

**Episode 2,374: Another Step Toward Banning Gas-Powered Cars**

**Guest: Eric Peters**

**WOODS:**  I thought we'd talk about a subject that Eric's been writing quite a bit about. And that has to do with what they're euphemistically calling the "transition to electric vehicles". That's kind of an interesting thing. It's like "the vaccine was voluntary". But if you didn't do it, you were going to lose your job.

So, anyway, welcome back, Eric.

**PETERS:** Thanks, Tom. Don't you love the blasé language that these leftists use?

**WOODS:** It's wild. It's really wild. And it really is like we're living in two universes or something. I don't know how to really account for it. But anyway, first of all, what would you say – other than this EV thing that has been going on for quite some time, so we'll get to that in a minute.

And I want to play devil's advocate a little bit just to make it interesting. But in general – I haven't been following the news. Are there any really big news items relating to cars that might be of particular interest to libertarians other than this one at the moment?

**PETERS:** Well, yeah, there's one that's very much related. On Friday, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration issued its latest proposed ruling, which will demand that by the model year 2030, I think, or '32, all new vehicles must average – wait for it – 58 miles per gallon.

**WOODS:** Oh, my gosh!

**PETERS:** Effectively, this will outlaw pretty much every vehicle on the road That isn't at least a small hybrid. To put it into some kind of perspective, the new Prius, which was just redesigned for 2023, averages 57.

And this is a compact-sized car. And if you think that a truck is going to average 58 miles per gallon, I've got some real estate on Uranus to sell you. It's not going to happen. Now, the purpose of this is to push vehicles that aren't electric off the road.

And it's a really oily and subtle thing that the government does. They don't come right out and say: *Okay, we're going to outlaw a certain class of vehicles.* What they do is promulgate regulations that have the same effect.

And that way they can dodge responsibility for it. And they can even claim, in a totally upended, bizarro kind of way, that: This is what the market is doing. This is what the market wants.

**WOODS:** Yeah, this is that "transition", again. We're transitioning from one thing to another. How about that? So, you're right about the way they go about it. They don't have an outright ban. They just make it impossible for you to function under the regulatory conditions they establish.

So, in some ways, it's like the point that I make a lot of times. Which is, very rarely does a bad actor in government come out and say: *The reason I'm doing the things I'm doing is because I'm an evil bastard who loves to lord it over you.*

They don't say that. There's always some high-sounding reason that they do everything. But of course, that's the way it's always going to be. They're never going to say: *We're doing this because we're flat out evil.*

Why would they say that? So, it always has to have some kind of cherry-on-top kind of explanation. But I think at this point, when you look at every single thing these people advocate, and it all adds up to making everybody's life much, much more challenging, I'm just not buying that this is just a coincidence or their intentions are all good.

I don't understand these people. I mean, maybe there are some people who just genuinely love to torture other people. I don't know what it is, but that's the best explanation I can come up with.

**PETERS:** No, I think so. I really believe this. I think that there is an aspect of psychopathology here, of sadism. And there's a faulty premise. Let's get back to what you just said a moment ago. This idea that we need the government to intercede as opposed to letting the market work.

If there were a demand for whatever it is, X, then there's a profit motive in providing X. Let's say that it's highly fuel-efficient vehicles. The Prius is a good example. That is a market-driven vehicle. The government did not have to mandate the Prius.

It was brought forth at a time when gas was expensive, when Toyota came up with this brilliant solution. A vehicle that has a part-time engine and a part-time battery. And the combination of that is very efficient and very affordable and very practical.

So, people buy that. You don't have to get a kickback from the government in order to sell that and get people to buy that. You don't have to mandate it. Good ideas don't require bayonets. Can't remember who said that, but that stuck with me for a long time.

And the same with regard to this whole gas mileage thing. The government will present and posture itself as the savior against these gigantic corporations and the evil oil companies. As if people were forced to buy big trucks and SUVs. That's what they want.

