



**WOODS:** All right, well, there's a variable here now. There's something new. There's a wild card, is what I mean to say, namely Bloomberg, that at least makes the debate a little bit different, because I think you and I were just throwing our hands up in despair at these debates. They weren't interesting. It was the same debate over and over. The people are boring and irritating to listen to. And then last week, I was in London anyway, but I had already kind of written off these debates, and so we missed the big Bloomberg bomb.

**ROCKWELL:** Oh, yeah, just tremendous.

**WOODS:** So maybe, I don't know, did you watch any of that? Did you just watch clips, or did you actually –

**ROCKWELL:** Are you kidding? I watched the entire thing, and I couldn't take my eyes off of it. I mean, it was the most interesting debate since Kennedy-Nixon. It was just tremendously fascinating. These people all look like, of course, total idiots, and Bloomberg especially, who I guess didn't get ready for it. I mean, he was a deer in the headlights and did very, very, very badly. And probably if he had a chance, I guess that has ended it, although last night, he did better, and what he did was he canceled all his events except one between the last debate and this debate to simply do preparation. And he was better. Still I think he seemed nervous, but he was definitely better.

**WOODS:** Yes, yes, he definitely was. That first time through, I don't know who was prepping him. He has so much money, he could hire the best people.

**ROCKWELL:** I don't think he was prepping. I think he was just so arrogant that he figured, I can do this. This is ridiculously easy.

**WOODS:** Yeah, you know, Lew, I think you may be right about that. Yeah, because how else do you explain he was obviously blindsided by what any consultant would have told him right away he had to be ready for? *Here are three or four things they are, without a doubt, going to hit you on. You'd better be ready.* He wasn't ready for any of them.

**ROCKWELL:** Yeah, no. And of course last night was just as crazy and chaotic, although less interesting than the previous one. Were there were any moderators? I guess there were, but they didn't seem to play any role, and they were all just shouting at each other. And my guess is that relatively few regular people – I mean, we watched the whole thing. Relatively few regular people watched beyond the beginning of that, because it just sort of gave you a headache. It was I think unpleasant. Funny. I'm sure Trump enjoyed it. But there were some interesting moments, though.

**WOODS:** Yes, right, right, so let's go ahead and talk about those. Okay, first of all, obviously, they're coming after Bernie because he seems to be unstoppable at this point. Who still knows about Bloomberg? You can't write him off, obviously. He has that much money. As I noted maybe with you, he's extremely uncharismatic. He's not likable at all.

**ROCKWELL:** Yes.

**WOODS:** Which is why he has to spend this kind of money, to get people to be able to stand the sight of him. So I didn't think he was going to really get a lot of traction. The only reason he might get traction is as the rich anti-Bernie candidate. And, as a matter of fact, before we

go on, I want to ask you something that I was speculating about earlier this week. Let's suppose Bernie does not get the nomination but Bloomberg does. Now, Bloomberg, he's a billionaire, and he will obviously have bought the nomination, and everybody knows that. Now, it's one thing for Bernie in 2016 to have endorsed Hillary, and we all knew he would because he has no backbone, and as I always say, he's not 1/100th the man Ron Paul was, so he's just going to endorse Hillary. Even though she stood for the things he was against, he endorsed her. Can he plausibly endorse Bloomberg just on never-Trump grounds, even though Bloomberg is the very kind of person he targets in his rhetoric and bought the nomination? Can he get away with that?

**ROCKWELL:** My guess is he will endorse him because he has no backbone. I mean, Tom Luongo had a great column where pointed out that if Bernie had any backbone, he would have done what Trump did; when he was told that the Russians were promoting him as the Democratic candidate, he would have said, "I don't believe these so-called intelligence agencies. I'm the guy that they want to get rid of. I'm the guy they don't want, and I'm here to tell you, I'm going to be here, and I don't care what these so-called intelligence people say. I'm not going to pay any attention to them."

