



Episode 1,160: Our American Pravda: How the Media Misleads

Guest: Ron Unz

WOODS: I cannot believe that, before now, I haven't had you on to talk about "American Pravda," your article and later article series, but better late than never. And before we jump into this, I do want to say that we are recording this on Monday, May 14th of 2018, and by the time this comes out, I don't know about the state of John McCain's health. I don't know if he'll still be with us. I don't know if it would be viewed as being in poor taste to be critical of John McCain. But my view is he's done a lot of damage, and I think people who are spending their time praising him, *The Washington Post* praising him almost absurdly is doing tremendous damage to our country and to individuals and to the peace of the world. So I personally have no problem being critical of him, even if he is in poor health. Let's leave that to the side. That's just a warning. If that's going to be too much for you folks, you may as well switch it off now. But for the 99.9% of you, carry on listening.

What was the basic thesis of this article of yours, which I'm linking to at TomWoods.com/1160. That's the episode number. What's the thrust of this here?

UNZ: Well, the thrust is that all of us really build up a picture of the world almost entirely based on what we see in the media, the electronic media or the print media. And once you discover enough anomalies in the media coverage, enough gaps that were never really explained, bizarre things going on, you really start to recognize that the media portrays a very unrealistic picture of many important aspects of history and the world today. And I think as the Internet has gotten more and more powerful over the last 10 or 20 years, all of us have started to see that what we find in our morning newspapers and *The New York Times* or *The Washington Post* or *The Wall Street Journal* sometimes is very different than what we find on the Internet. And sometimes what we find on the Internet seems much more accurate and more realistic.

So in a way, if you think back, let's say, 30 years ago or 40 years ago before the Internet came along, when all we had were the print newspapers, three-network television, a few weekly magazines, that sort of thing, or some newsletters, that really was all we knew usually about history and the world. And if you think of the events of the last few years, without the Internet, how much would our view of the world be totally different than what we believe it to be? And for me, it's the sort of thing, once you discover a few shocking examples of this, you really start to be very skeptical of everything else you read in the newspapers and see in the media.

And for me, one of the major steps along the way was about — by now it's almost ten years ago. When I came across a very long expose by Sydney Schanberg, who'd been one of the top

editors of *The New York Times*. He was the subject of that famous movie *The Killing Fields* that won him a Pulitzer Prize, that won Oscars. I mean, he was one of the most highly regarded journalists in America. And he spent years investigating the question of whether the truth is that hundreds of American POWs were left behind in Vietnam just as is portrayed in that silly movie *Rambo*.

And I stumbled across — it was published basically on an obscure website, and of course I couldn't really believe it could have any realism to it, because it was so contrary to everything else I'd seen in the media. But you know, I'd noticed the name Sydney Schanberg. It rang a bell. I got in touch with him, and we ended up actually republishing it as a cover story and a symposium in *The American Conservative*, for which I was publisher at the time. And I mean, it's astonishing that somebody of that stature who came up with one of the most explosive revelations of recent decades regarding the figure John McCain, who at that time was the candidate for the U.S. presidency, the Republican nominee, was not able to get his material published anywhere in print. I mean, he spent months and months trying to do it, and basically I never heard about it at the time. Most people didn't either.

And the volume of data he accumulated, a tremendous amount of evidence — I'm not saying I'm 100% sure his analysis was correct in that America deliberately left behind hundreds of POWs at the end of the Vietnam War and then covered it up for decades. But given the volume of evidence he produced and the strong indications that John McCain was the leader of the cover-up in the McCain commission that allegedly debunked it just shocked me. And I ended up spending time with him on the phone looking into the issue more, and I'd say the odds are at least 80 to 90%. But at the time the *Rambo* movie came out showing Americans being held in horrible prison conditions in Vietnam, which all of us thought was just a sort of silly, shoot-'em-up adventure film, at exactly that point, hundreds of Americans were being held in conditions very much like that in Vietnam and it was being covered up by the U.S. government and covered up by John McCain more than almost anybody else.

And something like that, it's so shocking that once you look at the evidence, you read maybe ten books on it, you talk to a lot of the relevant people, and you decided, yes, it probably was true; it was covered up by the U.S. government, the natural question you then ask is: what else is the media and the government covering up? And that really was the spur of my "American Pravda" article and the series of subsequent columns I published in that direction. In other words, there are so many examples that you can point to where there seems enormous evidence that gigantic scandals have been covered up by the media, the mainstream media and the U.S. government. You really end up deciding that the American media really is our American Pravda, as I called it. In other words, it has about as much reliability as the old Soviet Pravda did in the '70s and '80s.

