



Episode 1,492: Lew and I Watched the Debate So You Didn't Have To

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: I'm sorry I keep doing this to you, Lew. I don't even know what the point is. I mean, they're all the same. These stupid debates, they're just all the same. The Republican debates were, I think, more fun, because there you had people, some of whose rhetoric sounded like they agreed with us more than they really did, and to root them out and nail them was fun. And some of them were just so dopey. That was fun. But I don't know, this is a horse of a different color. I don't know what to say about this situation. But do you have any overall impressions?

ROCKWELL: Well, I think first of all, it's great that we're doing this so people don't have to watch this.

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL: Because my overall impression was how unbelievably boring it was.

WOODS: I know. So to everyone listening, you're welcome.

ROCKWELL: [laughing] So I thought Biden did well during the first hour, and my guess is nobody was watching the second and the third hour. I'll be interested to see when we get the figures on that, because it was just so boring. And Biden sort of started to stumble in typical fashion in the second and the third hours. Apparently, the poor guy has trouble with his teeth, which I hadn't realized. But I don't think people were watching. Although I noticed on the Drudge poll, which I always love looking at, Andrew Yang came in first.

WOODS: I know. His people are going to vote in those polls.

ROCKWELL: [laughing] And I think Biden came in second, and Klobuchar third. And they're all promoting Klobuchar, and she really is so great and wonderful. And I know from people who worked on the Hill and work on the Hill, that she's notorious for being unbelievably vicious to her staff. I mean, she just loves us yelling at them, screaming at them. And I think when somebody is nasty to people who can't fight back, that tells you something about their personalities. So my guess is she wouldn't be a good president, even outside of the fact that she is a crazy socialist.

And of course, they were all crazy socialists. They all agreed on seizing people's guns. Beto O'Rourke was hailed for saying that he was going to have a mandatory buyback. By the way,

why do they refer to this as a buyback? People didn't buy their guns from the government. It's a seizure or a confiscation, although they refuse to use those words.

And I do think that Warren, who got to 7% in the Drudge poll, hurt herself by getting the most time to talk. I think she's just extremely irritating. She really dodged the question about much higher taxes on middle class people for her Medicare-for-all program, which apparently Bernie doesn't entirely do, although I don't think you can trust him. All of these people are going to impose much higher taxes on middle class people, on the rich.

And of course, you're going to have people leaving the country. I did notice that Carl Icahn is moving his business and his home to Florida to get away from the taxes of New York. And it's true, very few rich people from New York die in New York — I think Icahn is 83 — because New York has a terrible inheritance tax. So all the rich people move out of the state as they're getting older, and good for them, so that the government of New York doesn't get to seize the money they're leaving, and that their heirs or whatever charities they're leaving it to are going to get it instead.

So I think that Warren just hurt herself. She's just very, very irritating. And Biden is very irritating too, of course. These people are all socialists, and even though they don't call themselves that, and I liked the fact that Elizabeth Warren is really a communist, as some bloggers on LRC have shown, and I'd be glad, by the way, to send people the links to that, about her seizing people's wealth and really having the government run the entire economy in an iron-handed fashion. She really is a very, very dangerous person. But of course, all these people are dangerous.

And Trump is dangerous too, so we don't have much of a choice. I will say that they didn't talk that much about Trump except to call him a white supremacist. And as you pointed out, there's no such thing as a white supremacist, or maybe there's 17 of them. But the whole thing, the whole part of the debate was concentrated on the evil of white people in America, how they are responsible for everything bad that has ever happened to people of color. And I think that people watching that, if they did watch it, will be offended by it.

And I noticed that, I think it was Beto O'Rourke got great applause for saying that America didn't begin in 1776, and that's certainly true. He said it began in 1619 when the first black slave was brought to America, and the reason that black people are behind other — they never mention Asians, of course, who are actually the first rather than white people — but are behind is because they never were compensated for their time in slavery, and that's why we needed a reparations bill. And they all talk about the unbelievable racism in America, that everything is racist. All institutions are racist. Most people are racist, and we need the government to really take the whip hand and straighten people out. So I think it's an alarming prospect.

And my guess is they were also talked to by consultants. I noticed nobody said "free health care for all illegal aliens who want to come here," and also none of them talked about open borders, so I think they've learned their lesson from the previous debate, when I think that dramatically hurt the Democrats when they talked about bringing everybody in who wanted to come in and giving them not only, of course, free healthcare, but welfare and housing and incomes and so forth. Milton Friedman, who was for open borders in general, I'm sorry to say, but he did say it was ridiculous, and in fact, impossible to have it if you had a welfare state.