**WOODS:** Right, right, exactly. And in fact, there are people like Jimmy Dore and others who've been saying, look, I warned Bernie, if you fall for this ridiculous Russiagate nonsense, it will come back to hit you. And now it is. And he's reduced to this pathetic line, "I'll say to Mr. Putin, you will never interfere in another election." What a stupid comeback.

**ROCKWELL:** By the way, does the US ever interfere in anybody else's elections? It interferes in everyone's elections and actually has an agency, the National Endowment for Democracy, that's officially, with a big budget, a real subsidiary of the CIA, although not officially, that intervenes in everybody's elections. I mean, that's its job, to "bring about democracy," by which they mean of course US control. So the idea that any other country is responding, and *that's horrible, it's terrible, kill them all, nuke them*, is it seems to me just entirely outrageous.

**WOODS:** And yet, here we have the supposedly leftist candidate who's willing to say Castro had his good points, but he won't say that. So he'll go out on a limb for Castro, but he won't go out on a limb against the intelligence agencies, which I'm sure in the 1960s he didn't particularly like, but now suddenly, the way the wind is blowing has changed, and so now he's on board.

**ROCKWELL:** Why didn't he pivot on the Castro question and say, "You know what I don't understand?" He could say, "It seems to me a terrible thing that every American president from Kennedy until Trump, with the exception of Obama, has wanted to starve the Cuban people to death with all these sanctions." He could say, "And we're having sanctions against North Korea to try to starve them to death, and Iran to try to starve them to death. And these two countries say, *We're not going to talk to you unless you stop trying to starve our people to death*, and we say, *Wow, what an outrageous, crazy-dictatorship thing to say.*" And he could say, "By the way, I think the Congress made a mistake in giving the president the unilateral right to impose sanctions. These are very, very damaging, anti-civilian sanctions. They're immoral, and the US shouldn't be doing it. And we shouldn't have done that to Cuba. We're now doing it again to Cuba. Shouldn't do it to Nicaragua. Trump has killed tens of thousands of people through starvation in Venezuela through his sanctions. Isn't it about time we stopped doing this?"

**WOODS:** Yeah, and he would have gotten some cheers for that.

**ROCKWELL:** Oh, no, he would have gotten — that would have been the answer. He didn't have to say, "But he set up a literacy program." And of course, as some people in Miami have pointed out, the literacy program he set up to make everybody literate was so they'd be subject to government propaganda.

**WOODS:** Of course. Yeah, of course.

**ROCKWELL:** [laughing] It's not because he wanted them to read great literature.

**WOODS:** No, of course. That's a lot of times what it is. And then I'll just say as a side point, there's so many people who are excited about countries having high literacy rates. Well, I would like to see that too. But then it does sort of depend on what you go on to read after that. If you spend the rest of your life reading ghostwritten James Patterson novels, you may as well be illiterate. What are you putting that skill to?

**ROCKWELL:** It's interesting that the American in the colonies before the American Revolution were noted in Europe for being extremely literate. And of course, there were no public schools at all, thank goodness, and parents took tremendous care to make sure their children read so they could read the Bible and so they could read great literature. That's the way it happened without government schools.

**WOODS:** They can probably dig up some pretty damaging things Bernie has said about — I mean, we already know the stuff on the surface about various people. And the whole literacy thing in Cuba, I did an episode — I'll link to it on our show notes page here — with our friend Humberto Fontova after Castro died, where he goes through and says, all right, the communists boast about this statistic and that statistic. Well, let me tell you the statistics before the communists got in, because that'll provide a little bit of context here. You can't just pull some number out of thin air and say, look what we've accomplished. Yeah, but if it's 30% worse than it was three years ago, that's actually not a good thing. So we went through that together.

But as other people have noted, probably any regime has something to be said for it. If you seize all those resources, presumably, it wouldn't all be graft. You would have a bridge that you built. You'd have a stadium. There would be something you could point to. That was why Henry Hazlitt's point was that you can't leave the analysis there. You can't say, here, look at this project that we can all see. Isn't that a good thing? You have to think about all the things that you don't see, all the things that would have been built, would have happened. So, yeah, okay, maybe there was a literacy project, but on those grounds, you could probably praise any regime whatsoever.

