



Episode 1,033: Was Gen. Kelly Right About the Civil War?

Guest: Kevin Gutzman

WOODS: We're a little bit late, but that's my fault not reaching out to you sooner about General Kelly and the so-called Civil War, but even before I knew what he had said, I could tell from the ensuing headlines that he was probably more right than he was wrong, even without knowing a single word he said. It was the usual, this is – In fact, one headline was, "Americans are just done with General Kelly." And I thought, what does that mean? Because he said, what? That maybe a lack of compromise might have led to the war and that Robert E. Lee was a decent guy, which is a view that was shared by at least the past half-dozen presidents or more, so nothing unusual there. And the idea that compromise might have helped avoid the war, well, that's obviously just a matter of opinion, but how could that be so forbidden, absolutely forbidden even to entertain the possibility? So what was your reaction in this?

GUTZMAN: Well –

WOODS: In other words, what was your reaction to the reaction?

GUTZMAN: Well, there seems to have come to be a general consensus among historians that one must say that there was only one cause of the American Civil War, and that one cause was slavery somehow, and if you say that there might have been more than one factor involved in bringing on the war, then somehow you are implying that continuing slavery was a good thing. So if you approve of the result of the war that slavery ceased to exist, you must say that slavery was the only cause of the war. Kelly, of course, in saying that there might have been a compromise that could have avoided the war, falls athwart this and seems to these people to be saying, *Well, if only we could have had a compromise, that would have been preferable to ending slavery.* So this is where he runs against the reigning consensus.

Of course, most of what these people are saying is just nonsensical. It's as if you said to someone, what caused the Iraq War of 2003? Why did the United States invade Iraq? There must be exactly one reason why this happened.

Now, you might adduce that, well, it could be that George W. Bush had a longstanding feeling of enmity towards Saddam Hussein for having tried to assassinate his father. Or it could be that the United States wanted to have some kind of control over Middle Eastern Arabs' oil, direct or indirect. Or it could be that there were neoconservatives in the George W. Bush administration who had planned on removing Saddam Hussein even before George W. Bush took office. Or it could be that George W. Bush had a

messianic religious belief that led him to think that it would be highly desirable from a theological point of view to try to democratize the Middle East and he believed naively that the American military could achieve that. Or it could be that you have any of a number of other motives that you could draw into an explanation why both the president and the Congress, including many prominent Democrats, thought this was a good idea. But no, you have to choose exactly one cause, and if you say there could have been more than one factor that contributed to this decision, then you – I don't know – you are just outside the realm of polite conversation.

WOODS: Now, I get what you're saying, and in fact, I think that's the clearest way to state it, that they're making an argument that does not follow, that simply because you believe one thing, you must believe the other when the second thing does not follow from the first. But maybe if I could try to reconstruct their argument for them, maybe what they're trying to say is that any compromise that might have been on the table would have to have involved the continuation of slavery, and so even to imply that it would have been preferable to have had a compromise means that you are advocating the continuance for at least some amount of time of slavery.

GUTZMAN: [sighs] Well, this assumes that the issue was yes-or-no, binary, "Should we have war or not?" But that's not how anybody understood the situation in the Secession Winter of 1860-61. And of course, even for people who thought there was going to be a war and ought to be a war, yes or no, slavery or no was not the issue.

So for example, Lincoln repeatedly said the tug has to come; the question is whether we have control of the territories. And he thought the issue was secession. That is, he said for over a year after the war started that, if the Southern states would simply capitulate and agree to accept federal authority as it had existed before the war started, that would be the end of it. So how is it that Lee in deciding that he would side with Virginia, which was going to be invaded by the U.S. Army, and try to resist that invasion – how could it be that he, in thinking he was going to do that, thought that he was going to be fighting for and solely for slavery, when, again, Lincoln was making clear that, if only Southern states would agree to come back in his Union, that would be the end of it? So it's very odd to me.

Now, one result of Kelly's statement was that there appeared in *The New York Times* a jointly written op-ed by two prominent historians in which they said, in the words of one of them – actually, it was a column where these two people were interviewed. And one of them, David Blight of Harvard, said, "Well, Lee had his choice. He chose treason." This is an interesting take on what General Kelly was trying to say, that he was saying we should respect Robert E. Lee even though Lee chose treason. I think that this is completely unhistorical.