It would bankrupt the government. And certainly this would happen, but they're not talking about that anymore.

They're just talking about, of course, the evil of Trump, the evil of white people, the evil of capitalism, and we need to have the government run everything. So I hope people who watched that were turned off. Probably they turned off the television. Who can blame them? I wanted to turn off the television. They really are a very unpleasant bunch.

Castro stood out for implying that Biden had forgotten something because he was too old, and I noticed that right after the debate was over, the people on ABC looked at the transcript and saw that what Castro was accusing Biden of saying he didn't say, and that Castro lost by attacking Biden like that. Who knows? I don't think Castro had a chance anyway. And whether we want a president who's going to talk Spanish on TV with Jorge Ramos, the vicious creep who was on there last night and hates Americans – and most of these people hate Americans. And if you're an American, if you're glad to be an American – not that there's not plenty wrong with this country, because of course, one of the things, of course, is the foreign policy of America, destroying so many countries overseas and thinking they should like it.

None of them, of course – they left out the two most interesting candidates. First Tulsi Gabbard, who bravely talks about what is good in American foreign policy and the evil of it, and also she took down Kamala Harris, who got, by the way, a similar question from one of the moderators. She didn't handle it well, about her own record as a vicious prosecutor in California. So they left out Tulsi Gabbard. They also left out Marianne Williamson. Now, she's a crazy, sort of secular evangelist, but she was at least interesting.

So these people are very boring, and this is something Trump has got over them. Whatever is wrong with Trump, and boy, there is plenty wrong with Trump, he's not boring. I mean, he can actually hold these long sessions that he has in various states where he just talks to people, to thousands of people, and thousands of people try to get in and can't get into these rallies. And if you could imagine Elizabeth Warren drawing 15, 20, 30,000 people to a rally where she just talks, it would never happen, nor any of these other people.

So my guess is Trump is probably going to win, although if we have a big recession before the election, probably he won't win, and one of these guys will win. I don't think the prospects are very good for America in terms of the election, whether it's a Democrat or whether it's Trump. He just called for zero interest rates or lower than zero interest rates, which I'm afraid to say the Fed is going to accommodate him on that. So I think that we're in for probably a rough ride, as Ron Paul points out.

On the other hand, Trump did fire Bolton, although why the heck he ever hired Bolton is, of course, another question.

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL: And I think the rumor is that Sheldon Adelson asked him to do so, and he's the richest donor to the Republican Party. So we'll just have to see, but the story is – and this may be just propaganda to fool us. The story is that they got into a fight because Trump said, I want to have toxin with Iran, and that means we need to lower our sanctions, and that Bolton just blew his top and denounced that idea and denounced Trump for saying so. And

that was when Trump fired him. So who will Trump have? I don't know. He could have somebody decent, but the rumors are he's going to have somebody just as horrible as Bolton. So I don't think we'll be seeing peace talks with Iran anytime soon. But I hope I'm wrong on that. I hope we are going to see some peace talks.

But these Democrats are all warmongers. They all, by the way, hate China. This is, of course, the new thing. We're all supposed to hate China. We're supposed to I guess forget what China was like under Mao Zedong. And whatever is wrong with China today, they've made unbelievable progress not only in economics, but in civil liberties. Christianity is allowed in China, where it wasn't allowed before, and China has come a huge way. And of course, everybody is saying, *They want to become the leading country in the world. How dare they? That's America.* Well, I don't think China, its economy, it's way behind the United States. Will it someday become the leading country in the world? Well, what is wrong with that? Why does the US have to be the world government and run every country? This is just an assumption that everybody seems to make.

So they all hate China. Republicans all hate China. And I guess they all still hate Russia, too. So politics in America, it's disturbing always, but it's especially disturbing now we don't have Ron Paul. We don't even have Tulsi Gabbard, although she still is running. But she won't get a platform, I'm afraid.

WOODS: The foreign policy issue I think we should say a little something about, because you just mentioned it.

ROCKWELL: Yeah.

