



Episode 1,438: Were Biden and Sanders the Losers? Handicapping the Second Democratic Debate

Guest: Tho Bishop

WOODS: It's actually the second time you've been on, but this time we're talking about something that a lot of people tuned in for. And as I said yesterday, it's so funny to hear how apolitical all my folks out there pretend to be, but I don't believe you, because I see the download numbers and you're all listening to these debate analysis episodes. So you can't look away, can you? So we looked at the debate last night that had more high profile candidates in it, particularly, obviously, Joe Biden and Bernie Sanders and so-called Mayor Pete among them. So in some ways, it's the more newsworthy of the two debates. The key takeaway from the first debate was, I think, the twofold take away that Elizabeth Warren is more or less the establishment-anointed one among those and maybe even overall at this point, but secondly, that Tulsi Gabbard, if you give her a chance to talk, people are very interested in her, judging from the Google search results during the debate. That was very interesting to see. Did you watch the first debate, Tho?

BISHOP: I did; I did. I'm not one of those libertarians that can pretend not to be interested in politics. I love the theater. I love the circus of it all.

WOODS: Yeah.

BISHOP: And round two, I mean, that was the fun one. A lot of punches being thrown. It helped that we had nine unhinged individuals, plus Marianne Williamson, my favorite on the stage last night, Oprah's spiritual advisor.

WOODS: Right, right, right. I'm going to give you some time to talk about Marianne Williamson, but let's start with the issue that would be on everybody's mind, which is Joe Biden.

BISHOP: Yes.

WOODS: Now yesterday, or on Episode 1437, I had Lew Rockwell on. You probably know Lew a bit.

BISHOP: [laughing] I've heard the name.

WOODS: You've heard the name. And he was saying he did not think Joe Biden was going to get the nomination. And I didn't know what to think about that, because I just assumed he

would, because he's going to have a lot of money, he's the establishment guy, and all that. But the trouble with him, we were thinking, going into this second debate was that when he's been on the campaign trail, he's not been that impressive. He's been stumbling, slurring, not making sense sometimes. And just from a superficial point of view, he looks a lot older than people remember him as vice president.

BISHOP: Yes.

WOODS: So he does have some factors working against him. So last night — and incidentally, I think he went into that debate last night not aiming to win, but just aiming not to lose.

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: That was the attitude that came through. So yeah, what did you think about his performance?

BISHOP: Oh, absolutely. He didn't have the luxury — like the first night, Elizabeth Warren won because she wasn't taken down by anyone. But Biden didn't have that sort of luxury last night for a variety of reasons. But the problem is that, and I agree with Lew 100%, I think Biden never really had a shot to win the nomination in this Democratic Party. The only strength he had going for him is the fact that the Democratic Party is the least Democratic Party in the United States, and it's so insider controlled. I mean, that's the only hope that Biden had, but as soon as the American people remembered that he wasn't the *Onion* character, Uncle Joe washing his Camaro on the White House lawn, it's this entire — like, that is what sold Biden as a likable guy. Outside of that, he's been a complete loser in national politics, never been particularly relevant in any of his past attempts to get the White House. And all of his weaknesses were put on display last night in a big, big way.

One is, his greatest strength is supposed to be, oh, well, his connection to the still very popular, on the Democratic side, Obama administration and his long experience. Well, he was getting some punches with that Eric Swalwell, the Millennial on stage, it seemed to be the only reason he was there. He had the little line about, *Well, 36 years ago Joe Biden was talking about passing the torch, and it's about time to pass the torch.* You're actually using the fact that he has all of this experience against him. And again, visually he looked his age. So that was definitely working against him.

And then Kamala Harris coming in and attacking him on the segregation issue, not only his record on busing, but some of his recent comments that he himself made unprovoked. The guy is just a gaffe machine. He looked totally out of touch, especially with this modern Democratic Party. And it was interesting seeing, like he was trying to take credit for, *Oh, well, we fixed all these issues with the administration,* and then he was trying to hide from some of the Obama stuff in terms of deportation. And then, *Oh, well, no, we want to change the health care system to do what Obamacare didn't do.* You know, he's trying to have it both ways and just simply isn't clever enough to have it any way. I think you're going to end up seeing, from this point on, him falling in the polls. I've always had on PredictIt.org, the political stock market game, I've been shorting Biden every chance; I've been able to make some money on that. Yeah, just this is not an old-white-guy party anymore, and last night's debate I think is just the beginning of the pain that the former vice president is going to face.