So today, it's commonly accepted by people in the elite institutions' history departments that it was treason to resist federal authority, come what might. But in Lee's time, this was not how people understood the situation. And that's true even in the North. So for example, when Robert E. Lee was a student at the U.S. Military Academy, where he graduated second in his class, the textbook they used on U.S. government was by a Philadelphian lawyer named William Rawle, and it said that secession was constitutional. So if Lee thought that secession was a constitutional right of Virginia and Virginia had seceded, that meant that Lee was no longer a citizen

of the United States, and therefore, fighting in an army that was defending Virginia against the United States could not have been treason because Lee didn't owe any duty to the United States.

And so I guess what we're supposed to take for granted along with Professor Blight is that whatever might have been the official teaching of the U.S. Military Academy, it was generally known in 1860 and '61 that, if you as a current citizen of the United States or as a citizen of a state that purported to have seceded resisted the United States by force, you were committing treason. And this despite the fact that the official position at least of the U.S. Military Academy was that secession was not treason.

So how can it be that secession was treason? Again, the reasoning seems to be the Civil War led to the end of slavery. That was a capital-G Good capital-T Thing. Therefore, anything that might have impeded that was a capital-B Bad capital-T Thing, and that includes secession, of course. So secession is, as a result of this line of reasoning, unconstitutional, even though the U.S. Military Academy, an organ of the federal government, was teaching everybody who graduated from there that secession was completely within the states' rights. And so Lee might have thought on the basis of what he was taught by the federal government that Virginia had seceded and he no longer had any duty of loyalty to the USA at all.

And again, this is unhistorical. It's just odd that a history professor, two eminent history professors should have been in *The New York Times* saying this, besides the fact that both of them, our mutual friend Phil Magnus instantly found passages in their own books where they had said, well, what happened over the Secession Winter was a failure to find any kind of compromise that might have prevented the war. Both of them said this in writing. So I guess there's just a kind of – On the one hand, there's this political orthodoxy about the Civil War, and on the other hand, there's a prevailing attitude among historians and elite institutions that one must attack every member of the Trump administration at every opportunity, even if it involves not only nonsensical, unhistorical arguments about secession, but also complete and utter repudiation of one's own published work.

WOODS: I've got an episode of this show from way, way, way back I'm going to link to. The show notes page will be TomWoods.com/1033, but I will link to – I think it's Episode 51, if I remember correctly, where I go through the arguments about secession. And really, to me, the most persuasive argument goes back to just the nature of the Union itself, the compact theory of the Union. Secession just follows as night follows day from that. And when we hear these so-called eminent historians talking about this subject, they never, as far as I can see, deign to discuss any of the kinds of points that you and I might raise from there, even though they seem quite salient.

So this sort of thing, where – you're right, you can cite William Rawle. But even beyond that, we have this whole argument for which we have tremendous historical evidence about the nature of the Union as a compact among states, that I think makes the whole thing a home run, and they act as if they are self-evidently correct. All they need to do is hector us.

And so let me ask you this. Historians over the years, if we try to figure out what the consensus among historians is, have changed their minds, I think, on the war. Like I'm pretty sure that, decades ago, you would find the consensus saying something like: the war came because people on both sides blundered into it. The politicians blundered into the war. Which strongly implies that if wiser political decisions had been made, there would have been no war, which at least makes it somewhat plausible to suggest that, if some compromise could have been worked out, there would have been no war. So is it the case then that critics of Kelly are really just being critics of an entire school of historical thought that they now pretend never existed?

GUTZMAN: Well, this that you've just outlined is called the Blundering Generation thesis, and it's most associated with a Quaker historian of the middle of the 20th century named Avery Craven, who wrote a book entitled I think *The Coming of the Civil War*. And actually, now there's an annual award given by I believe the Organization of American Historians for best book about this period, and it's called the Avery Craven Prize. I wonder whether somebody who made Avery Craven's argument could win the Avery Craven prize. I guess probably not.

What's reining now in this precinct of academia is the idea that's associated with people who are called neo-abolitionists, that essentially it's obvious that the Constitution should be understood as being anti-slavery and that basically any act that helped to bring about the end of slavery has to be justified. So this is like a results-oriented legal argument, where a lawyer has the idea that, well, I need to defend my client and so I'm going to massage the legal materials and historical materials and the testimony and so on in a direction that is conducive to her getting the outcome in court that she wants. So we have the same kind of thing going on with the historians.