And at that point, you start to see why so many more people are turning to the Internet and so-called fringe websites for their information. Now, I'm certainly not saying all of these so-called conspiracy theories are true or all of these fringe figures on the Internet are correct. But you have to take seriously the claims that they make, simply because they're sometimes true and each of us has to use his own due diligence and his own analysis in deciding what's plausible and what's implausible, what's likely and what's unlikely, rather than just believing word-for-word what you see in the headlines of *The New York Times* or publications that are very critical of *The New York Times*.

WOODS: I want to say a little something about a couple of pieces that have appeared on the editorial page of *The Washington Post*, and I realize that the thrust of "American Pravda" is not so much that on the opinion pages you'll see bias in these papers. That's old hat. We already know that. You're talking about something quite different. But nevertheless, I think it's relevant to note that we're seeing pieces like Dana Milbank's column: "John McCain Is the Single Greatest Political Leader of Our Time." That appeared in *The Washington Post* a few days ago. Then last year when the McCain diagnosis first came out, we got this from the editorial team at *The Post*: "What We Can All Learn From John McCain." And let me just share a paragraph or two:

"[W]e have another wish also" — so beyond just their wishes for his health — "for Washington and the world beyond to pause for a moment to absorb the example that Mr. McCain sets every day...Mr. McCain has been, for the most part, and more than just about any other practicing politician, true to his convictions. He is in politics not just to win but, as far as one man is able, to improve our world.

"...[A]ll over this world, Mr. McCain is associated with freedom and democracy. He has championed human rights with verve and tirelessness..."

Now, this is — and it goes on like that. Now, *The Washington Post* has a reputation for being left liberal, and that's the way it looks at John McCain. Now, would it ever say, "What We Can All Learn From Ron Paul Because Here's a Man Who Fought for Peace for His Whole Life?" No, this is a man who's fought for every inane war you can imagine, and they cannot make enough gushing claims about him. How can people who think that way be trusted in their supposedly factual reporting? Oh yeah, on the opinion page, of course I expect inanities, but if they think that way, if we see on the opinion page how they think, how does that not spill over into what stories they run, what stories they don't run, and what slant they put on those stories?

UNZ: Exactly. And the whole thing about the McCain situation is so bizarre. And once I started investigating it, there seems very considerable evidence — I mean, interviews, hard evidence, statements by other Vietnam POWs who were the top-ranking POWs in the camps — that John McCain spent nearly the entire war broadcasting propaganda for the communists. I mean, I think there's a very high likelihood that he was the Tokyo Rose of the Vietnam War.

Now, the truth is many American POWs were tortured in Vietnam. That's certainly true. But there seems a lot of evidence that John McCain was not among them and that, in a sense, the stories of torture then were fabricated once he came back — because his father was one of the highest ranking military officers in the Vietnam War. He was I believe a four-star admiral in charge of all of our military forces in that theater — that the stories of the torture were fabricated so that once the facts of his propaganda broadcasts for the communists came out — and I mean, there are tapes of them and everybody knew at the time. In fact, it was reported in *Stars and Stripes* magazine. I found the article where it described how strange it was that one of the chief propaganda broadcasters of the communists was the son of America's commanding admiral in the region. And again, it's in print. I found the example of it.

So the whole thing is: sometimes what happens is the media or interested parties are very worried about something embarrassing coming out, so they create a cover story. And I think what sometimes happens in history is the cover story grows and grows and grows over time until it swallows reality. And in fact, I wrote an article exactly on the point, suggesting that,

given the evidence that John McCain was the Tokyo Rose of the Vietnam War — you know, that Japanese-American woman who spent the whole war broadcasting anti-American propaganda and was prosecuted and lost her citizenship — it's an astonishing statement of the nature of American society and media today that basically the Benedict Arnold of the Vietnam War is hailed as America's greatest patriot and that nobody's willing to call him on it.