It's not that some people don't want smaller cars that are more efficient. Those are available. And those were available long before the government got into the business of mandating mandatory mile-per-gallon requirements.

**WOODS:** Now, again, this is all speculation, but I think it's quite possible that some of the elites genuinely can't stand the rest of us, can't stand the riffraff.

And so, if a policy they advocate means there will be fewer cars on the road, and we say: *Oh, the unintended consequence of this policy is that it'll be harder for poor people to get cars.* That's not an unintended consequence of the policy.

That gets a lot of the riff raff off the road so they can drive more comfortably to their ski vacation or whatever. This is going to make it harder for people to afford to fly on airplanes. Yeah, great. Fewer of these people to struggle with when they go to board.

At this point, I can't think of any other reason. I don't believe that they actually think the world is going to end. I don't think they believe the catastrophic predictions they're making. So, I'm left only with this.

But anyway, that's just my private obsession. Let's get to the very public matter of the EV situation. Now, you have an article – I'll link to it at TomWoods.com/2374, where you're talking about some of the arguments here.

And you were talking about – in fact, let's start with this problem of fires. And I'm going to read actually what you say here. The article you're quoting refers to these fires that electric vehicles are causing as "an additional challenge" to the transition.

And you wrote, *"EVs spontaneously combusting is not an 'additional challenge'. Observe the blasé language, as if we were discussing losing weight or some other thing that could be improved via effort. What we are dealing with as regards lithium-ion batteries is an inherent vulnerability that cannot be fixed. At least, with that particular type of battery."*

So, what are we talking about with fires? What do you mean?

**PETERS:** Lithium-ion batteries can short circuit. And everybody knows about small devices and how they sometimes catch fire. And that's why we had an issue with cell phones in airplanes.

In fact, I think there were a couple of airliners that actually were brought down because there were cell phones in the cargo hold and they caught fire and brought the airplane down.

These are very fast, very hot burning fires. The problem with electric cars is now you've got an enormous battery. I point out – people have no idea, many people – that the typical electric car battery weighs about 1,000 pounds.

And some of them weigh close to 2,000 pounds, as in the case of the F-150 Lightning. And within that battery, there are literally thousands of individual cells. And each one of those is a potential failure point.

They can short circuit and thermally runaway – that's the terminology – for a variety of reasons. But it's inherent in the chemistry. And also, potentially as a result of physical damage to the case that the battery is in.

And there have been a number of incidents of these EVs catching fire when they're parked. Nothing hit them. They're not even being charged. But just parked, they spontaneously catch fire. That's what's happened now twice with cargo ships.

Right now, out off the Dutch coast, the Fremantle Highway, at this moment, as we talk, is still burning because some electric vehicles that were being transported spontaneously caught fire. And these fires, unlike gasoline fires, are very difficult to put out once they start.

And even when you do put them out, they can restart. And it's interesting to me that the same governmental apparat that says it's so very concerned about our safety, and if it saves even one life, is – again, to use our word of the day, blasé.

Not particularly interested in this built in fire risk that is just an inherent problem with all electric vehicles.

**WOODS:** Let me play devil's advocate here a little bit on this issue. Now, we'll use the acronym ICEV, Internal Combustion Engine Vehicle. So, I have a listener who is not as down on electric vehicles as you are.

And he says, *"ICEVs also catch fire and sink ships. An EV (electric vehicle) is less likely to catch fire than an ICEV, though an EV fire may be harder to put out. And EVs with lithium iron phosphate batteries catch fire far less than the batteries in most EVs today.*

*Technological progress is already solving this problem as it has solved and continues to solve similar problems with ICEVs."*

What do you think about that?

**PETERS:** Well, let's see. First of all, the interesting thing about gasoline fires is that they require something in addition. They require a spark. You can get into an accident in a vehicle that has a gas tank, and even if the gas tank is punctured and gas leaks, unless there's a spark, there will not be a fire.

