



Episode 1,460: Kamala Harris Destroyed, and Other Debate Highlights

Guest: Tho Bishop

WOODS: [Heavy sigh] I just finished recording this week's episode of *Contra Krugman* with Bob, and Krugman's column is just so bad. So I started the episode with that sigh and I asked how many episodes of *Contra Krugman* have begun with that sigh. I think it's a whole bunch. I don't know how many debate episodes. Maybe none yet. But as we were saying just before we started recording, these are becoming pretty indistinguishable at this point, especially because, I mean, it's the same questions about the same issues, really – more or less the same questions – to people who are more or less indistinguishable.

Now, there are a couple who are distinguishable from the others. Andrew Yang and Marianne Williamson are going to give you different answers from what the others will give. And Tulsi on foreign policy will give you answers that are somewhat different, and she did have an interesting and memorable exchange with Harris in this debate. But otherwise, this is just excruciating. And I'm kind of a let-everybody-debate kind of guy, but at this point, I am begging them to tighten the admission requirements to these debates, so I don't have to do this two nights in a row. I mean, Tho, there's nothing I wouldn't do for my listening audience, but I will say this is at the very least coming right up against it [laughing].

BISHOP: Oh, yeah, it's been painful, and your listeners cannot see me, but just to set the stage, I am sitting here at a table with no fewer than three Himalayan salt lamps and an orb that I bought from a gypsy down at Cooper's Corner because I'm totally on the Marianne Williamson train. I think that we need more people like her in politics, just adding in a little bit of a different flair. So having to go from that to watching what we saw last night, I think it was definitely a letdown.

Yang, the original meme candidate this cycle, I thought did a little bit better job. He got a lot more airtime, which definitely helps. He got in some good quips. He loves that, "What's the opposite of Donald Trump? An Asian guy with math." That's one of his favorite go-to lines. So at least he was able to go out there and do his secure-the-bag thing.

But really, the only reason last night was memorable was the Tulsi exchange with Kamala Harris. And also, I mean, just how much punches were thrown at both Joe and Kamala. And Joe had a little bit more energy this time than he had the first debate, but he just cannot think on his feet, especially when it came from someone else. It was like he was prepared when Kamala Harris threw punches at him, but when he got attacked by Booker, when he got attacked by de Blasio, who, like the highlight of Joe's performance was just him showing how much he really despises de Blasio, which is something actually I'll give them credit for. But outside of that, I mean, it just we keep hearing these constant talking points about health

care, that, oh, yeah, we want to make sure that everyone gets it for free. We're going to ignore — you know, math is a right wing talking point. And I don't see how much is going to change.

The problem is that once they start reducing the stage, the first people they're going to take out are the interesting ones: Yang, Williamson, and Tulsi. And we're already seeing it with the way the Democratic Party threw out a debate that had Yang qualifying for the most ridiculous reason ever. Once again, the Democratic Party showing its committed hostility to democracy, which is the only thing they have going for them. That going forward, I think it's going to be — that's the unfortunate thing, that the smaller the debate stage, the more boring it's going to actually become.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. That's true, although there are some marginal — I mean, there are some governors and stuff who are maybe so-called moderates, but they're still boring, who have basically no support, and I wouldn't be super sad to see them go. But yeah, I would at least like to have those few in, just because at least it keeps it sort of interesting.

It's too bad about Marianne Williamson, by the way, that somebody who has this spiritual dimension wouldn't take that to where you'd think it would lead them, which is the idea that, look, we should — I mean, I don't know what her entire shtick is, but I could easily imagine somebody who's kind of flaky or new-agey saying something like: we need to move beyond the ways we've interacted with each other in the past, and government is the most blunt, crude instrument of all. Surely, we can figure out cooperative, voluntary solutions to our problems that don't involve the hang man and the executioner. Surely we have evolved to a level of consciousness that's a bit above the crude primitivism of, you know, thousands and thousands and thousands of years of the state. I could easily imagine somebody saying that, and she won't. She'll say, no, no, it's a great instrument of human advancement. Okay, so your great spiritual discovery is that we should just do things 3% differently from how we've done them before? I mean, I know she says things that you like from time to time, but that fundamental insight that she should be having and is not having annoys me.

BISHOP: Oh, yeah.

WOODS: Okay, I'm kicking that over to you.

BISHOP: Yeah, I mean, her big thing, like she wants to start new agencies; like she wants a Department of, I think, Child Welfare or something like that, which just, as long as we keep Jeffrey Epstein away from that — you know, that's a whole different thing. She wants to do the Department of Peace, which has been one of her big things for a while, which might — you know, if you reformed the Pentagon into the Department of Peace, I mean, that might be a slight improvement in some ways.