WOODS: There were some sensible things said by some people, like about there's really nothing to be accomplished militarily in Afghanistan at this point. It is stupid to try. But on the other hand, we've heard that one before, and then nothing comes of it. I thought probably the best line, in my opinion anyway, was Bernie saying to Biden: well, the difference between you and me is I never fell for what Cheney and Bush said about Iraq.

ROCKWELL: That's right.

WOODS: And so he brings in Cheney before Bush, surely on purpose, because Cheney is still hated, even though now these days, Democrats are nostalgic for Bush because he was nicer than Trump. Sure, he killed a lot more people, but those people weren't Americans, so they don't really count. It's so funny. The anti-racist Democrats, if Bush had led to that many deaths of Americans, oh, they'd be appalled. *But it's Iraq. I mean, come on, we don't even know these towel heads.* I mean, that's basically their attitude. It's shocking to me that so-called progressive Democrats would look back and say, *I miss those days when George W. Bush would hold hands with Michelle Obama.* Yeah, I miss those days when the establishment was in charge. I mean, there's something wrong with these people. But that was a good line from Bernie, I thought.

But geez, that guy, he can't be charismatic for two minutes, you know? Two minutes. Two minutes would be — I'm asking too much. He can't be charismatic for ten seconds. It's hectoring and yelling. And so it's like Elizabeth Warren, hectoring and yelling the whole time, which I think, if she's up against Trump — I'm not saying she was she wouldn't win. It's

possible. I think Trump has not built on his base. I think he's still got most of the base, but he hasn't really built on it, expanded it in the four years, so he could be in for some trouble. But I am saying, however, that in terms of the visuals of a debate with Warren and Trump, she would be this hectoring, angry woman, and he would be this absolutely confident man making jokes about her. And I'd like to have a super intellectual debate, but knowing that's not going to happen, I will say that that would get a lot of people's attention. There are a lot of people in America who would say, *Yeah, I'd rather have that guy. I don't want to tell my neighbors that, but I'd rather have that guy.*

ROCKWELL: No, and Warren, of course, kept saying that she wanted to be a public school teacher all her life from the second grade. And she was a public school teacher, and the only candidate who was a public school teacher, will go back to being a public school teacher. Why is she a senator? Why was she a professor at Harvard? And of course, part of it was that she portrayed herself as an American Indian. And obviously, nothing's lied. You just have to look at her and know that's not true. But nobody on the Democratic side is talking about that, but we can be sure that definitely Trump is going to talk about it, that she's a liar and fraud, an affirmative action fraud. There's relatively little affirmative action fraud in this country, by the way. It probably is a tribute. But she was a fraud, is a fraud. And I think and hope she'll be taken down over that.

But the foreign policy question, of course, is essential. She also said had some good things to say about Afghanistan, but I don't think you can – can you believe them? I mean, as the moderators kept pointing out, well, the generals think that we need to say in Afghanistan. Oh, okay. And do what? Continue to kill people, destroy their societies, and promote heroin production, which of course goes on in the section of Afghanistan controlled by the other drug lords who have always been associated with the US. The US has always been allied with the drug lords in Afghanistan.

So they're all talking about how we need to do more for Honduras and Guatemala and other countries in Central America. It was pointed out at Ron Paul's conference recently in Washington, DC, or near Washington, I should say, that in 2009, the US overthrew the elected president of Honduras and installed its own guy, who's a monster. So that's when, of course the real outside immigration started. That's when people started leaving, and does anybody point that out? No, of course not. So the US, of course, has a long record of overthrowing other governments and installing its own horrible people.

But the fact that they did this in Honduras in 2009, and this was unknown – I'd never heard of it. It was Rick Sanchez, who was fired by CNN and is now an RT TV star, talks about this. And he said, so far as he knew, he was the only person in the media to talk about what happened, what the US did in Honduras. So the US, of course, has a long history of horrendous practices in Central America, has been responsible for the killing of hundreds of thousands of people, installing vicious dictators, and of course, nobody discusses this. Nobody discusses, again, what they're doing and the total destruction of Iraq, because they were allegedly involved in 9/11, which, of course, everybody knew wasn't true at the time.

And I also liked the fact that Bernie said he was the only one who voted against all three of Trump's military appropriation bills. Well, that was good, but of course, he voted for all the ones before that. Any he especially is for the this F-35 fighter, which is partially built in Vermont. So he's not entirely honest on the war question. But he did vote against the Iraq War, and of course, Biden voted for it.