WOODS: I thought it was surprising that Biden would have been so poorly prepared for what was surely at attack to be expected.

BISHOP: Oh, yeah.

WOODS: He had to know that was coming, and he has no glib response?

BISHOP: Yeah, and what's remarkable is not simply the fact that he got punches for someone like Kamala Harris. I mean, Kamala Harris has spent her entire life dreaming of the day that she could be in this position, so it's no surprise at all that she was going for his neck. It was the moderators that were going after him. I mean, the knives were out from – all the debate moderators gave – outside of Tulsi Gabbard, he got some of the hardest questions thrown his way. Rachel Maddow had to correct Bernie on that thing, but for the most part, they put him on the defensive, even from the questioning stage. And the commentary afterwards, which in some ways is just as important as the debate, because the normie political people out there that actually have their opinion changed based on the debate, it's as much as what they hear afterwards being told what they should think. The NBC analysis afterwards was just as bad as we saw it. So again, I we've seen the peak for Joe Biden, I think, at this point.

WOODS: On the busing issue, by the way, he was trying to make a fairly technical point that he wasn't against busing, per se; he was trying to say I was against busing directed by the Department of Education, but he wasn't against busing, per se. But the thing is, even if he were against busing, per se, I think – well, I don't know, given the modern Democratic Party, I don't know. Who knows? But they do have a lot of Independents to appeal to. And he could say: look, at this point, for heaven's sake, even *The New York Times*, even the NAACP, a majority of black parents as time went on, have all said this was a failure. This was a bad idea. This isn't some crazy right-wing thing for me to say. This is what everybody admits now, that if you really wanted to bring about as much racial misunderstanding and hostility as you could, you would basically break up neighborhoods, break up local patriotisms, send people 90 minutes each way on a bus to a place where they're going to be hated and ostracized. That would be what you would do.

And what you would further accomplish would be to simply have the wealthy white folks move four hours away from the city so that it's just impractical to bus them. And so now what you have accomplished is you don't have a single majority, white public school population in any major American city. That's a direct result of this kind of policy. If that's what you – because they've all fled so that you couldn't do this to them. You think of that as a success? How could you think of that as – Everybody knows this failed. He can't even say that. He can't say it, because, well, in his case, it's not fully true, but secondly, you can't even state a fact. That's just a fact in the modern Democratic Party.

BISHOP: Right. Yeah, these were some of the best Joe moments, was him talking about the dangers of federal overreach and treading over local rule. But yeah, that just doesn't fly within the modern Democratic Party. And of course, he walked into – I mean, Kamala Harris was just waiting for that, given her story about, oh, she was part the second generation of students that were desegregated in the California schools, so it's set up perfectly for what she wanted to do. And again, just the fact that Biden thinks that he can win over by explaining away with nuance and substance these emotional attacks that his opponents are going to throw at him, again, he is just not built for the modern age.

And this is something that Michael Malice has brought up several times, is that Biden's ability to ad lib is awful. And you saw that with kind of the torch question, because like Joe said like, "Oh, I still haven't given up that torch." It's like, yeah, that's exactly the point that he was making, right? He doesn't have the ability to react quickly when he gets in those spots.

WOODS: No.

BISHOP: And again, in this sort of news cycle, especially when you are playing the role of lead dog, you're not going to be able to survive long if you can't react. I mean, he's low energy, Jeb Bush 2.0.

WOODS: In fact, even on Twitter, where I'm sure, naturally, he has to have a social media team running it for him, there was a time a couple of months ago when the Biden groping was big in the news.

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: And Trump tweeted out this image of Biden groping people, and the media called it a doctored photo or a doctored video, which is so stupid [laughing]. Yeah, it's obviously a joke. What, do you think people thought it was real? How ridiculous can you be? But Biden's response to this was something along the lines of, *Oh, I see you're, as usual, maintaining the dignity of the office.* So you're going to come up with a wet-blanket, serioso response instead of something funny? That calls for a funny response. He can't even hire people to come up with a funny response.

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: Like he can't even hire people to come up with funny responses.

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: Yeah, not good. Not looking good for him. So let's go on to some other candidates. Let's pick out, let's say, one of the outlying candidates, because I just saw on Facebook, you reproduced one of her tweets as I was coming up the elevator to get here to talk to you. Marianne Williamson.