And there's less likely to be a fire in the first place because the gas tank is located in one specific part of the vehicle. Typically, it's around the rear axle, usually ahead of the rear axle, and very well protected by that axle and by the bodywork of the vehicle.

Whereas the electric vehicle's battery pack, because of their physical size, is spread out over the entire length of the floor pan, typically, of the electric vehicle. So, essentially, no matter where you hit it, potentially you could damage the case.

And once the case has been damaged and the structural integrity of the battery has been compromised, you've got this potential problem.

And even if it doesn't actually catch fire, just for the sake of caution, insurance companies will typically say: *We have to total that vehicle, or we have to replace the battery, out of all due diligence and concern for possibility of there being damage.*

Because nobody's going to disassemble the car, then disassemble the battery, then inspect those thousands of individual cells to make sure that they're all okay, nothing was done, in even a minor fender bender type of accident.

So, they just say: *We're going to require the battery to be replaced*. And since an EV battery can cost $15,000 to $20,000, if your electric vehicle is 3 or 4 years old, it's already depreciated and lost a third to half of its value.

You're not going to do that. They're just going to throw the vehicle away.

**WOODS:** What about this problem of extreme temperatures? Not extreme temperatures, but let's say it's very cold out or it's very hot out. There are other challenges associated with these temperatures and these types of cars?

**PETERS:** Oh, absolutely. Again, I'm speaking from personal experience. I test drive new cars every week. And I had an opportunity to test drive a number of electric vehicles in a variety of different conditions.

And cold weather – and this was something that was actually reported on and widely discussed during the winter last year. The range that you have with an electric vehicle can plummet by 30% to even 50%, depending on how cold it gets.

Because batteries, as a just general matter, are not very efficient in the cold. And this is something that everybody understands. If you live in a very cold place, like Minnesota, let's say – and I'm talking about before electric cars.

If you hadn't kept your car plugged into a block heater, if you try and turn it on in the morning when it's 15 degrees out and the engine's going "rrrrrrr" because the battery has a hard time cranking the engine. It just doesn't have as much juice.

And the same basic problem afflicts these electric vehicles. But it's compounded because everything in an electric vehicle is electrically powered, including the heat for you, the heat for the passenger compartment and the defroster.

And then, by the way, the battery itself also has a heating and cooling system because it's imperative to maintain that battery within a certain spectrum of temperature. If it gets too cold, you can't charge it. And if it gets too hot, you have problems with charging. You also have problems, potentially, with fire.

So, it's this serially compounding problem. And now here we are in the summertime and people are discovering – again, go on YouTube and look. And you'll see people are saying: *You know, my electric car is going substantially less far than it used to because it's 90 degrees outside and I'm running the air conditioning.*

So, that's why I call them "occasional use vehicles". They operate very well in certain very specific conditions, like temperate Southern California. But most of the country isn't temperate Southern California.

And as the fact about that begins to leak out, I think people are beginning to sour on electric vehicles. And that's manifested by the recent news that there is a glut of these things just sitting in dealerships around the country waiting to be sold. I think the number now is 72 days.

So, pushing three month's worth of supply of these vehicles that haven't sold. Because people are beginning to have some hesitancy (remember that word?) about buying electric vehicles.

**WOODS:** And we know how they've handled "hesitancy" in other areas. That we make it very, very difficult for you to live your life other than by knocking off your hesitancy. Well, likewise here it looks like: *Well, sorry you're hesitant, but if you want to get from A to B, this is the choice you're going to have to make ultimately.*

Unless something major changes between now and whenever.

**PETERS:** Well, I think that parallel is actually most apt. And I've been talking about that. I've been writing about that. In that people were (to be very generous) misled about the efficacy of the vaccines, for example.

We had Biden telling people: *If you take the vaccine, you won't get Covid.* He made a universal statement about that: *You won't transmit it to other people*. It turned out that was absolutely not true.