To give an example, reporters went at the time John McCain was running for the presidency, and they decided to check into how his Vietnamese captors were reacting to the fact that allegedly the man they brutally tortured was close to reaching the White House. And they said, "Oh, yes, we all support John McCain. We became such great friends of his during the war. We worked so closely together. We really hope he reaches the White House and the presidency." And then of course he has to say all this nonsense about torture, but you know, politicians always do that.

So I mean, given those facts, given the fact that the tape of one of his propaganda broadcasts came out recently, there was a print article in America's leading war magazine, military affairs magazine from that period describing John McCain as one of the chief propaganda broadcasters of the communists — you know, basically Hanoi Jane, Jane Fonda was ferociously vilified for simply taking a visit to North Vietnam during the period and expressing her support for it. She was a civilian. What do you say about an American officer who spends the whole war, in exchange for favorable treatment, doing propaganda broadcasts for the communists? And I'm not saying I'm absolutely 100% it's true, but the evidence seems absolutely overwhelming, and I think it's 80 to 90% likely true. I mean, basically his commanding officers have said the same thing. They said, well, basically he was a traitor during the war.

So given those sorts of facts and given the fact that the American government and the American media seems to have totally covered it up for decades and made John McCain this towering hero of patriotism, you have to wonder how many other things are entirely backwards and upside down that we read about in our history books or in the newspapers. And it's sometimes a frightening thing. When you suddenly come face to face with the reality that you've always assumed over the years you were growing up and what you learned in school is actually false, that it's upside down, I mean, that's very much what happened to the people living in the Soviet Union when the Soviet Union collapsed. I mean, they suddenly came face to face with the fact that everything they'd learned in school, that all of their parents had learned, that they'd lived for decades was just a lie from beginning to end.

And in America right now, there are so many other claims floating around which may or may not be true that deal with day-to-day events right now that are shaping our current world. When you find out the government has covered up these other things for decades, you really have to wonder how many of the current things going on are believable. And a perfect example for that is all this nonsense about allegedly the Russians stealing the election for Trump. As far as I can tell, there's absolutely no evidence for it whatsoever. A lot of the key credible figures have denied that it was the Russians who broke into the DNC computers and leaked the information to Wikileaks. A lot of the key people have said it's all nonsense. And you have the media repeating it over and over and over again as if, if they repeat it 150 times, people will start to believe it, even if there's really no evidence for it and it's not true.

I mean, we're talking about the American political system being overturned by an utterly dishonest and unified media. And to be honest, I'm not thrilled with an awful lot of things that Donald Trump has done, and I think he's been on the wrong track in many ways. But the notion of the media and what sometimes people call the secret establishment, the "deep state" overturning the results of an American democratic election are really very horrifying. And when every media organ, every establishment media organ blares out the same lie over and over again, the vast majority of people start to believe it, and that's really a problem for our society.

WOODS: I think there are a lot of people who are willing to admit that, when it comes to foreign policy and events around the world, the U.S. media is not altogether reliable, that it seems to be cheerleading for war, it seems to play up every atrocity claim and then only later on page B27 does it say maybe that might not have happened. This has been going on for years and years. You can go back to Serbia and Kosovo and well before then. And I think we've kind of come to accept that that's who they are and they have their agenda and their interests.

But people seem to stop short of thinking that maybe they might be pushing an agenda even in matters other than foreign policy. So for example — well, I suppose the Russian influence thing is partly foreign policy, but it's how it bears on our domestic election. There are many areas I think where we have exactly the same lockstep media kind of response. For example, the way Ron Paul was treated in the presidential campaign. That can't just be a coincidence. I don't mean they all conspired together, but I mean it's not like some networks were really letting Duncan Hunter have it and others were really hitting Fred Thompson. They were all hitting or ignoring Ron Paul, because he in one way or another went against the way they all think. So there's something truly sinister going on, if you ask me, and so we have to be willing to consider that this is not just an accident. They have an agenda that they're pushing for particular reasons, and we have to realize that.

Now, let me ask you this. This might sound a little bit off the wall, but there was such a thing called Operation Mockingbird. I mean, that happened. That happened. That's part of American history. Do you have any thoughts about that?

UNZ: I've actually become — a lot of these issues are things that I'd never even heard of or considered until the last few years when I started really being a lot more suspicious about what we see about the media. And the notion of, for example, American intelligence agencies exerting enormous influence in violation of the law over domestic American media outlets seems more and more credible.