BISHOP: Yes.

WOODS: Tell us who she is and what her performance last night was like.

BISHOP: She has now skyrocketed to number two on my big board as far as people that I would trust with running this great country. Tulsi is number one. Love her. But yes, Marianne Williamson, Oprah's spiritual advisor, bestselling author, big fan of healing crystals. "Medicare for all" is reactionary; healing crystals for all is both progressive and revolutionary. I am digging the vibes that she is bringing to this campaign. What's interesting is that she ended up actually speaking more than Andrew Yang, almost had twice the amount of speaking time, despite the fact — I mean, they refused to like even acknowledge her until halfway through, which I understand. I mean, she's not one of the more serious candidates on the stage. But what's interesting, she had one great line that should make every ancap out there heart go

flutter, which is that even if the government does it, it is still a crime. Now, she was referring to some of the immigration enforcement stuff that's been going on, but that line was great. Like she won me over with that. Her whole thing is, oh, we're going to send out good vibes and that's the way that we're going to rebuild our foreign policy, which you know, I could get behind that.

And she also kind of showed a great understanding of modern politics, where she said, *Oh, we keep talking about these plans, these great plans, whatever. Well, Trump didn't have a plan. Trump didn't need any white papers. He just came out there and said, "I'm going to make America great again."* And her point was that we could learn from that, and we need to have like this larger message that can resonate with the populace. And she was absolutely correct about it. I was stunned. She was, I thought, the most intelligent person on the stage. And she has a long history of tweets that just keep on giving – you know, *We're all space stations full of laser beams*, I don't know. It's great. I just hope there is more of her, because the more people with the sort of experience that she has, that is I think better off for the country than this group of generic senators and governors and these Congresspeople that really have nothing to offer. At least make it enjoyable. And so Marianne Williamson, ancap queen, she was definitely one of my personal highlights from last night.

WOODS: I did not enjoy one bit of any of this, but I will say that I was trying to put myself in the shoes of a voter who is, let's say, is not knowledgeable of any advanced libertarian theory and just takes this all at face value that these are all public-spirited people with plans to make the country better. That's all they're thinking about. And I thought which one would be most impressive to me, and to me, it was so-called Mayor Pete, this Pete Buttigieg.

BISHOP: Yes.

WOODS: First of all, he's very young, so it's important for him to come off as being very measured and in control of himself and he can't be having outbursts. He can't look like a child, basically. And he has to seem knowledgeable and sober and confident. And I thought he accomplished all of those things. He even tried to sound reasonable and moderate in some of his positions. He would say, *Look, there's no problem with having a private sector in healthcare. What I'm saying is blah, blah, blah.* So I'm not saying I would want to vote for this guy. Do I even need to add that?

BISHOP: Right, right.

WOODS: Right. But I thought his delivery and his persona, I thought all of that worked really well. What was your impression?

BISHOP: Oh, absolutely. Because with these debates, nobody's going to win the primary with the first debate, but you can lose it. And especially someone like Mayor Pete, because he just had a really bad week in terms of how his response was to a police shooting, and he was asked about that last night, and his response, I thought was as best as you could, being put in that situation on national television. He didn't avoid responsibility. He was very articulate in outlining all the steps that he took and his government took to try to prevent these sort of incidents from happening. He sounded very competent. He sounded intelligent. He had his own little minor, a little bit of Spanish that sounded better than what Beto O'Rourke could muster on the first night. He even invoke God, which is not something you hear often in a Democratic debate these days.

As far as that, and I think especially if we end up seeing Biden going down, those moderate Democrats are going to try to rally around someone. Buttigieg has already proven to be a very good fundraiser. He's raising more money out of Massachusetts than Elizabeth Warren. We'll see if that changes after her performance the first night. But I mean, this is a guy that is raising the sort of money, low key, kind of similar to what Obama did in 2008. This past week, he was getting attacked from left-wing outlets for the first time, really, since he announced his campaign. We'll see if his performance last night kind of stabilized that. But I think in terms of just sheer intelligence within that group, I think he definitely seemed to be the brightest bulb out there. I think he had a very good night. I think he gets one of the tickets that kind of keeps his campaign going on, going forward. Kind of similar to like Cory Booker the first night, Castro the first night. He's one of those people that's kind of been that mid-tier, hasn't really broken out yet in the polls, but I think this is the sort of performance he can build on.