But I also am not persuaded that somebody like Blight knows anything at all about the ratification of the Constitution. I mean, you mentioned the very nature of the federal compact. There also is the evidence that people like James Madison and Thomas Jefferson would point to first, and that is the understanding that the people had at the time that they ratified the Constitution. People who were saying at the time they ratified the Constitution that, well, you know, states are the parties to a federal compact, and in the Virginia Ratification Convention, one of the leading delegates explained that in case the federal government abused the powers it was being granted, Virginia could reclaim them, which is another way of putting what we call secession. Virginia could secede if it thought the federal government was abusing the powers it had been granted.

You know, another thing is there's a kind of orthodoxy now that one must never say that any of the Southern states seceded for any reason other than to protect slavery, but this belies the fact that Virginia had a ratification convention. It voted not to ratify. It had heard from secession commissioners from South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana. They had gone to Virginia and argued before the secession convention, you know, you guys need to secede because the election of this guy Lincoln and his "black Republicans" is going to mean the end of slavery, and Virginia decided no, we actually aren't persuaded. And if it's true that Lincoln is going to behave unconstitutionally, we'll have time enough to see that happen and then secede.

And that's exactly what happened. Lincoln took office, and he began behaving unconstitutionally by suspending habeas corpus and by calling for 75,000 volunteers and then by announcing that he was going to go attack South Carolina. And so Virginia's secession convention came back into session and voted to secede not on the ground that slavery was threatened, but on the ground that Lincoln was acting like a dictator.

And this actually was the same position as Virginia had taken in the Nullification Crisis. They didn't agree with South Carolina then. They thought that nullification was unconstitutional. Whatever you think of their position, besides the fact that they thought nullification was unconstitutional, they thought that for the federal government to attack South Carolina would be completely violative of the federal union's very nature. And so even as Virginia was trying to persuade South Carolina to rescind the Ordinance of Nullification, the governor of Virginia was preparing to use his militia to oppose the federal army if it tried to march across Virginia to go attack South Carolina.

So my guess, again, is that McCurry and Blight have no idea of anything I just said. One needn't even know anything. This is just the politically correct mantra to recite, and because – this is a fact of American intellectual life that's really come to annoy me in these last few months – because these people are at famous universities, they can get their arguments into major media, regardless of their merit or lack of same, and there's no way to answer them. So Kelly makes these arguments that are just completely unexceptionable.

In fact, it wasn't that long ago that Nancy Pelosi's father, the mayor of Baltimore, was dedicating statues to Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson. And the reason that people admired Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson was that, number one, a lot of their relatives had gone to war in defense of the South, but number two, they thought of these fellows as just exemplary Christians.

That's another thing about them. When I was a boy, my dad was in the Army and for two years I lived in Louisiana. At one point, I lived on 8th Street in DeRidder, Louisiana, and across the street was a small house in which lived a little old lady all by herself. I was eight years old. And I remember one time she invited me into her house for cookies. And I walked through the front door, and on the right, there were three pictures on the wall: Jesus, General Lee, and General Jackson. Now, David Blight would tell you that's a monument to white supremacy. But there wasn't a black person on the street, in the neighborhood, or in that half of town. I do not believe the reason General Lee was hanging next to Jesus on that lady's wall was because of white supremacy. I think she saw him as a good, Christian, Southern man. And actually, I have a feeling that there are some people who know this and that's part of why they are after these statues.

But anyway, the whole assault on Kelly was without merit. The pretense that these questions are settled is also absurd. And in fact, as we've said, the settlement they've apparently arrived at is just contrary to the evidence. And I think it's pure partisanship that we see reflected in this, partisanship for a particular argument and of course the more vulgar kind of partisanship for a particular party.

WOODS: Yeah, that expresses my frustrations exactly. These people have enormous platforms, and we do our best to get the word out, but I can't compete with the number of people they're going to reach. And they reach it and they're so condescending that, *How sad it is that this type of ignorance. He hasn't been reading my books. Or, He hasn't been reading my books from the last two years.*

GUTZMAN: Right. *This week.*

WOODS: *It's really sad. Yeah, exactly. He doesn't know what we're talking about this week over at The New Republic. And so that goes to show what little he knows about U.S. history.* [sighs] I don't know. I mean, I don't even have any follow-up questions for you. I think we just sit here and start cursing or something.