And Biden, of course, is one of the most establishment guys ever to run for president. And they're all members of the establishment. None of them are antiestablishment. Not Bernie, not Warren. They're all in bed with the establishment. And they'll all do its will. Maintaining troops in 800 bases overseas and all the wars and seizure and looting and destruction that the US calls bringing democracy and freedom are going to continue if these people are in power, and I'm afraid they're going to continue if Trump is in power.

By the way, all of them think it's a great thing to destroy Venezuela, all these Democrats, and Maduro's evil and they didn't have free elections. And nobody pointed out that the sainted Juan Guaido, the US-approved, so-called president of Venezuela, when they had the last election, he and his party abstained from voting. So there was only one side voting, so amazingly, Maduro won. And so again, how many Americans know that? We're just supposed to starve everybody to death in Venezuela, make them all into refugees, bring them all here, put them on welfare. Won't that be great?

So there's nobody sound on any sorts of issues, whether it's war, immigration, growth of the state. Nobody talks about economics. Nobody talks about the Fed, by the way. The Fed was unmentioned, as is typical in these things. So these people are all evil. Don't vote for them, is my advice.

WOODS: Pretty good advice. Lew, you mentioned Castro talking about, we should help these countries in a new Marshall Plan and that that will help. So it actually made me look up – at this point, this is an old book now. 15 years old now, my *Politically Incorrect Guide to American History*, hard to believe, Lew, it was that long ago that it came out.

ROCKWELL: It's a great book, Tom, and everybody should read it. Everybody should buy your book.

WOODS: Well, thank you. I appreciate that. That's just good advice, good life advice in general. If there's a Woods book, go out and buy it. So I went and looked it up. I looked up what I – because I remember, I have a section on the Marshall Plan, but I wanted to get the exact details.

So it's a myth that – the really great thing, one of the really good things Tyler Cowen wrote was years ago, he had a scholarly article about the Marshall Plan, assessing whether it really did live up to the hype. Because the idea was, these countries are devastated after the war, and poverty tends to lead to communism, so if we send them money, this will make things better, and it'll accelerate the recovery and all that. But it's not enough just to say that we sent them the money and then just assume that it all worked out.

So it's interesting to note that the economic recoveries of France, Germany, and Italy already was underway before they got any Marshall aid. And then per capita, Austria and Greece got substantial amounts of Marshall aid, but they started to recover only as they were phasing it out. And then Britain got twice as much Marshall aid as Germany, and yet they lagged considerably behind Germany in terms of economic growth over the next decade. So that's not a home run by any means, but nobody knows that. So you just hear "Marshall Plan," you think that sounds good idea.

Another thing I noted was Bernie was saying that it's unfair to use the term democratic socialism and associate it with Venezuela. That's just not fair. That's not socialism. But what's funny is, back in 2013, a guy who's now on his team, his campaign team, David Serota, over either at *Slate* or *Salon* had an article in which he said that everybody on the right wing in America is very upset about Venezuela, because it shows what socialism can accomplish. He said that this is flat-out socialism. He said that. So in other words, it's socialism up until the starvation occurs .15 minutes before the starvation, it is real socialism. Then suddenly, even though nothing about it has changed, it is not real socialism, and we just want Sweden. Okay, well, I'm not sure I'm going for that.

And then finally, Lew, I want to read a little passage. This is from another Woods book, the worst-titled book in the history of the world, *33 Questions About American History You're Not Supposed to Ask*. Why the publisher did not intervene and insist we have to come up with something better than that, I'll never know. But given that we did have some talk last night about education, and what we need is to spend more money, and there's a racial achievement gap, and we haven't spent enough money and all that, well, they talk as if that hasn't been tried a million times already. They act as if this is a bold, new plan, and this is going to solve our problems.

So one of them — I don't maybe, it was Beto. I don't know — said that we've got a situation where even in kindergarten, we have black students more likely to be disciplined and so on. Okay, but it turns out that black teachers are even more likely to discipline black students who are five years old. So it's not the case that this is just mean, old, white women who hate black kids. That is not what the numbers show at all. And we also find that Asian students are less than half as likely as whites to be suspended or expelled. So again, they can't mention that. That just has to go unmentioned.

