campaign anymore? Of course, you mentioned that you quit, of course Trump says otherwise. What happened there?

ROGER: I did resign from the Trump campaign because two things became clear to me. Donald Trump is his own best strategist. Donald Trump had a vision for this campaign that was a nonconventional vision. Donald Trump's campaign was a campaign without polling. We talked about the importance of polling in the beginning of the interview. It's the roadmap of how you get elected. Donald Trump never spent any money in his campaign for the nomination on polling. Donald Trump did not use massive doses of paid broadcast television. That's a staple in our modern political campaigns.

Donald Trump believed that he could essentially compete with these massive doses of paid advertising being put forward by Jeb Bush and Ted Cruz and others through saturation of the

free media by totally dominating the cable networks through his very well crafted rallies and through as many interviews as he could possibly jam into a day. I was a skeptic that that would work, he was right, I was wrong. Just because I resigned from the payroll of his campaign -- By the way, at least four journalists, one with the New York Times, one with Politico, saw my resignation letter the evening before I submitted it. I wasn't born yesterday either -- I determined that I could be more effective on the outside as a veteran then of nine presidential campaigns and with very strong ideas of my own about how this election could be won, I thought that my book Clinton's War on Women, which was to be published shortly was the definitive opo dump (ph) that anyone would need to wage a campaign against Hillary.

I know from a number of things that he said in public that candidate Trump read it and that candidate Trump utilized it. I never at any time suspended or halted my support for Donald Trump. The day I resigned I was advocating his candidacy on CNN. I gave literally hundreds of surrogate speeches talking about why I thought and think he could end up being a transformative president. He could end up being one of our greatest presidents. Just his independence from the two party duopoly that has run the country into the ground, his feisty nature, his natural skepticism, his courage, all those things add up to the potential for him to be a very great president. That's why I'm still 100 percent for him and it's why I'm happy to go out and do battle with his critics and enemies every day.

JORDAN: What incentive does he have then to say, "Oh, I fired Roger Stone?" I didn't understand that. If you resigned why not just say, "Hey, he doesn't work here with me anymore, but it's okay?"

ROGER: Because no one ever leaves Donald Trump, he leaves you.

JORDAN: Got it, okay.

ROGER: It's meaningless. I still have great affection for Donald Trump. He went to my wedding, I went to two of his. I was there for the

wake and funeral of both his parents and for his brother in law John Barry who was a very fine lawyer and an active Republican. I have the highest possible regard for his sister Maryanne Trump Barry, who Ronald Reagan appointed to the federal bench and Bill Clinton elevated on the federal bench. She is an extraordinary woman, a great federal judge, a good friend, and I'm proud of whatever small role I played in getting the Reagan administration to recognize her talents and appoint her to the judiciary.

JORDAN: When you look at the lobbying, when you look at the influence, and when you look at the Stone's Rules in action -- you know the modern day Machiavellian's principles at work -- do you think this is good for politics, do you think it's good for America, or do you just think it's good for the person who is executing and pulling these things off?

ROGER: If you want to win elections then you should go and purchase a copy of my upcoming book Stone's Rules. I think you will find them handy. The problem with politics is it looks easy from the outside. Political campaigns operated on the basis of scientific research that helps you determine what to emphasize and what to de-emphasize in your campaign, it helps you become well known to the voters in a way that enhances your position and your chances of getting elected. There is no one kind of text that tells you exactly what to do but you better read Machiavelli's The Prince, you better reading David Ogilvy's Confessions of an Advertising Man, and you better read Stone's Rules if you want to know how to get elected in America today.

JORDAN: Roger Stone, thank you so much. Is there anything I haven't asked you that you're like, "I want to get this in real quick?"

ROGER: Well you didn't ask me who made this shirt.

JORDAN: Who made that shirt, Roger?

ROGER: I have no idea. No, this is actually something I've had for many years. As you know, I'm a little bit of a clothes horse. I have a

men's style blog called [Stone on Style](#) which doesn't get as updated as often as it should, but if you're interested -- And it's funny, as I travel, a lot of younger men ask me questions about how to build a wardrobe and I'm always willing to give sartorial advice. Recognizing that the average person doesn't need to dress exactly like me to be well dressed, you want to cultivate your own style. I have and I think every young man should.

JORDAN: Roger Stone, thank you so much. Really appreciate your time.

ROGER: Delighted to be here.

JORDAN: Big thank you to Roger Stone for coming on and discussing Stone's Rules as well as the style brand. Jason, that just caught me off guard, I'm not going to lie. That was out of left field entirely for me.

JASON: Me too, yeah. But now I know where to go to match my shoes and my shirt.

JORDAN: That's right and more. So his books of course, and the style guide because we've gotta -- will be linked up in the show notes and if you haven't seen Get Me Roger Stone on Netflix, I highly recommend it. It's a really interesting profile of the guy. Get Me Roger Stone is on Netflix. It is not made by him -- so it's kind of this cool semi-adversarial but not really -- relationship between him and the filmmaker, that's what got me interested in talking with Roger Stone in the first place. If you enjoyed this episode or if you just have something to say about it of course, don't forget to thank Roger on Twitter. We'll have that linked in the show notes as well. Tweet at me your number one takeaway from Roger Stone. I am @theartofcharm.

As usual, we'll be replying to your questions and feedback for Roger on Fanmail Friday. Remember, if you're looking for the show notes, you can tap our album art in most mobile podcast players. You can see the show notes right on your phone screen. You can also find the show notes for this episode at theartofcharm.com/podcast, it'll be linked in there.

I want to encourage you to join us in the AoC challenge, theartofcharm.com/challenge or you can text 'AOC' to 38470. The challenge is about improving your networking skills, your connection skills, and your relationship development skills, inspiring those around you to develop a personal and professional relationship with you. It's free, it's a great way to get the ball rolling and get some forward momentum. It is unisex, it is for everyone, there is nobody who can't get some value from this, and we'll also send you our fundamentals Toolbox that I mentioned earlier on the show. That includes some great practical stuff, ready to apply, right out of the box on reading body language, having charismatic nonverbal communication, the science of attraction, negotiation techniques, networking and influence strategies, persuasion tactics, and everything else that we teach here at The Art of Charm. This will make you a better networker, it'll make you a better connector, and a better thinker. That's at theartofcharm.com/challenge or text AoC to 38470.

This episode of AoC was produced by Jason DeFillippo. Jason Sanderson is our audio engineer and editor. Show notes on the website are by Robert Fogarty. Theme music by Little People, transcription by TranscriptionOutsourcing.net -- I'm your host Jordan Harbinger. Go ahead, tell your friends, because the greatest compliment you can give us is a referral to someone else, either in person, or shared on the web. Word of mouth is everything. So share the show with friends, share the show with enemies, stay charming, and leave everything and everyone better than you found them.