But yeah, I mean, it's the same standard progressive stuff in a bag, though it was interesting to see the think pieces that came out yesterday, where they were trying to make her out — like you now have a lot of leftists who are concerned that she is taking away some of the spark from the more appropriate left-wing candidates. So they're trying to paint her out to be some sort of spiritual reactionary, because she dared give spiritual advice to gay people suffering from HIV in New York and tell them that they should consider what their own actions played, rather than simply blaming the system that oppressed them. And how her entire spiritual philosophy, it's all about understanding that you as an individual have power on your

life and that you can't simply play the play the victim card. Those pieces are the best propaganda out there to make my ironic support for Marianne Williamson become slightly less ironic. But yeah, every time she actually talks about policy, it never gets there, and the reparations thing I think is — the more that the Democrats embrace it, I think the more Trump is going to smile.

The advantage she has, though, on the stage, which is the same thing that Tulsi has, the same thing that Andrew Yang, the same thing that few of these others have, is that at least when they talk, I mean, even if they don't know what they're talking about, the sound often [inaudible] talking about it. Whereas you get someone like Kamala Harris up there, and she appears to have all of the authenticity of Dana Bash's dye job. She keeps talking out of both sides of her mouth. She doesn't know where to go. She'll go from one side on the health care debate to the other. She has nothing else to bring up with Biden except for this busing issue. I thought she would get some new material.

But she's just one of these politicians that her reason for running is to get the White House. Policies are simply means to that end, and I'm interested to see what her next evolution is, because I think that she's going to constantly be changing her positions in order to take advantage of some of these voids that are going to open up as we have more candidates start dropping out.

WOODS: I have to, because I can't help myself, just address something that keeps coming up in these debates, which is that the climate crisis will nevertheless create a lot of jobs, millions of jobs. I think it was Harris who said that Donald Trump is so ignorant, he thinks wind turbines cause cancer. *They don't cause cancer; they cause jobs.* So I could understand somebody saying: look, we are facing an extremely challenging situation when it comes to climate change. It's a situation that threatens the future of life on this planet. And so for the time being, we're going to have to tighten our belts, live a little bit beneath our means, beneath the expectations we might have had for our material condition in order to cope with what we're facing. I could at least understand that.

What I don't understand is: we're facing an unbelievable crisis that's going to involve the expenditure of huge resources, but thank goodness we're facing this terrible crisis, because it'll put a lot of people to work and it'll create economic prosperity. I mean, if we weren't facing a crisis that threatens civilization, we would be in terrible shape, is what they seem to be saying. What a strange thing to say.

BISHOP: Absolutely. This of course goes back directly to kind of the original Green New Deal document, where AOC constantly was comparing her proposal to the lead-up to World War II. It's like, oh, if we can energize society and organize the economy in a way to come up with — World War II, I mean, at least they're explicitly trying to equate their policies to military preparedness.

But what's interesting, though, is that nobody seems to be identifying the fact that, hey, look, we know this issue is going to come, and if we simply keep using the phrase Green New Deal and we start debating on little-bit things at the margin, well, then, nobody's going to remember that the next day. Especially if you're a minor candidate, your goal is to have something a little bit different that will spin off a little bit more media, so that you might be able to get a little bit of a boost to keep playing the game. The fact that nobody's talking about nuclear energy, the fact that nobody is talking about any actual innovative solutions

outside of simply, oh, just give government more control, I think that kind of just shows the lack of creativity that they have there.

It also just shows how intellectually bankrupt I think that the left really is. I mean, they don't want to offer anything that's not a big-government solution, that doesn't stop that slow creep to full socialism that has become increasingly more popular on the left, in part because they're so afraid of alienating the progressive base, that if you have — like John Delaney, I know that you and Lew talked about this a great deal yesterday, how the moderates really aren't that moderate. But at least someone like John Delaney, who has a very interesting background in the private sector — it's a shame that he doesn't recognize that the threat the government actually plays to that. But he's got an interesting background. He has some plans that he's actually put a lot of effort in. And him simply pointing out little things like cost get him immediately savaged on Twitter as being some sort of right-wing reactionary that has no business being in the Democratic Party.