In fact, one of the interesting things is there was a book that came out a few years ago, and based on publicly released documents, it's pretty much established that the term "conspiracy theory" that always floats around, that's used to denigrate anybody who goes against the views portrayed in the establishment media — the term "conspiracy theory" was actually deliberately promoted by the CIA and other intelligence agencies to try to make sure that the American people would reject any ideas that weren't vetted by the establishment. I mean, basically in fact, if you look at a graph of the use of the term "conspiracy theory," it spikes almost immediately after the CIA started distributing a memo to all of its regional offices encouraging them to use their media assets to begin attacking people who promote "conspiracy theories."

Now, you know, the truth is there are a huge number of so-called conspiracy theories floating around on the Internet and the media and in discussion circles, and the truth is the vast majority of them are totally false. They're all nonsense. But the vast majority does not mean all of them, and just as you might see a situation where, for example, you have to mine ore carefully to find the nuggets of gold that are buried within it, you really have to start looking at a lot of alternative media outlets, even if a lot of what they say is total nonsense, to try to find the nuggets of reality that are buried there that would never get into the mainstream media and that sometimes reflect an entirely different view of reality.

Now, that also relates to another thing that was a major step along my discovery or I guess you could say my sort of recognizing some of these shocking things around me that I'd never suspected all of my years in college or afterwards. And that's during the 2000s, I invested a lot of time and effort digitizing the complete archives of hundreds of America's leading opinion magazines of the last 150 years, putting them up on the Internet so that everybody could read them. You know, mainstream magazines like *The New Republic* or *The Nation* or magazines, for example, like *Century* and *Outlook* that nobody's ever heard of before but at one time were among the most influential in America.

And what I gradually discovered, to my shock, was that so much of the American history that I'd naively accepted based on introductory history courses or reading between the lines of book reviews or newspapers really just presented a very distorted view of 20th century or even sometimes late 19th century American history. I mean, there were so many very prominent writers of that era who were the equivalent of the most prestigious columnists of today whose names had vanished and I'd never heard of.

I mean, they were the people influencing American society, and that's actually some of the stuff I'm hoping to write up, because it's one thing — For example, if you take those people who believe everything they read in *The New York Times*, and they say, "Well, it's *The New York Times*. It has to be true" — I'm not saying that's you or I, but there are a lot of people today who sort of adopt that approach.

Suppose, for example, *The New York Times* and its ownership changed, and the new owners came in and they fired all the staff members and they changed around the editorial board, and *The New York Times* started saying things that were the exact opposite of what *The New York Times* had been saying before. When you invest all that credibility in these elite media outlets and you discover over time that they've completely reversed their positions 180 degrees, it really is very much like a 1984 situation where reality changes. And most people don't go into the archives and check what had been said before. They don't sometimes even remember the fact that what was said one year was entirely different than what it would have said a few years before. And that's why the Internet has I think in many people's situations played such a huge role in allowing them to discover all these hidden truths and hidden realities, plus a huge amount of junk and falsehood as well, but things that really are important to know and affect our lives today.

I mean, for example, right now. Off and on for the last few months, we've been close it seems to threat of war with Russia, which is just astonishing. It's just insane. And that's the exact opposite of what Donald Trump had promised when he was running for the presidency. And you have to ask yourself: given the fact that we were on the verge of a military confrontation with a nuclear-armed power that could destroy the United States in a matter of a couple of hours and kill a hundred million Americans — the fact that in a sense the biggest charge

against Russia, namely allegedly meddling in the American election, seems an entire falsehood is something that all of us should be very worried about.

We're living in a world of illusions, and those illusions can kill a huge fraction of the American population if we don't do what we can to wake people up on that issue. I mean, there are many things going on right now that I think any sensible person should be very, very worried about. I mean, our government seems to be acting more and more irrationally over the years. We're on the verge of another war in the Middle East, possibly against Iran, when in a sense everybody, an awful lot of the people — I mean, I voted for Donald Trump. One of the main reasons I voted for him over Hillary Clinton was that it looked like he was much less likely to get us into a military confrontation with Russia, and he was talking about what a disaster our Middle Eastern wars had been under Bush, which was a very welcome change for someone running for the Republican nomination to say and then the presidency. And now, after a little over a year and a half in office, the establishment in D.C. has turned him around 180 degrees. And you really have to ask yourself whether we're living in a democracy or not.