The problem is that his whole history, that his father had kind of some interesting, kind of more hardcore communist stuff than his relatively moderate background as a small-town red-state mayor would lead you on to believe, so it's going to be interesting to see how that kind of presents itself later on. But no, I agree with you. I think in terms of the sort of people that you could take seriously as an individual, I think he was one of the few last night that really stood out in that regard.

WOODS: Let's hold off till the end on overall winners and losers, and not even on, let's say, who won or who lost, but like in other words whose prospects are improved and whose prospects are not improved. So I want to bring up Bernie, and I know your opinion of his prospects after this debate, but let's hold that off for a minute. What I want to talk about it specifically is he was asked about, they were talking about whether the Democratic Party and the idea of socialism, if that mix is good electorally or if that's going to hurt them. Now, there's this Hickenlooper character who thinks that that is going to hurt them, and of course, Bernie doesn't think it is. So he was asked about this, and his answer about electability and stuff was to say, well, look the most recent poll has me ten points ahead of Trump, so why are we even talking about this? But I just had lunch with Michael Malice today, and I was saying to him that I kind of, even though I'm not in any way sympathetic with Bernie — I could not be more out of sympathy with him.

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: Still, I would have cheered if he had said something like: Well, look, I'll tell you what doesn't work. We could run a Hillary clone. We could run a clone of the loser we had in 2016, who is unsound on everything that matters to us, who's wobbly when it comes to war, but who, yeah, will apologize eight years later. A lot of good that does it. So we could we could do that. We could take somebody who is generating no energy at all among the grassroots, who everybody is bored with. We could do that. Or we could say, look, the whole system is corrupt and broken, and we're going to take it apart piece by piece and put it back together in a way that actually benefits people.

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: I wish he had said that, frankly, because even though that would have scared the bejesus out of me, at least it would have shown some life. It would have shown that we're

tired of the establishment wing of our party. It would at least have added some zing to the proceedings.

BISHOP: No, absolutely. And I think this is kind of where Bernie kind of finds himself in this weird situation where he's now been around as a national figure in a way that he was not before for the last four years. And so he's kind of lost his edge, especially on a stage with a lot of the extreme opinions that we saw last night. He doesn't really have that same outsider cred, in part because the Democrats needed to bring him out for campaign purposes and kind of culturally appropriated his likeness for a lot of things so as to kind of build their own base. I think just throwing up poll numbers, perhaps that helps appeal to some of the pragmatics out there.

And it has been interesting to see the overlap, because, again, in political punditry, you never have to take responsibility for bad analysis, so we always get these repeated things, of, *Oh, we need to be appealing to the moderates, and extremist candidates can't win.* Well, these same people were telling us, *Oh, well, obviously, the Biden and Bernie wings are the two polar opposites within this primary.* But what we've actually seen is that there's been a tremendous amount of overlap between Biden supporters and Bernie supporters. Now, part of that might simply be name recognition. When you have a bunch of people they've never seen on a national stage or whatever, that plays a role. But I think a lot of it comes from that working class, blue collar, white middle America sort of appeal that both, at their best, Joe Biden and Bernie have shown. But yeah, if he's not the extreme on the Democratic stage, I don't know how he's going to energize people the same way he did in 2016. And his answer to that question I think kind of was a reflection of what I saw throughout the night last night.

WOODS: Let's talk about your views on Andrew Yang, but particularly if he stood out at all last night.

BISHOP: Yeah, I think Yang was actually extremely disappointing. Someone who I find all of the, especially the Generation Z, political culture stuff, the memes and all that sort of stuff very interesting. And the Yang Gang social media story I think is very interesting, and actually in many ways as frightening as anything out there, because he's kind of been able to build this larger demographic, appealing to a lot of young former Trump types, a lot of New Right types. And basically, a lot of this online culture has been attracted to this accelerationist argument that, basically, there's nothing that we can do to fix the government that we have, so we might as well vote for the guy that's going to give us \$1,000 a month, no questions asked. Let's secure the bag, and then once we have once we have secured the bag, we can spend the money on whatever we want to spend it on and ride it out until it all falls apart.