So they say, okay, but it's a matter of social class, right? That's why we have this difference, and so therefore, we've got to spend more money in certain neighborhoods and so on. But my old professor at Harvard, Stephan Thernstrom, wrote a book in the early 2000s, or maybe mid 2000s, called *No Excuses*. Now, Thernstrom, only an idiot would call him a racist. I mean, he was a serious, serious social historian and a real authority on race. So he gave the example of Shaker Heights, Ohio. That's an affluent Cleveland suburb. The high school there spends 50% more per pupil than the national average. And in terms of education and income levels, the black residents of the town are only slightly below their white counterparts. But yet, the same racial gap in achievement persist there, as in basically all other school districts in the country. So this is from my book, just summarizing the Thernstrom findings:

"Even though the school makes a special effort to urge black students to take advanced placement courses — students can take whatever courses they want, regardless of test scores or past grades — only 30% do, compared with 87% of whites. Two-thirds of the city's blacks failed at least one of Ohio's state proficiency tests in 1999 to 2000, whereas that was true only have one sixth of whites. And while over half the white students passed the test with honors, only 4% of blacks did. That number, according to the Thernstroms, was no higher than the statewide average for African Americans, despite the fact that the income and educational levels of black families in Shaker Heights were far above those for blacks in Ohio as a whole, and their children were attending integrated schools that were regarded as among the best in the state."

Now, that's just one example, and there are many, many others. But then, also, I think I want to read this. Even though it's lengthy, Lew, I want to get it on the record.

ROCKWELL: Please.

WOODS: And I'll have these books linked at TomWoods.com/1492. So at first, we were told that desegregation will solve these problems. Now, they've modified it a bit saying that the beneficial results of desegregation can be achieved, if accompanied by some substantial policy changes, like culturally sensitive textbooks, relaxing disciplinary measures to account for cultural differences between blacks and whites — that's how the behavioral differences are described — and the abolition of heterogeneous grouping, or ability tracking. So you have the more advanced students in certain classes; we're going to abolish that because that's racially discriminatory.

So the claim is that some progress was made in narrowing the black-white gap until about 1990. And so they say that goes to show that it works. And so desegregation is responsible for why there was some narrowing of the achievement gap. But actually, the statistics will not bear this — the explanation can't bear scrutiny here, because between 1975 and 1988, which were the years of the greatest black improvement, black 13-year-olds who were in predominantly minority schools, where indeed, less money is spent on average, achieved essentially the same gains and reading scores as their counterparts in majority white schools. So it's not clear that the money is really the explanatory factor in anything.

Then moreover, blacks in predominantly minority schools actually gained ten points more in math than did blacks and majority white schools. Other age groups show similar results. So David Armor, who's an education scholar, says that during the same period, age nine blacks in segregated schools — so again, these are schools where typically less money is spent — gain 12 points in reading and 17 points in math, compared with 11 points and 16 points, respectively, for blacks in desegregated schools. For age 17 blacks, those in segregated schools gained 34 points in reading and 22 points in math, compared to 21 and 17 points, respectively, for those of desegregated schools. So overall, by 1990, there was a difference of only a few points in the reading and math scores of age nine blacks in de facto segregated schools, versus those in desegregated schools, and hardly any measurable difference at all in the scores of black 17-year-olds.

Now, I mention that because — now, it's a rough proxy, but you can, as a rough proxy, think of segregated schools as being ones where perhaps, indeed, less money is spent per pupil, and yet, that's actually where blacks wound up doing even better. So the idea that the problem is, we just haven't spent enough money, no matter what they do with the money, the problem is that in 12th grade, the average black student is approximately, in most subjects, where the average white student is. And they have tried every conceivable thing. In the most progressive school districts everywhere, where you would assume that couldn't possibly be systemic racism, they've tried it absolutely everywhere, and they still come up with the same dismal results. And then they get on the debate stage, and they say, here's a brand new idea. Let's just spend more money on the public school. I mean, I wonder if even they actually believe that, or they think, well, I don't know. I don't know what to do at this point. I guess I'll just say we'll spend more money. Okay, if you want absolute, guaranteed failure, then do that.

ROCKWELL: Also, all teachers should be paid at least \$60,000 a year.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah.

ROCKWELL: That's what was proposed last night.

WOODS: Yeah, that's the problem.

ROCKWELL: They're crazed, although I do think we can't dismiss the racial achievement gap. Tom, we need to do something about it. Why are white kids doing so much poorly than Asian kids?

WOODS: Of course, we can't talk about that. Yeah, yeah. And you know, there's an interesting —

ROCKWELL: Asian kids are smarter. They have higher IQs. Excuse me for mentioning that.