WOODS: You know, Ron, a few weeks ago — I wound up writing a whole issue of my email newsletter about it — David Stockman, whom I sure you know, was on the Fox Business network on one of these morning shows, and he was on a panel of four people, and the other three were dead-set against him. They liked what he had to say about spending, but they didn't like what he had to say about foreign interventionism, even though in a way they're two sides of the same coin. If you want to cut back on spending, that really would be a place to start.

And at one point, one of the panelists said, "You know, David, you just lost me. I was with you when you were talking about spending, but on foreign policy you're just all over the map." And all they could think to say to him when he said he did not believe there was good reason to intervene in Syria — plus, he said I don't even see what possible interest Assad would have in launching a chemical attack at this moment. It makes no sense whatsoever. And their response was — I kid you not, Ron. You think I'm making this up. Their response was, "Oh, so you think Assad's a good guy. You're saying Assad's a good guy." When did he remotely say that? And you wonder could they be that low-IQ, or is it a matter of that has to be the narrative? If you disagree with us, you're siding with dictators. This is what I think makes people think something's fishy about the media, that they would act that way toward a guy like Stockman, who's got more intelligence than all of them put together, and treat him and abuse him with such low-IQ responses.

UNZ: Exactly. And there's also another very practical point. Any of them that deviated from the line might no longer be in the media. In other words, it's the sort of thing, if you went to Stalin in the 1930s and you reported that things were not going well with collectivization, you were not going to be in that position any longer. And with the media, when somebody who's prominent in the media deviates too severely from the party line, they lose their show. They disappear. And that's exactly what happened, for example, in the early days of George Bush's efforts to get us involved in that utterly disastrous Iraq War. Many prominent media hosts whose ratings were very good raised doubts about what was going on, and their shows disappeared.

And that certainly could probably be very much the case today, so people have to toe the line or they disappear. Now, in Stalin's day, they disappeared into the gulag. In America today, it's not that they're sent off to prison; they just lose their show. They lose their media platform.

They're not invited back as guests. And there are many prominent, for example, figures, prominent journalists, prominent academics who've privately raised enormous doubts about the conventional media narrative but who are very reluctant to say anything publicly because they would never be invited back to the primetime green room for any of these cable shows. So if one of those guests bantering with Stockman had said, "Well, David, you raise some very good points and maybe we should not get involved," he probably would no longer be on that show.

WOODS: All right, let me push a little bit here. I want to push a little bit here. What's motivating that? Why is it that that's so toxic even to consider? Why would it be unthinkable to express a view like that? Where's that coming from? What's the source of it?

UNZ: Well, I think again it's sort of a collective perspective. It's very much like the weapons of mass destruction with Iraq. In other words, everybody in D.C. said Saddam had weapons of mass destruction, and the few people who said otherwise many times lost their slots in the media or that sort of thing. In other words, basically there's a collective mass of think-tank experts, lobbyists, consultants who formed a narrative saying we have to support this effort to get rid of Assad of Syria for a variety of different reasons. For example, Israel is promoting the efforts; Saudi Arabia's promoting the effort; various other very powerful and wealthy and influential groups are promoting the effort. And once that consensus forms in the establishment, it becomes very hostile towards any individuals who break ranks and try to oppose the consensus.

Now, looking at the issue raised about military spending, I don't know the exact figures, but I think America currently spends more on its military than the next 20 nations combined, and many of those 20 are actually American allies. I mean, we spend I believe it's ten times more than Russia does, and we're talking about Russia as being a military threat. You have enormous interests supporting that spending to continue. And if you raise doubts about it, you might have people think twice and endanger a lot of careers and endanger a lot of well-paid consultants or corporate beneficiaries and they would crack down on this. I

mean, the whole thing about it is, in a country that's more or less run along electoral democratic lines, what you have to do is ensure — if you're pressing a certain agenda, you have to make sure that the people vote the right way. And the way you get them to vote that way is to make sure that their only source of information, their overwhelming source of information supports that particular perspective. And you have to be very harsh against anybody who has a large media platform who deviates from that position, just as you said with Ron Paul.

In other words, Ron Paul was not part of that consensus and he in a sense was subjected to a blackout by the media. There was that famous case where he came in second in one of the primaries, and the television people went down the list and they left out the second-ranking candidate. They covered number one, number three, number four, number five, and they just sort of forgot about Ron Paul's name in there, because you have to just ensure that people vote the right way by giving them as few options and as few perspectives and as few choices as possible.