GUTZMAN: Well, it is a really bleak situation when the academic profession turns out to be such a monoculture and it's impossible even to have a contrary opinion. And actually, I think it's increasingly this way. I don't think there's even as much openness in it as there was when I entered it 25 years ago.

WOODS: Oh, yeah. I agree completely. Yeah, it's gotten — and we thought it was pretty stifling then.

GUTZMAN: It was.

WOODS: That was like the windows were open and we could smell all variety of flowers compared to today [laughing]. I would gladly take that again.

GUTZMAN: In those days, you could have a contrary position and get a job, at least. Now, it's just you can't get into any of the magazines, newspapers. They would prefer not even to let you have tenure. It's just kind of astounding and I don't really understand how they justify it, you know? But again, somebody like Blight will just go on and on about the idea that, well, these are all monuments to slavery, or this whole attitude is about white supremacy, and people immediately began attacking General Kelly as a white supremacist, which is very odd, you know?

Again, I'm an Army brat and when I was a kid, if you were the offspring of an Army officer, that meant your father — it generally was going to be your father — had a college degree, and yet, he had decided to go into the Army, which was the most integrated institution in America. So why would white supremacists do that? Why would a white supremacist end up being a Marine Corps general? There are certainly other things a smart, personable fellow could have done instead to impose his white supremacist beliefs on people than be a Marine general. It's just kind of loopy. The whole situation is loopy and it's also one that I can't think of any way to correct or even to affect [laughing].

WOODS: But you know, Kevin, it's like in so many areas of life, it's like we have two different countries. In a way — of course, it's more than just two, because two simplifies the situation too much, but in a way, there are two, because on the one hand, there is a group of people who are monomaniacal about insisting that the world must be viewed one particular way, and that means history has to be viewed a

particular way, down to minute details have to be viewed a particular way. Gender identity has to be viewed a particular way to the point where you can't even question much less actually oppose something like should my elementary school child transition to another gender. That went from nobody was even conceiving of such a thing to no one can say anything about it extremely quickly. In one area after another, it's the people with all the proper, acceptable opinions and everybody else.

Now, among the everybody else, we've got a lot of dissension among ourselves, but it's them against us. It's like we've got parallel existences here and we're going to have to start carving out – I don't see what the alternative is. We're de facto carving out parallel institutions, where we've got our own conferences, even increasingly our own social media platforms like Gab. We have to build our own separate world where these imperialists, these ideological imperialists can't get us or will just leave us along.

GUTZMAN: Well, I'm not very hopeful about the extent to which that's feasible, you know? If they control all the major – [laughing] If they control all the major news media and all the major universities and all the Hollywood studios and all the major publishing houses, it's just grim. Honestly, I feel as if – if we were under the Stasi's surveillance, at least we'd be able to kind of whisper to each other that, well, there were certainly a lot of people out there who had our opinions even if the Stasi was keeping us from publicly proclaiming them. But it's not even like that. I think we're more in a situation like Middle Eastern Christians who were the huge majority when they were conquered in the 7th and 8th centuries, and then if 1 or 2% of the population converted every generation, you end up with 1.5 billion Muslims and 2 or 3 million Christians by now. It's just, over time, no matter how heroic, we're a dwindling minority. So I don't know what to say about that.

I think obviously Kelly was right, at least in regard to Robert E. Lee. I don't know what he exactly had in mind about compromise, but certainly Robert E. Lee was what in virtually any generation would have been called a really good man, and the kind of person you'd want your son to grow up to be, if you had one. And now what? Again, these people just impose their view of society from moment to moment.

Another thing about it is I was recently reading an article. I can't remember who wrote it, but something to the effect that the most objectionable aspect about Marxism – maybe this was from Solzhenitsyn. The most objectionable thing about it was they wanted constantly to exercise their power by making you say things you knew weren't true. Like, that was what they really most had in mind. They wanted not to make you believe what they were making you say, but just to make you say it. And so, you know, a boy could become a girl if he would just be mutilated [laughing]. They make you say that. So this is where we are.