Anything that goes outside of questioning the fact that — this is Bernie Sanders' party now, which is actually I think one of the things that hurts his campaign, is that everyone sounds like him. It's very difficult to stand out, it's very difficult to go forward. But again, nobody on that stage that has any sort of real money raised, that has any sort of momentum, wants to offer anything outside of, you know, watered-down Bernie 2016 rhetoric.

BISHOP: Let's say something about that Harris and Gabbard exchange. Can you set it up and tell people exactly what happened? I mean, I bet a lot of people at least saw the clip.

WOODS: What was greatest was that — so we had just had a run on questions about criminal justice reform, generally. And CNN, being the enemy of the people, did not bring up Kamala Harris at all and her actual record as a prosecutor in California. And up to that point, I thought Tulsi — Tulsi could be frustrating to me, because I love her talking about war. I think that there are some other little parts about her background that I think are really interesting, more than just simply the antiwar side, which would have been enough by itself to be a lesser-evil sort of situation. But she was kind of playing timid. Her opening statement was forgettable.

And then all of a sudden, they asked her a question, and she goes right to Kamala Harris and saying: look, I'm really troubled by Kamala's record on criminal justice reform, because, well, she's out here is talking a good game. When she was in a position of power, she was locking up black families. She was destroying lives over marijuana, and then laughing about smoking it herself on radio. She highlighted just the really sinister side of Kamala Harris. I think she was extremely articulate at it.

And Kamala Harris — who should have seen this coming. I mean, Gabbard was telegraphing that she was going to go after Kamala Harris that night. She didn't know how to respond. And Kamala Harris' response was like, *Oh, well, Tulsi, it's easy for you to get a good speech, but oh, I had to do things that were being done.* I wanted to see Tulsi come back again and say, *Listen, lady, I was an actual soldier as a medic in Iraq. Don't tell me about simply giving political speeches for a living. That was what you were doing your entire career, but I've seen the realities of the world.*

But just simply the fact that she had that moment, it's been hugely successful on Twitter; it made her the most Googled candidate afterwards. Of course, now, social media is trying to

crack down on her organic search, because she is being perceived as a threat to the mainstream, and like she's a Russian bot candidate. She's an Assad apologist, which Kamala Harris actually tried to use afterwards. Of course, Tulsi Gabbard is an Assad apologist in the same way that anybody questioning whether Saddam had weapons of mass destruction was a Saddam Hussein apologist in 2001. They have nothing new against her.

It was good to see her actually spice it up a little bit, and we'll see if that's enough to actually give her campaign some real momentum, or if it's simply a black eye that Kamala Harris has to recover from. Because sometimes you have these moments — like, for example, Chris Christie knocking out Marco Rubio's candidacy, the best thing he's ever done in politics, it didn't help his candidacy at all, Christie's that is, but it did successfully destroy Rubio. It will be interesting to see the long-term consequences of that back and forth, because I don't think there's any question about it, she was the big winner last night just for delivering those easy-to-share viral moments.

WOODS: And what it kind of makes you wonder about is, given that Harris did get propelled into top-tier status after the first debate, why is Tulsi the only one doing this? These facts are available to anybody.

BISHOP: Yeah.

WOODS: And if you want to emerge from the basement, you're going to have to do something bold. Why is she the only one who wants to — and basically, the argument she was making were very antiestablishment arguments. She's saying, Harris, at least when it comes to criminal prosecution, is part of the establishment, and I'm going to take her down. Well, good for her, because everybody else is either too cowardly or lazy to do it.

BISHOP: Well, I think for a lot of them — for example, if you are a governor from a state and you're a white guy, the fact that you're running in this Democratic primary at all kind of shows just how little you understand the political world you're dealing with. Because again, I think if a lot of them — if Michael Bennet, the senator from Colorado, who may have the smallest mouth I've ever seen in an adult male, if he actually went after Kamala Harris — and I don't know if he particular cares about this issue, but if he actually went after Kamala Harris like that, we know exactly what the response would be. *Oh, Senator Bennet is mansplaining to Kamala Harris, a woman of color, criminal justice reform*, right? They have their hands cuffed because of the ridiculous identity politics of the left right now. So I think that works in Tulsi's favor. So I think that helps her.

But you did see a few more of the other candidates get a little more comfortable going after the, I guess kind of still nominally the frontrunner, but definitely falling backwards, Joe Biden. He had a big back-and-forth with Cory Booker. At one point, it looked like Cory Booker wanted to take a swing at the guy, which would have made it for far more entertaining television and made this recap a lot more entertaining. De Blasio went after him. Castro went after him in some really good Obama-alum-versus-Obama-alum crime.