But that's low hanging fruit. I mean, you and I, somebody commenting on the debate from the Heritage Foundation could be making these points, Lew, so I feel like you and I need to step it up to another level. So let's go on and give me your overall assessment of who emerges — I mean, did anybody advance last night, and did anybody fall behind? Or did they all more or less maintain their positions?

**ROCKWELL:** Well, I guess Biden advanced slightly, although I enjoyed his hilarious comment that if only Bernie had voted for some gun bill, that we would have saved 150 million people from death.

**WOODS:** Oh, I know.

**ROCKWELL:** 150 million? Yeah. But I think that was the one blooper he made. But is he actually going to get any votes? I don't know. We'll have to see. I think Elizabeth Warren fell back. She was obviously looking to redo what she sees as her great success the last time in showing up Bloomberg, and so she went after him again on the NDA business. And he said, well, I've released everybody, and we're not going to ever have any more NDAs in my company, and that took care of that.

And then she said that you told one of your employees when she was pregnant, "Kill it." And he said, "Why, I never said that." And then he sort of said, "I don't remember saying that." Well, of course, you know he said it. It's the kind of guy he is. But she said, when I was a teacher and I was pregnant and I got fired because I was pregnant, at least the principal didn't say to me, "Kill it." Of course, I guess obviously, you can't be ironic about these kinds of

things, but I thought it would have been funny if Bloomberg had said, "No, no, I should have said, and this is what I say now, 'Let me have my car take you to Planned Parenthood, because we don't want to have your career affected by this mass of cells that you're carrying around. Get rid of it and exercise the woman's right to choose.'" So she was actually criticizing his calling for an abortion. I mean, it's very interesting that that's a problem for her.

And again, she told the story about her being fired because she was pregnant. Of course, it is one of the many lies she tells. People went back to the records. The principal offered a contract. When she turned it down, the Board of Education in this little town asked her please to stay, and she didn't want to stay. And again, she of course is the pretend Indian and all the rest. Somebody on Tucker Carlson's show referred to her as the "Cherokee dominatrix" after the last debate, and she tried to fulfill that again. It didn't work, and I noticed on at least the Drudge poll, which is the only poll I saw this morning. She is the lowest ranking.

And Klobuchar is up, although I must say I don't see it with Klobuchar. But she's up; Biden's up. Bernie still won according to Drudge, and Buttigieg is down. And I noticed all the media praising Buttigieg. *Oh, he's magnificent. This was his best night. He's great. He's wonderful.* He's, it seems to me, a very sinister figure, of course, is owned by the CIA, and just very unpleasant. I think maybe all these people are potential dictators. He definitely I think he is. But they all claim that Biden is doing better, but of course, they're desperate to have Bernie beaten, and Bernie did I think take some blows last night. And they're going to go after him of course in the intervening days before the before Super Tuesday. But I think he held his number-one position. And Elizabeth Warren at the bottom. Buttigieg is at the bottom of the Drudge poll. Maybe that's going to be different on a regular poll. We'll just have to see.

**WOODS:** Well, let me say this. Bernie has a rhetorical advantage, in that pretty much everybody in the Democratic Party and probably just about everybody in the Republican Party has already accepted the basic premise of what he believes. He's just taking it farther. So when Buttigieg was criticizing him for being a democratic socialist or whatever and being a radical, all he had to do was come back and say, and he was very powerful here, he said, "Okay, do you think this is radical? Do you think health care for people is radical? You think this is radical? This is the mainstream of what America wants." What's Buttigieg going to say? "Well, yeah, but I think they should have 10% less of it?"