And when we're talking about, for example, some issues, that's a bad thing for society. But when we're talking about possibly having a war with a nuclear-armed power that could kill 100 million Americans, I mean, that just is insane, and people have to be courageous enough

to step out and say they won't take something like this. And you know, for example, if you take the case of David Stockman you brought up, it would not surprise me if it would be difficult for him in the future to be invited on that same show again, because he showed he wasn't with the program. He showed he thought for himself. He raised doubts in people's minds. So you know, when they're going down the list of guests that they would have, they would cross his name off. And what you're really doing is basically purging people from the media if they deviate from the establishment line, and you're basically creating a sort of groupthink that can easily destroy our country if we let it.

So some of the stuff like that gas attack in Syria, there seems to be overwhelming evidence it's a hoax, yet nobody who read *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* and *The Wall Street Journal* and other major media outlets would be aware of that. They would be denouncing: oh, these conspiracy theory people who are talking about a hoax. And I mean, you just can't believe the media anymore, and when you start to recognize that the media is untrustworthy, that it's an American Pravda, you begin realizing you should begin investigating a lot of other things and be very careful about whatever you see in the mainstream media on a whole range of different issues, not just one or two of them.

WOODS: Ron, tell us a bit about your website. We should note that it contains quite a number of controversial voices.

UNZ: Sure. Well, I mean, basically what happened was a few years ago after running into all these shocking situations where our media had been totally dishonest, I decided really to set up a website to provide a wide range of both left and right perspectives, alternative media perspectives that are excluded from the mainstream media. And I'm not saying certainly I would necessarily endorse many or most of these perspectives. In fact, many of these perspectives directly contradict each other. In other words, one of the writers would say one thing, and another writer would say exactly the opposite thing. But it simply seemed beneficial to provide a website which gathers together a whole range of these alternative perspectives and makes them available to people so that they can read all these different sides of the issues, including things that they would never find in the mainstream media, and draw their own conclusions, to weigh one perspective against another perspective.

And so it's Unz.com. It's the Unz Review, and we've really been growing quite well. A month ago, we ended up reaching 2.7 million page views a month, which is really pretty good for a small website that really is run on a shoestring.

And what I'm also doing is starting — I've attached to it the archives again of all these American magazines, some of the most prestigious establishmentarian magazines in American history from the last 150 years that are available, and people can go and read these articles and can find out that what they were saying, for example, in the 1930s was sometimes entirely different from what they said in the 1940s and the 1950s, and that what you read in your history books is sometimes very different, as far as I can tell, than what actually happened during that period. So in other words, it seems to me just providing a huge amount of raw material, opinions, beliefs, sources allows people to just look at them and draw their own conclusions and decide what's real and what isn't.

And in my own case, for example, there were so many things that I regarded as "conspiracy theories" over the years that I never paid the slightest bit of attention to, because they were dismissed by the media and I said, "Oh, that's just nonsense," and I totally ignored them —

including, for example, all this John McCain stuff or the POWs in Vietnam. I never paid any attention to it because it seemed totally crazy. And when you've gone through enough of those cases and discovered that they were probably true all along but the media was afraid to report them for fear of getting in trouble with powerful people, you start to become very suspicious about a whole range of things.

And again, it doesn't necessarily mean many or even a substantial fraction of all these "conspiracy theories" are true. I mean, most of them, they're just nonsense. But unless you dig through all the straw, you'll never find the needle that's buried in there. And mining gold requires sifting a lot of raw material, and that's what I try to provide. So we provide a lot of background material on these issues. We run a lot of conflicting columnists, both on the left, on the right, libertarian perspectives, pro-big government perspectives, that type of thing. And people can just read the different perspectives and decide for themselves what really sounds the most true.

WOODS: Well, it's a very, very interesting site that I enjoy very much, and I've been reading your columns for a number of years and I was telling you that when you put together a book of your columns — I didn't realize you'd done that — well, that's a reason to have you back on. We've got to go back through some of those and get talking about them, because you've challenged my own views on more than one occasion with some of your really lengthy and well-thought-out pieces, and I always appreciate that. So Ron, thanks so much for your time today.

UNZ: Well, thanks so much for having me.