And I think people found out about that and they became more and more hesitant about taking these vaccines. Because, after all, what's the point? If I'm going to get the stupid sickness and I'm going to give it to somebody else, why would I want to assume the risks?

And the same thing is happening with these electric cars. Word about them is beginning to percolate out. And as it does, people are thinking: *You know, this may be not for me*.

And then you get into the economics of it. The average price paid for an electric car is about $58,000. That's about a $15,000 increase over the average price paid for a non-electric car last year. How in the world do they think that the average person out there is going to be able to just come up with another 15,000 bucks to spend on a car?

And that goes back to your earlier point about the maliciousness of these people. I don't think that they're that stupid. I think that they know perfectly well that most people cannot afford these vehicles. And that's exactly the point. That's not a bug. That's a feature.

**WOODS:** The cost involved, I think, is something most – I mean, most people are very rarely on the market for a car. I don't know what the average length of time people keep a car is, but I'm sure a lot of people keep them for quite some time.

They're not really on the market. They haven't had the sticker shock. They don't know what the differential is between one of these vehicles and a car they're more accustomed to.

But once they do become acquainted with that, I think their casual environmentalism will go out the window. Like: *Okay. Yeah, yeah, yeah, I'm all in favor of working on climate change here, but come on.*

**PETERS:** Yeah. And also, when they really get wise to some of the everyday practicalities. For example, you'll hear often in the media when the subject of electric cars comes up about these so-called "fast chargers".

I always put air fingers quotes around "fast", because I just think it's hysterical that you would characterize as "fast" sitting in a Walmart parking lot for a half hour to 45 minutes. Because that's what fast charging is.

Anyway, the point is that you can't do that at home. So, the very best that you can do at home is what they call "level two charging". And that's a 240-volt circuit that's like a dryer or an electric stove-type outlet.

And by the way, you have to have an electrician come out to wire one of those things up, probably. Because you probably don't have one of those in your garage right now. Most homes don't have that.

And that's going to cost you 500 bucks to 2000 bucks, depending on how much work has to be done to your electrical panel and so forth.

But the point is that even if you have the 240-volt level two charger setup, that's going to take 8 to 11 hours to give you a full charge back, and at least a few hours to get any kind of meaningful charge back into your vehicle.

And think about what a limitation that would be on people's mobility, and how they're going to have to plan their lives around these endless recharge sessions. And I've dealt with this personally, because I don't have a fast charger at my house.

You live in a city, maybe you have easy (or easier) access to one of those things. But if you don't, you're constantly having to think about: *Well, am I going to stop and wait at the Walmart parking lot here at the fast charger and get home 45 minutes later, or get to work 45 minutes late?*

*Or I'm going to just crawl home and hope I don't have to go anywhere once I get there because the car won't be ready to go anywhere for another 4 or 5 hours?*

**WOODS:** Well, let's talk about a few of the other arguments against them, because there are things that supporters of these vehicles can say. And I want to hear your thoughts. So, a lot of times we hear the electrical grid will be overwhelmed by electric cars.

And we've seen this actually repeated. I see this all over social media. And the argument I've heard against that – and in fact, I have a particular listener, as I said, who, he doesn't believe in subsidies or anything, but he's not as down on EVs as you are.

He says the thing is that power generated by the grid has already doubled many times. And as population grows and productivity grows, it will keep growing. And the grid we have now is sufficient for the EVs we have now, and a future grid can produce more power.

He says this is the kind of problem that markets solve all the time. There's no reason it can't solve this problem.

**PETERS:** Well, this idea about the future is just speculation. And we keep hearing about the battery breakthrough that's right around the corner. And by the way, I've been hearing that since the '90s. I've been covering this stuff since the '90s.

And that's how long I've been hearing about the breakthrough that's right around the corner. The fact is that the existing grid – and that's actually not accurate because the regional grids – you probably know about this – is not adequate.