And the thing is, anti-socialists have done a really, really embarrassingly bad job in recent years and particularly against Bernie, because they think for some reason, that just saying the word *socialism* is enough. But why would it be? Especially if you're a young person who's never heard that word have a negative connotation. So in other words, you're just throwing out a word. It's like calling somebody a racist. You're just throwing out a word, and you actually think that substitutes for an argument? And then beyond that, then they'll just say, "Oh, Bernie's ideas lead to 100 million deaths." Maybe, but I'm not entirely certain that Bernie actually wants to have the state own the means of production. The whole thing is just dumb. There are good arguments against Bernie. And Lew, as you may know —

**ROCKWELL:** Yes, your eBook.

**WOODS:** I have a free eBook, doggone it. [BernielsWrong.com](http://BernielsWrong.com). You should go over to [BernielsWrong.com](http://BernielsWrong.com) and get it. There are actual arguments against the guy.

**ROCKWELL:** No, no, it's great. It's one of your tour de forces.

**WOODS:** Oh, thank you. But the thing is that if you — I don't listen to right-wing radio, but from what trickles out to me, they've got nothing. It reminds me of the financial crisis. Because none of the right-wing media people knew anything about the Fed, or their overlords never told him to talk about it, they didn't know what to do. So they had to say, *Oh, the Community Reinvestment Act*. Like, *We found something from 1977 that caused the financial crisis*, because they didn't know what else to say. Because they had no intellectual

foundation. That's what basically happened. The so-called opposition has been completely hollowed out intellectually, and so it's basically us and nobody else to fight this.

**ROCKWELL:** I did think it was interesting that when Bloomberg was charged with being for stop-question-and-frisk, nobody would have brought up, let alone Bloomberg, Walter Williams' column this weekend, which is on the subject, and he says I'm very sympathetic of an innocent black or Latino guy who's stopped by the cops and put through this. It's humiliating and it's an outrage. It makes you angry, and so forth. But he said, this program of Bloomberg's probably saved tens of thousands of black and Latino lives. There are probably tens of thousands of young men alive today who wouldn't have been alive if Bloomberg had not been doing that.

**WOODS:** It's easier to envision how you get away with that legitimately in a private property society where there are clearly understood rules, where there are private firms involved, and people can make choices, than to blanket-impose this the way he did. I hear that argument. And given that these people are all statists on the stage, they have no really principled case against that. They would all have some reason — I don't think they would mind —

**ROCKWELL:** They're all for the surveillance state, for example.

**WOODS:** That's right, of course. What is that other than a kind of stop and frisk of everybody? And I don't think they would mind — would they really have a principled objection to a stop-and-frisk policy of people that they view as domestic terrorists of one kind or another? I just don't think they that they do. So as usual, only we really have a principled objection to that. For them, I think it's just opportunistic. And half of them probably 20 years ago would have just silently supported the policy, so I don't believe a word they say about any of that stuff.

Let's see. So the Castro stuff we talked about. Buttigieg going after Bernie, I think he was partially effective, I have to say.

**ROCKWELL:** Yes, he was. Oh, yeah.

**WOODS:** Because he's saying, whatever else you want to say about these ideas, if we have to defend a nominee who's saying the Castro regime wasn't all bad, I'm not looking forward to November, and the down ticket candidates are all running away from him and running away from his positions. You're putting them in a very difficult position. Is this really how we win? I think that's a legit point.

**ROCKWELL:** And I think Elizabeth Warren was not successful in her attempt to say, look, I'm the safe Bernie. I'm slightly more moderate, and so I've got all the Bernie qualifications and all the programs he wants, but I'm going to do that a little more of just a softer, easier way to go about it. I won't be as hard. I won't be as radical. I'm sure it was her last night last night, thank goodness.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**ROCKWELL:** I think of Warren as Lizzie Borden and her axe.

**WOODS:** Yeah, no kidding. Okay, now let's imagine a Bernie Sanders nomination. There are some people who say, oh, that's exactly the guy Trump would want to go up against. I'm not really sure, partly because I don't think Trump will be prepared. He'll have none of the facts and figures at his fingertips. He's not a principled opponent of the state, not that any politician is. But so he's going to have to agree with Bernie on 40% of the stuff. So I don't think that's a matchup he necessarily wants. I mean, Hillary was so intensely unlikable, that he could just be contemptuous of her and people would cheer. Bernie's not particularly charismatic, but he looks like a guy who really believes what he says, and he's angry because he's outraged at injustice. That's the way he comes across. I think that's hard for Trump.