But I think it's precisely the fact that Tulsi Gabbard is a woman on the stage that gives her the perfect opportunity to go after Kamala Harris. And what's interesting is that she didn't even get into the commander-in-chief stuff, which Tulsi Gabbard brought on the campaign trail, I think it was last week, saying that she doesn't think Kamala Harris is even fit to be commander-in-chief because of her background. That wasn't brought up at all. And so again,

if she can keep qualifying for these debates, we are going to see more fireworks between the two, and that's great.

And some free advice out there for Tulsi Gabbard: I mean, she should be trying to knock on your door, begging to get on your podcast, Tom. She should be trying to get on Dave Smith's podcast. She should be trying to do Michael Malice, the *Ron Paul Report*, because the only shot that she has is broadening her donation base. And the best way she could possibly do it is reaching out to libertarians. Andrew Yang actually gave a shout out —

WOODS: Yeah, he even said, I'm building a coalition that includes libertarians and conservatives. Yet why would she not want to do that? I mean, and she doesn't even have to be so open about it. Her supporters don't even have to know she was on Dave Smith's show. But she'll definitely get hundreds of donations from it.

BISHOP: Oh, absolutely. Like if you were libertarian and you're not willing to donate \$1 to a very effective antiwar — basically just think of it as a PSA. Okay, she's going to say dopey stuff about free college. She can't be trusted on gun policy. I get that. Those are big things. We should ignore that. But if you simply have the opportunity to pay \$1 to see an antiwar PSA go in front of 10 million people on CNN, and best of all, cause Jennifer Rubin's head to explode in *The Washington Post* next day, you know, there are far worse ways of spending \$1. So I personally have given Tulsi \$1 myself. I wish she would just do more outreach to libertarians, because this is such an obvious base for her. And when you consider that New Hampshire has that sort of built-in network there, it is just — I don't know who is managing her campaign. Maybe the person managing her campaign really doesn't care that much about it. But she is just committing — it's just stupidity not to be offering a handout to natural allies that care about her signature issue.

WOODS: All right, let's say a little something about the attacks on Joe Biden. They're all sort of predictable. It's that Joe Biden is too right-wing because of positions he held 25 years ago, or something. And I remember — maybe it was Castro? I forget. But he responded to one of them by saying: look, you're really unhappy with me right now because of what happened in the Obama administration, but you were there at the time, and I don't recall you saying anything at the time. The only thing that appears to have changed is that the two of us are running for president.

And I know that that response obviously didn't really land, but it did land with me, because I thought I could just imagine being in Biden's position, and these ambitious people just exploiting the situation who couldn't have cared less obviously about half the things they're talking about when they actually had power to do something about it, but now suddenly, they're going to be the great crusaders for justice in front of everybody. And it's just a little bit too much for Biden to stand there and take. I mean, out of the 300-and-something million people in America, I at least appreciated that point, because I know the type. I know that type. At the time, not a word, because all these people, they portray themselves as crusaders for justice and how courageous they are, but nine times out of ten, when they're in a position to do anything, they clam up.

BISHOP: Oh, yeah. It's always good to see some of these self-important, self-righteous politicians called out for their baloney. And that I thought was the highlight of Biden's performance, where he could take a punch and throw it right back at them. But what's interesting is that Biden faced this sort of criticism three ways, and this isn't going anywhere.

This is an issue that's going to remain with him. But he got attacked by Castro, he got attacked by de Blasio, and he got attacked by the audience itself. You actually had that chanting about deportations. So that's not a good sign either. So he got attacked three ways on that issue.

But the problem is that Biden's only justification for running at all is being Obama's VP. And Castro had a good follow-up on this and was saying: hey, look, Joe, nobody likes invoking the name Barack Obama more than you do, but when it actually comes to his record, you try to say that, oh, you have no fingerprints on it. I mean, that is also hypocritical from Biden's side. So again, I think that Biden has the position he has simply because of name recognition, because of that Obama prestige. He's actually doing better with black voters than Kamala Harris is and some of the others, which might be a little surprising, except for the fact that that's just Obama carryover. And what's interesting, though, is that he's not fundraising the way that you would expect a Hillary Clinton sort of candidate in the race to do, which again, I think shows some of the underlying cracks in his campaign and why I don't think he's going to win his state when it's all said and done.

But yeah, he opens himself up to all of this. And there was the great line about, you know, Castro was trying to describe Trump's economic policies as white nationalist. I just wanted someone to ask, you know, does Obama, being a far bigger deporter-in-chief, does that make him a half-white nationalist? Because again, the idea that they can use these attacks on Trump and call him names on some of this stuff, and then completely run away from the actual realities of the Obama administration, I think the superficial nature of all this, I think, is one of the reasons that these people are struggling, offering anything of actual substance during any of these debates.