WOODS: All right, but let me play devil's advocate for a minute, just to try to see if we can wring some positive out of this. Let's say it was 30 years ago and you had a dissident professor like Jordan Peterson in Canada, and he came out and just said, "I'm not going along with this new gender revolution. I'm just not doing it. And whatever you say, I'm not doing it. I'm not going to say your crazy pronouns, and if you make me say them or if you try to make me say them, I'm prepared to be tossed in jail, where I'll go on a hunger strike. I am not going to let you do this to me." 30 years ago, that guy would never have been heard from again. Nobody would be covering him. The

three television networks would have colluded to pretend he didn't exist, the two major newspapers. Whereas today, he has outlets. He has outlets that can't be controlled by those people, and he has outlets that have allowed him to reach in the millions, which we didn't have 30 years ago. Isn't that some kind of an advance for dissident voices?

GUTZMAN: Well, on one hand, yes, certainly. But on the other hand, look what he's objecting to, you know? This stuff —

WOODS: Yeah, I know. How far has it gotten that this is controversial?

GUTZMAN: And overnight. Whoever even heard of this before two or three years ago? Whoever heard of this? And now apparently in Quebec if your six-year-old tells you he's a girl and you say, "No, you're not," and you take him to see a therapist, they can take your kid away from you permanently. Isn't that just amazing. So, wow. It's Winston Smith territory now, I think.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, it is. Geez, now you've got me all depressed. I just wanted to talk about General Kelly and the Civil War, you jerk [laughing].

GUTZMAN: Well, it's all one issue, really.

WOODS: It is. It is one issue.

GUTZMAN: You know the truth, and then there's this newly proclaimed "correct opinion," and you must accept it or what will we do to you? It's really odd. There's an ongoing battle on the campus of Boise State University, where my great aunt used to be on the Board of Regents. She's deceased now about 10 years. But she was on the Board of Regents and now there's a fellow there who just made a very neutral statement about this gender transition thing and people are giving him death threats. And he doesn't even have a position. He's just said, you know, it's essentially the end of parental authority if the state can tell you you have to go for this gender transition in your child. And he's not saying I have a child I'm not doing this with or you shouldn't do it. He just brought up the fact that this is a substitute for parental authority, and people literally have been threatening him. And the president of the university came out and said something like, *This violates our commitment to diversity here at Boise State. Or, you know, If you want to be part of our commitment to diversity, you must never dissent.* So, wow.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, I mean, the best you can do for now is publicize this stuff as much as possible, ridicule it as much as possible, smash it as much as possible, so as to make it kind of cool and chic not to be an ideological automaton but to be an actual, thinking person. Maybe that'll make that unexpectedly attractive to some people as they're growing up.

GUTZMAN: Well, I've heard people saying that and a lot of people saying that this crazy stuff goes on in universities and over time the market will be the cure to this, and I am not persuaded that people are going to stop sending their smart kids to Harvard because David Blight doesn't care about what happens — he doesn't mind

contradicting his own two-year-old book when it comes to saying the Civil War could not have been avoided by compromise, let alone Robert E. Lee committed treason by believing the version of the Constitution he was taught at West Point. I mean, it's just – I think the closest explanation or best explanation of it I can think of is Solzhenitsyn saying that they just want to make you say things that you know aren't true. This is what their power means to them. They'll make you say black is white and up is down, and if you don't, you'll be deprived of your kids and your job, and there you go.

So I found it really eerie when I – first of all, I was kind of surprised that Kelly came out and was talking positively about Robert E. Lee, although, until last Tuesday, it seemed everybody ever had always talked positively about Robert E. Lee. And then came the feedback from these very prominent professors. So my guess is Harvard's application will not be less numerous this year than last's, regardless of what kind of antics professors there perform because it's not really about what people are being taught. That's the elite certification program they have going there. And along the way, if you're educated, well, that's a good thing, but that's not the main reason why kids would rather go there than go to the University of Michigan, I think.

WOODS: Yeah, well, I agree. I agree. That is why people are doing that and it's why they'll continue to do it. The silver lining is that there are a lot of people who aren't going along, and not only are they not going along, but they're educating their children from kindergarten through high school in the exact opposite worldview, which, since the '60s, has never really been done, that you got exactly the opposite worldview from what kids are absorbing in the main school.