**ROCKWELL:** Also, he's a populist. He's a populist, and it's going to be tough for Trump to go up against another populist, even though he's a left-wing populist.

**WOODS:** Right. So I don't think you say, if Bernie gets the nomination, Trump automatically wins. I think people are being much too complacent about that. Is that your opinion?

**ROCKWELL:** Yes. But I think they've signaled that if he doesn't have a majority of the delegates when he goes to the convention, he will not be the candidate. I mean, I think they all said that last time. They didn't put it quite like that, but that's what they meant. And is it going to be Hillary? I don't know, but my guess is it would not be Bloomberg. I guess Hillary is waiting in the wings, and she wants it very, very badly. And she would be the ideal candidate for Trump to go up against again.

**WOODS:** Okay. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, that's interesting. You think that they are so anti-Bernie, they just won't let him get — because my thinking on that is, if they pull some kind of stunt to take the nomination away from him, then they permanently alienate a massive block of people.

**ROCKWELL:** That's true.

**WOODS:** Wouldn't it be better to just bite your tongue? Let him have the nomination, maybe he'll lose, and okay, so you have four more years of Trump, which is great for fundraising, which is all they care about. And then they can say, look, we tried your way, the same way they said to Goldwater. We tried your way, being an extremist. Now we've got to go back to the old establishment candidates just the way we used to do it. Couldn't they take that gamble?

**ROCKWELL:** Well, they could very well try that. Of course, it depends on — if he's five delegates from getting the nomination, it's one thing. If he's got, say, 60% of the delegates, then it seems to me it's something else. And of course in the second ballot, the super delegates can vote, and so my guess is there would be a huge amount of pressure, bribing, although somebody pointed out that it's not technically against the law to bribe a delegate to a convention.

**WOODS:** Whoa.

**ROCKWELL:** That if Bloomberg really wanted to get the nomination, he could just pay everybody.

**WOODS:** Oh, man. Well — but if that happens — I mean, obviously no one will know. But if Bernie — look, Bernie's almost 80 at this point. This has got to be his last shot at it.

**ROCKWELL:** Yes.

**WOODS:** Does he really wanted his legacy to be, he raised a stir, but when push came to shove, he got in line and was a company man? Or does he want his legacy to be he created an amazing grassroots movement, and when those SOBs took it away from him, he told everybody where the dog died? He told everybody everything he knew about this corrupt organization and just said, "Set fire to this corrupt thing, because it's what you people deserve." I'll tell you, that's how I'd want to be remembered. I'd want to be that guy.

**ROCKWELL:** That would be great. And we'd all be cheering Bernie if he did that.

**WOODS:** Yeah. Yeah. It's so funny, Lew, that when we were doing these debate episodes four years ago, it seemed to me at that time that the party that was really in trouble in the long run was the Republican Party, because the old consensus of a free market economy, so-called, limited government, strong national defense, and family values was just breaking down. It was just so Boomer, so '80s, so irrelevant, and it wasn't speaking to a lot of the concerns of ordinary people, and Trump personified that. It looked like they were the ones in trouble. And now it looks like, geez, the Democrats are going to have a hard time holding it together. I mean, I don't know, which one of these parties do you think its long-run health is worse?

**ROCKWELL:** I would say the Democrats, but the Republicans, we'll have to see, if Trump is reelected, what happens when the next election, or if he's not reelected, then I think it

would happen immediately. And I think the establishment people are still in control, or they would be absolutely in total control immediately if Trump was defeated. So they could be in trouble, too. I'd love to see them both go down myself.

**WOODS:** So after Super Tuesday, which as we're talking right now, that's less than a week away, I would assume people start dropping out at that point and they make endorsements.

**ROCKWELL:** Yes.

**WOODS:** Do you have any — I hate to tie you to predictions, so if you don't want to do this, you can just tell me to jump in a lake. But I mean, do you have any sense of who — because I think by the end, it'll be — I mean, after Super Tuesday, it's going to be hard for anybody, but there'll be one establishment person, at least, and Bernie, at least. Who gets the endorsements of the other candidates? I mean, is Warren going to endorse Bernie?