WOODS: We can't have a white nationalist in the White House. How hysterical can you possibly be?

BISHOP: Of course, I mean, last night Don Lemon said that it's racist to say that Maryland has rats.

WOODS: Yeah, that that was a racist tweet.

BISHOP: Oh, yeah. There's a big online meme out there about how birds aren't real. I mean, maybe Don Lemon believes that rats aren't real. Perhaps that is his justification behind all of this.

WOODS: Well, I mean, look, I think it's about time that somebody said: look, the Democrats have been in charge of the major cities for half a century. And as a result of that, do we have gleaming metropolises everywhere?

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: I mean, everybody — how stupid would you have to be? Have you visited Baltimore? Have you visited these places? They're uninhabitable in some parts. They're obviously — and the people the live there know that better than anybody. I mean, for crying out loud. Somebody who actually lives there could seriously be offended by that statement? Grow up.

Come on. I mean, look around at these places. Give me a break. And apparently there is a well-known libertarian podcast that went, *Oh, yeah, it was very racist to say that*.

BISHOP: No, yeah.

WOODS: Can we just stop being seven years old all the time? I mean, okay, fine. Fine. Use whatever word you want to use. What about the content of the statement? I don't care what word you want to use that's fashionable and chic to describe it. What about the content of the claim?

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: I mean, are these places desirable? Do you want to move there? I'll help you move. We'll get moving vans, and we'll get these people to go there. Of course, not in a million years would they want to move to any of these places, which proves the point.

BISHOP: And people are leaving in droves for a good reason. I mean, Trump is great at playing the role of pied piper of the media. Sometimes his destinations don't make a lot of sense even for him, like he'll distract from otherwise good news in the news cycle. And you know, Trump is Trump. But I think this is one of his most brilliant moves yet, and I think that it's probably something that he will continue on. I mean, we're going to have Democrats defending San Francisco streets covered in poop.

WOODS: Yes, exactly.

BISHOP: We're going to have Democrats defending Chicago. I mean, I think this is one of the best strategies he's used. Basically, I mean, these people in these neighborhoods, they know — they may not like Trump, but I think that if you really go to them and are like, look, you're you've been taken advantage of —

WOODS: Obviously.

BISHOP: — I think that is the best message that he could possibly come up with, with some of these people.

WOODS: Yeah, I like the idea of forcing them to defend what's going on in San Francisco. And then all you've got to do — the ads right themselves.

BISHOP: Oh, yeah.

WOODS: You have a camera in a car that just covers everything that you're seeing as you're driving by, and then you just have voiceovers of Democrats talking about how wonderful these places are and that it's racist to say there might be anything wrong with them. And then you interview a couple of people who say:

Yeah, I live in an unsafe and filthy neighborhood, and yeah, I've voted for Democratic and even black politicians my whole life, and it's been exactly this way my whole life. So yeah, I guess I'm over people saying it's racist to say anything. I don't care what you say it is to say. I would like to have a livable place. Is that so wrong? I would like to have a place that's livable.

That's all I'm asking for. And anybody who says anything about the way I'm living is immediately condemned.

I mean, this thing is, it just boggles my mind there. And there are actually libertarians out there who are upset about the perceived racism of pointing out that the Democrats have not exactly created a paradise on earth, which is — the logic of their argument is that the more government spending there is, the better people's quality of life will be. Well, then New York City and these other places, every single thing that — it should be a paradise. Whereas it's unaffordable, for one thing. Forget about the filth. In New York, it's unaffordable for people, and they don't have to answer for it.

BISHOP: Again, these respectable libertarian circles in the Beltway, I don't know if they're intentionally — maybe it's an inside job. But yeah, this sort of response to these sort of things — or I loved it last week, where Rand Paul, how dare Rand Paul say rude things about a politician?

WOODS: Yeah.

BISHOP: I mean, we're libertarian. Like we're supposed to be making fun of politicians. I guess we have to tone-police our political rhetoric on, again, people that want to destroy us. Like that's what the ideology of the far-left Democrats are. They're not looking for compromise. They're not looking to live and let live. I mean, they're looking to destroy private property. They're looking to destroy capitalism.

WOODS: Yeah, but beyond that, though, Rand was Mother Teresa compared to the way these libertarians treat other libertarians.

BISHOP: Yes.