The problem is that he showed no energy last night. He didn't create any moment that you can meme, which is terrible for a meme candidate. He says his mic was cut off, I don't know, but he had total of three minutes speaking time, by far the least amount of anyone on the stage. He didn't do a good job of handling the UBI question when it came to him. He didn't have the opportunity to mention any of his other interesting subjects. Like he did a great interview with Kmele Foster, where he talked about some of his views on education, and there's a lot there that I think you would actually – there's some solid stuff there. There's a lot that he and Kmele Foster, a libertarian himself, they found some common ground there.

There was just a total lack of energy, and so I'm interested to see – And he also found himself, if he's going out there and saying, *Oh, we're going to have open borders, oh, we're*

going to have free health care for everyone, and oh, everyone's going to get \$1,000, then I think even the people that could get behind the UBI as sort of a more practical form of the welfare state or practical way of dealing with automation, I mean, that math really quickly doesn't add up. So I think that he has done nothing for himself to try to help. — again, I think there's going to be more Marianne Williamson meme magic going on and less Andrew Yang going forward. Which is a shame, because, his campaign — again, I think the accelerationist, the very nihilistic sort of worldview that kind of makes people attracted to him, it's kind of dangerous. But that memes were good, and I'm always happy with a good meme.

WOODS: Yeah, who isn't? So let's think now about overall winners and losers. And by the way, I had the same impression of Yang. I thought this was his opportunity, and he's pretty well spoken, and he's going to be different from the others. Yeah.

BISHOP: He was bragging about his debate skills before. Like he was tweeting out, "Oh, I was a" — like, no. Yeah, he was low energy.

WOODS: But the thing is, he may be talking about like the debate team in high school, which is totally different.

BISHOP: Yeah.

WOODS: This, facts don't matter and you don't have that much time, and it's all ridiculous.

BISHOP: It's just theater.

WOODS: And by the way, that reminds me — I beg your pardon?

BISHOP: This is just theater.

WOODS: It is theater, and he's not ready for that. That's absolutely true. And that reminds me, by the way, when Biden was getting beaten up by Harris, he was the only candidate I've seen so far who, when his time was up, said, "Oh, I'm sorry. My time is up."

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: Obviously, they all talk over the time being up, so the fact that he says that means he was uncomfortable with the line of questioning and he was totally unprepared. If I knew that something like that was coming at me, I would have a response that would not only answer it, but would turn it around on the questioner. And it would be something that I would be glad they asked. Like, I would be licking my chops? You're ready to ask me that? I am so ready for it, and I don't even care about my time limit. I'm going to be going over the time. That goes to show Biden doesn't even have the passion that I have, and the last thing in the world I'd want to do is be president of the United States. So that's not a good sign.

BISHOP: Another great Joe moment is one of those things where they asked the entire stage a question; I think it was on, would you deport people if they did not have proper immigration papers, or something like that. And Joe kind of, like he put his hand up halfway.

WOODS: [laughing] He doesn't know what to do, yeah.

BISHOP: He was like, eh? That moment, I think, just illustrated his entire night. Like, eh?

WOODS: So let's go to winners and losers. In the long term, who do you think comes out of this with some momentum, and who is going to really have a slog? And you don't have to name all of them, just the words that stand out to you.

BISHOP: Sure. Well, the big winner is Kamala Harris. I mean, she started out very strong in her campaign. She raised a lot of money. She's from California, which gives her a big advantage. Her campaign's pretty much been static since then. She's been overshadowed by Bernie, by Biden, by even Buttigieg. And so she is now tied with Biden for the Predict It stock market now. She had a very good night, just like I think Warren did the first night. Biden, I think, is dead in the water. I think we are seeing the end of Bernie, too. I think that he has –

WOODS: Really?

BISHOP: Again, what does he have to offer that nobody else on stage has to offer?

WOODS: Right.

BISHOP: He's Elizabeth Warren without the historical nature of a first-woman president and without the plans. So again, if he's no longer the most extreme candidate on the stage, then what does he have to offer? And he just comes across as bitter. He kept putting his finger up, trying to get more time. I think that he was the low-key, less obvious loser, because his messages, there's nothing new to it. I think it's a one-note performance, and I don't see that – he has to change things up and start really getting feisty with others, especially Elizabeth Warren, I think, in order to be able to maintain that sort of lane that he built for himself. I do not think it was a good night for him.