And maybe these kids – and plus, like with the Ron Paul Curriculum, those students actually learn not only the stuff, but they learn how to communicate it. They learn how to be public speakers, how to start blogs, how to start YouTube channels, how to start a home business and be self-sufficient so that some SJW boss can't go ruin their lives. I mean, given the overwhelming odds we're up against, you know, we're giving it as good a fight as we can.

GUTZMAN: Right. Right. Well, that's all we can do. *Cultive no jardim*, you know? What else are you going to do? I mean, you get to the end of *Myth of Sisyphus* in Camus' version, and he says, "Sisyphus smiled." You know? That's all you can do.

WOODS: Yeah.

GUTZMAN: But that doesn't mean it's not a grim prospect. So I keep tilling my little acreage, but wow, it's really daunting at this point. I really am amazed that there seem to be these leaps into newer and more odd little areas, you know? Who would have thought that these things would even come up? I never even imagined most of this stuff that's going on now.

WOODS: And that your worth as a human being would be measured by your enthusiasm for them. And the unbelievable degree of conformity among people. And to top it off, the icing on the cake is they think they're being cheeky by being conformists. They actually think they're the cheeky ones, whereas some people are risking their careers trying to stop it and they're the evil, terrible ones, the ones who actually have an independent thought once in a while. It's – yeah, you're right.

Okay, look, this episode took a direction nobody could have predicted, but I think we both at some level needed to have this conversation. So it has been had. I wish I had more answers. I'm going to have to just keep thinking about what to do. But yeah, it's frustrating.

The best thing I can do, which is not, you know, world-changing, but it is the people I have influence over, is I'm raising five really great daughters. And the funny thing is I don't propagandize them. I don't sit them down in a classroom setting and teach them the compact theory of the Union, but I am a good dad and I'm a good influence on them and I answer their questions and they read things when they ask for recommendations and they respect me as a person so they're inclined to think, *Well, maybe the old man knows a thing or two about such and such*. And they also kind of have a sense of what it means to be a good person. And you put all those things together, and they don't want to be automatons who just go along with the latest fashion. They want to be serious, thinking people. So I mean, I've got that to say. I can speak for the five little people I've got over here. But, boy, I'm sending them out amidst the wolves, really, ultimately when they come of age.

GUTZMAN: Yep, I agree. Similar story for me. Mine are right now at the point where they're entering the real world, and it's just very worrisome.

WOODS: Yeah, I've got to somehow find five decent men to marry them.

GUTZMAN: Good luck.

WOODS: Yeah, I mean, I don't know. Are there five in the world who aren't compromised in some way? I don't know. I don't even know. So anyway, well, look, we'll continue this over drinks sometime.

GUTZMAN: [laughing]

WOODS: That's probably the most appropriate setting for this. But Kevin, tell us what your most recent — like what are you working on these days? Tell us the last thing you released and then what you're working on these days.

GUTZMAN: Ah, well, the last thing that came out, the last major thing that came out was my new book, *Thomas Jefferson, Revolutionary*, which you can find at my website, KevinGutzman.com. And I'm presently working on a review of a new Madison biography that's going to run in *The Weekly Standard*, actually. So it's actually by a law professor at Harvard, and I won't give you any indication of what I think of the book, except I'll say it's a Madison biography by a law professor at Harvard.

WOODS: [laughing]

GUTZMAN: So you may find the essay amusing when it appears.

WOODS: Oh, I'm very much looking forward to that. Okay, so yeah, definitely check out Kevin Gutzman. Check out his books at KevinGutzman.com, particularly *The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Constitution*. You'd just love that book. It's so well

done. And I'll just recall something I said years and years ago when it came out. When I read that and I thought about my *Politically Incorrect Guide to American History*, I thought my book is a piece of nothingness compared to yours. And I know we're not here to have a competition about that, but I thought yours was just — there's no book anywhere like it. There isn't — I mean, forget about anything published by so-called right-wing think-tanks or whatever. Kevin is going to give you the real thing in that *Politically Incorrect Guide to the Constitution*.

All right, anyway, let's you and I part ways and we'll come back if we ever do figure out how to fix the world. Or if you have a new book or article out, which I suspect is going to come sooner than we figure out how to fix the world. Thanks, Kevin.

GUTZMAN: You're welcome.