WOODS: They surveyed students and they asked: what grade would you get in trouble for if you got it in school? Like how low would your grades have to be for you to start getting in trouble? And for the Asian kids, it was like A minus, like that already. And for the white kids, it was like in the B range, a little bit below a B, you're going to start getting in trouble. And for the black kids, it was like in the C range. So right off the bat, the expectations are radically different across groups. How is that not going to have an impact? So the differences are very substantial, and there are differences of all kinds that, of course, are going to lead to different results. How could that not? I mean, why would you — really, how dense would you have to be to think that, under such circumstances, the results should be absolutely equal? Why would they be? I mean, the burden is on you to account for why, in light of something like that, you would expect the results to be equal.

Lew, do you think there are winners and losers last night? I know it was a big bore all around, but does anybody come out ahead or behind? I'm going to discount the Yang Drudge Report poll, but what else?

ROCKWELL: Well, I think actually, probably Biden was a winner, anyway. And they all say that Klobuchar was a winner, and I don't see it, but maybe that's true. And my guess is Warren is going to decline to the polls, that Harris is going to disappear, and that she deserves to disappear.

Booker deserves to disappear, too. He keeps talking about, I live in a poor black neighborhood, where I can see all the problems. He doesn't live in a poor black neighborhood. He lives in a white neighborhood, but he does have a home in a poor black neighborhood. But whenever reporters go in and ask people how often they see Booker, they all say we never see him. He's never here. It's, of course, a lie. And he's a fellow bald guy, so I shouldn't say this about him, but I don't I don't think a bald guy is ever going to be elected president. Listen, we're discriminated against, Tom. It's terrible, as bald people. But I don't think Booker is going anywhere. I don't think Harris is going anywhere.

And I think that maybe Beto O'Rourke actually helped himself and his talking about seizing guns, among the Democrats, that is. And maybe Buttigieg helped himself a little bit by trying to be a moderate, but who knows? I'll be interested to see what the official polls show, although the official polls, I think just like the political polls, are probably lies. I think they

weight them in favor of the people they like, just like the political polls. They oversample Democrats. So this is the way they handle it. We probably won't know probably until the election who's going to win, but I think Biden helped himself. I think Sanders hurt himself. But anybody who watched the whole thing and wasn't a Democrat or a political consultant or a reporter, my guess, is going to dislike all of them, and that would be a good thing.

By the way, they all want to kill us with their climate program, which is another unbelievably horrendous thing, where first of all, they just assume there's going to be all these wind farms and solar farms. These can't possibly supply the electricity that we need. It's going to impoverish this country. My guess is they're not going to actually do it. But who knows? They are fanatics. And they're all being influenced by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and similar people. And they all talk about, yes, the earth is going to be destroyed in five years, ten years, or whatever, unless we do X, Y, Z. And it's just this is just an assumed thing. This is, of course, baloney. It's not true. It's a lie. There is climate change. There's always been climate change, of course. It's controlled basically by the sun, not by human beings, who as a friend of mine used to say, are just like ants on a beach ball in terms of their influence on the climate. So I think and hope that people will reject them for that, if they like electricity. If they like electricity that's not five or ten times as expensive as it is now, I hope that they'll not back any of these people who are the climate fanatics.

WOODS: I have some pretty good material on this, because among other things, I interviewed Patrick Moore, formerly of Greenpeace, who said that if AOC's plan is implemented as she proposes it and on the timetable in which she proposes it, the result would be mass death. And that was the first words out of his mouth, were "mass death." So I actually have that whole exchange in —

ROCKWELL: And of course he's right.

WOODS: Yeah. So I did an eBook called *AOC Is Wrong*, and that's in there. So AOCISWrong.com is where people can get that for free.

ROCKWELL: And of course, don't forget your great book on Bernie, even though he's going down.

WOODS: Yeah, BernielsWrong.com, I have a book about him, too, and they're both free. So go grab those. All right, Lew, thanks so much. I don't know how to assess winners and losers in the thing last night. It seemed like a tie to me among all of them. I really couldn't see that there was any breakout one, or the ones who were lower down in the polls who wanted to break out, I just don't think anybody really did. So we'll just have to wait and see. But Lew, on behalf of all my listeners, all I can say to you is thank you for your service.

ROCKWELL: Tom, great to be with you, as always. It's an honor.