As far as the rest go, I mean, I think everyone else is pretty – Mayor Pete, he gets to play on. He's going to need a lot of help to really make him I think a top candidate, but he gets to play on. Gillibrand did better than I was expecting. Again, her campaign has been pretty much nonexistent. She's been kind of down there at 1%. She fought forever – I don't know that she was ever asked a question. It seems she just kept interrupting people and using that to speak. I appreciate the aggressiveness there, though, because you've kind of got to jump your way in there. She's crazy, don't get me wrong, but I appreciate her playing the game. Everyone else, again, except for – I do hope Marianne gets a few more debates just for my own personal entertainment.

The rest are irrelevant. I mean, again, you had you had the Bennetts and you had the Hickenloopers and you had the Swalwells trying their best to be somewhat relevant, and I just don't think any of them broke through. So I think Harris is the big, big winner. Mayor Pete gets to play on. Gillibrand didn't hurt herself. I think Biden is done, and Bernie needs to find a new game.

WOODS: Wow. All right, that's a very, very interesting assessment. I mean, I've been wondering about the Bernie thing myself, given his advanced age and given that he doesn't check very many diversity boxes.

BISHOP: Yeah.

WOODS: It's not clear what the benefit of having him is, especially when he's been outflanked on the left, in a way, by Elizabeth Warren. So then what is the remaining allure, other than sentimental value from four years ago? I don't get it.

BISHOP: That's all he got. It's three-year-old nostalgia.

WOODS: And then he turned around and stabbed his followers in the back by endorsing Hillary.

BISHOP: Yeah.

WOODS: Which I knew he would do. I said from the beginning, he's not 1/100th the man Ron Paul is. He'll turn right around and endorse her, *Because we have to defeat Donald Trump*. That's the way he's going to think.

BISHOP: Yeah, and the insanity of it is that it didn't buy him a single kernel of credit or love from Hillary staff. I mean, Hillary staff was going out there as soon as he announced his campaign this time, planting these stories about how Bernie Sanders, you know, Mr. Working Class With Three Houses, was flying private jets. So it's like, you had Hillary Clinton's own people attacking Bernie for flying around in private jets to do events for Hillary Clinton. Like, this is the lack — the knives that were going to come out from the former Hillary people. Hillary's people cannot win a national election or find Wisconsin on a map, but they can hold a grudge better than anybody else in the United States. And so they were always going to find a way to destroy Bernie for what they see as what he did to her last time around. But I don't think it's even going to come to that, because I think he is just going to lose the energy that he had last time around. Again, what does he bring that Elizabeth Warren doesn't? I just don't think there's much there.

WOODS: Yeah, I agree with you. I think this is all very plausible stuff you're saying about what's to come.

BISHOP: And this election, again, we kind of saw it play out last night. I mean, there was a little bit of butting heads on the Medicare question, and it mainly kind of came from the moderates in the group. I think what you're going to end up seeing is that this is going to be the most vile, personal political primary that we've ever seen, because nobody who is a serious candidate to win this nomination is going to want to disagree on policy with anyone else, because they don't want to downplay the left, and they don't want to go out of their way to offend the sensibilities of some of the donor class. And so they're going to talk about all the areas where they agree on: getting money out of politics and getting everyone health care and immigration for everyone. They're going to ignore the minor policy differences and instead try to focus on the politics of self-destruction and finding the ways that — either they're going to collect as many victim cards to try to play that game, or they're going to find the insensitivity of their rivals. It's going to be the nasty, personal, the sort of attacks that you never forgive in politics.

And that is exactly why it is going to be, I think, an extremely entertaining primary leading up to the grand show of another Trump general election. So I think that for people that can distance ourselves from the actual policies and the terrible ideas being thrown out there and instead simply enjoy the circus and theater for what it is, there's going to be a lot of laughs in

store. We'll just see — because if we're not laughing, we'll end up crying, and that's not useful for anyone.

WOODS: Right. That's right. That's right. Well, thankfully, with the help of you and Lew Rockwell, we've been doing more laughing than crying in evaluating these debates. So I appreciate that. I want to, of course, urge people to check out the Mises Wire, which is one of the great reasons to visit Mises.org, the website of the Mises Institute, where you do such great and important work on a daily basis. So thanks so much for sharing your thoughts. I had some requests to have you specifically —

BISHOP: Oh.

WOODS: — as the commentator, and I thought, yeah, doggone it, let's get Tho on here. And I think it worked out just splendidly. So thanks so much.

BISHOP: It's a great honor, Tom. Big shoes to fill. No one can, but I really appreciate coming on.