**ROCKWELL:** I guess she would endorse Bernie, because she's not going to endorse Bloomberg.

**WOODS:** Right.

**ROCKWELL:** And in fact, I don't think that any of the others would endorse Bloomberg. So yes, they'll all hold their nose and endorse Bernie, that yes, he has his problems, but he's much better than Trump, much better than Bloomberg.

**WOODS:** Yeah. Yeah, so they show polls saying that Trump gets beaten by Bernie. What do you think about that in February?

**ROCKWELL:** I always get a kick out of, on Fox saying, *Hey, the latest poll shows that Trump has 49% approval rating. Imagine that. Wonderful. Can you believe it? It's so high.* And so there are a lot of people that don't like him. And I don't like a lot of what he does, either. So I think Trump may have trouble, and also he's going to be like Bloomberg in the first debate. He's not going to prepare. He feels he knows everything and that he can handle himself perfectly well. So I just hope he pardons Roger Stone. That's the one thing Trump could do for us.

**WOODS:** Yeah. Yeah, there are a bunch of people who should be pardoned, and certainly Stone, this whole thing's ridiculous. And then we found out that the head person on the jury, the foreman, I guess, was an anti-Trump activist, right?

**ROCKWELL:** Yes, and she was tweeting anti-Stone stuff during the time they were in there and having their deliberation.

**WOODS:** [laughing] Yeah, it turns out that in the Anglo American tradition, you are not allowed to do that. We have these crazy rules.

**ROCKWELL:** And of course, the judge is a communist. I mean, Amy Berman Jackson is horrendous, and I would say openly anti-Stone and anti-Trump as a judge. So we'll have to see what happens. She may grant him another trial, because my guess is he could be granted another trial on appeal, because everything is so obviously crooked. We'll just have to see.

**WOODS:** Lew, one last thing —

**ROCKWELL:** Roger, by the way, has no money. He and his wife have lost their home, all their money, as happens when you're targeted by the state like this. And so even if he is pardoned, in some sense, he's already been ruined.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**ROCKWELL:** Terrible.

**WOODS:** Well, now it seems sort of anticlimactic to ask this, but I am entertaining a contrary-to-fact scenario here. Imagine Obama, instead of quietly criticizing Joe Biden and indicating that he's not going to intervene, suppose he had been a big, major cheerleader for Joe Biden from the beginning. Do you think that changes the shape of things?

**ROCKWELL:** Yeah, I think it would have helped with the black vote, but of course Biden is convinced he's going to get the black vote in South Carolina. I would not be surprised to see him lose to Bernie, but he might beat Bernie. We just have to see. But I think Obama definitely, yes, would have changed things.

**WOODS:** Now, I'm trying to remember this because it's been four years, but didn't Hillary just absolutely kick the crap out of Bernie in South Carolina last time?

**ROCKWELL:** Yes.

**WOODS:** Okay, because he did not connect with black voters. Now suddenly he does. What do you think happened? Is it just that there's no Hillary anymore?

**ROCKWELL:** Well, that's probably part of it, but also it's what he's talking about. He's talking about redistribution and all the things that people are interested in. And I think that they're paying attention to him. I think last time, they didn't pay any attention to him or anybody else, except Hillary.

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah, there you go. So we'll just have to see what happens in South Carolina and on Super Tuesday. I guess it looks like Trump has the nomination pretty much locked up, would be my instinct, on the Republican side.

**ROCKWELL:** Yes.

**WOODS:** And then, of course, I'm curious to see what winds up happening with the LP. But folks, LewRockwell.com is the website in case you're one of the seven people in the libertarian world who didn't know that. And I guess there isn't going to be another debate for a little while, but I think, Lew, that one, given that the race will be pared down by that point, that one may also be worth talking about.

**ROCKWELL:** Yes, I think that's right.

**WOODS:** Let's pencil that in on our calendars, and thanks for your time this morning.

**ROCKWELL:** Tom, thank you very much.