WOODS: The things they say, the implication that they're fascists or that they're maybe kind of like Hitler. I mean, I hear this from so-called libertarians. *And that's perfectly fine, but don't you dare say anything about a sitting member of Congress because you're just* — I mean, what the — ? You know, I belong to the Hans Hoppe school that says that what you need to do with politicians is ridicule them at every opportunity. Instead of buying into this idea that they're a separate class of people who deserve a certain dignity, or, *I want my president to be presidential* — what? Stop talking like that. Stop talking like that. You are validating the whole regime, every time you say things like, "I wish he would behave in a word that's more presidential." Stop talking like your third grade teacher, for crying out loud.

BISHOP: And that's precisely why Murray Rothbard had more influence on the political system than just about any other libertarian out there. This is exactly what he understood well. We have to get normal people entertained and outraged at what these parasites are doing. If you are a libertarian out there, you don't realize that Rand Paul's only true political value is being Donald Trump's golf buddy, and making fun of John Bolton either in front of or behind his back, and then trying to get him to not bomb Iran like that. That is the most important thing out there. And guess what: if insulting a politician — a *politician* — helps with that end, well, then I hope he does it every single day, because that is what matters.

WOODS: Yeah.

BISHOP: Just the fact these people don't get it — I get at a certain point, you have to start wondering whether these people are just that incompetent or whether they truly have ulterior motives, because it is unbelievable.

WOODS: And to say that Rand is being xenophobic when Rand is the guy who would like to prevent foreigners from being killed.

BISHOP: Right.

WOODS: And they say that about Ron Paul, that he's xenophobic or whatever. Okay, but no one called John McCain xenophobic. But you know what? I will officially say it. John McCain was xenophobic, because, I mean, really, it was one war after another with this guy. And I happen to think that killing people is worse than calling them names. I do.

BISHOP: That's a bold standard.

WOODS: I think killing people is worse than calling them names.

BISHOP: Yeah.

WOODS: So all right, let's talk about winners and losers.

BISHOP: Okay.

WOODS: So you said Tulsi is a winner in some sense, but we don't know if she's going to reach the threshold necessary to get into the next debate. I don't know that for sure. But how do you assess winners and losers and maybe people who just stood still? You don't have to go through all of them, the ones who stood out to you.

BISHOP: Yeah, I think the winners, as far as the meme candidates in this cycle here, I would be surprised if Tulsi does not qualify for the next debate based off of this performance. Now, whether it goes forward, we'll see. Again, she could be a little smarter in who she reaches out to help secure that, but I think she did enough there to get her to the next debate stage. I think the same is true with Andrew Yang.

I think as far as kind of the normal people, I think that Booker, he still has enough money in the bank, and I thought his performance last night was, of the respectable candidates on the stage, I thought he helped himself perhaps the most. Castro has been solid, I think, in terms of normal Democratic circles. We actually had, I was watching the debate last night with an Auburn student here who's a lefty, and yeah, I didn't let him know that I was on the other side on this one, so it was interesting getting his feedback. And he really liked Booker in this. Castro, I think, would have been competent enough; the problem is he's bleeding money. So I think at this point, if you do not have enough money in the bank to pay your staff for the next couple of months, then you're not going to be long in this race. And so if you haven't had that breakout moment, by this point, you're not going to do it. So I think most of the stage is going to go down very, very soon.

And I think as far as the people that, going forward — I think this was a bad night for Kamala Harris, and I thought it was a bad night for Joe Biden. And I was surprised by how bad the

instant analysis from the CNN people was for Joe Biden last night. I thought they were trying to prop him up a little bit, because he did a little bit better than last time, but they still weren't giving him love. So the losers that matter: Kamala Harris and Joe Biden. The big winner was Gabbard, I think and the other two winners were Booker and Yang. The rest I just don't think matter. And unfortunately for New Yorkers, that means that Bill de Blasio may be spending more time in his city again, so my condolences to Michael Malice.

WOODS: Yeah, indeed, indeed. All right, well, I don't think I have — I'm trying to think if there's anything particularly we want to link to. Yeah, let's link on the show notes page to the exchange between Tulsi and Harris. Let's do that. Yeah, yeah, yeah. So let's put that video, that'll be a [TomWoods.com/1460](https://www.TomWoods.com/1460). And Tho, I don't know what they're going to be doing with the debates. Maybe there'll be two; maybe there'll be one. But either way, we'll have to talk again soon. Thanks a lot.

BISHOP: It's been a pleasure and an honor, Tom.