It is why you have had governmental authorities in California and Washington (and I think some other places) urge their populations to not use high draw electric appliances during peak load times.

If the grid is adequate, then why are they doing that? And why are they talking about using smart meters to meter the amount of electricity that people can draw from the grid at given times? And in fact, there was a hearing with our "friend" Pete Buttigieg, the transportation secretary.

And he was being interviewed by – I can't remember the congressman's name, but he's an electrical engineer. And he was actually pulling out some facts about this. And about how much draw is going to be added to the grid by hypothetically having one EV charging out there for each person who currently has a non-electric car.

And it's a staggering figure. And the grid cannot support that. And how is the grid going to support that when the government, the federal government, is making it almost impossible to build any kind of generating capacity? Because that will increase the carbon footprint, right?

You're not going to do this with solar and windmill farms. You're going to need to build either nuclear plants or you're going to need to build more coal fired plants, hydroelectric, or whatever. But they aren't being built, and that's the objective fact.

To say that: *Well, it could be built.* Of course, they could be built! We potentially could go to Mars too, you know, in a year. But we're not actually there, so let's not talk about hypotheticals. Let's talk about actuals.

**WOODS:** Well, on this issue of how long it takes for the batteries to charge, the response that I've heard from him and from others runs something like this. That most people charge at home. They top up overnight.

And unless you're driving hundreds of miles a day, you very rarely use a public charger. And you spend less time, he says, at a charging station than you spend now at your traditional gas station.

On occasional long trips like 500 miles, you'll stop once after 4 or 5 hours for half an hour to an hour. That's a meal break, so not that big of an inconvenience.

**PETERS:** It's extremely disingenuous. I'll give you an example. I test drove the Mercedes EQE last week. And this is a high-end electric SUV that has a price around $78,000 to start. And it advertises a fully charged range of about 240 miles, which isn't very much.

And by the time they brought it to me, it only had 145 miles on it because I live fairly far away from wherever there's a fast charger. So, it's in my driveway. I've got 145 miles. That's not very far.

And you drive these EVs. Then you find out that the indicated range is often optimistic by 10%, 20% or more, depending on conditions. And if you drive up a lot of grades, if you drive faster than a crawl, you're going to discover that the range goes down significantly.

So, I have 145 miles and I go out and I drive 40 or 50 miles, which for me is nothing. And now I've got 80, 70 miles. And remember that electric cars aren't like gas powered cars. Which, if you run them down to fumes, what's the big deal?

Because as long as you can roll up to the next gas station, you can literally be back on your way in 2 or 3 minutes, which is how long it takes to pump in 15 gallons of gas. If you get too far down the road in your EV and you run out of range, the thing bricks. And it's not going to move.

And you can't walk to a gas station to bring back a can of kilowatt hours. You're going to have to call for a truck to tow the vehicle to where the charge is. Or you can have one of these trucks that has the ability to charge a battery come out to you. And that's going to take a whole lot longer than 2 or 3 minutes.

**WOODS:**  We hear a lot about wicked corporations. And sometimes there's something to that. But in the case of electric cars, this is not an initiative coming from corporations, it's an initiative being imposed on corporations.

That if they had their way, they would prefer not to do this, but they're more or less being coerced into doing it. And what surprises me – I think we might have touched on this before. Is that apart from the isolated person here and there, you hear basically no complaints at all from the industry.

No complaints at all. They get told that they have to do something radically different from what they've been doing up to now, and they have to do it extremely fast and they have to meet all these requirements. And they just say: *Okay, you tell me to jump, I'll say, "How high?"*

Does that surprise you?

**PETERS:** It depresses me, this corporate poltroonery. Which, it's just a general problem, I think. And I think the reason it is that way now is because at the very apex of the corporate structure, you've got these CEOs who live in a reality that people like you and I can't even begin to fathom.

For example, Mary Barra, who was the current CEO of General Motors, her compensation package is something on the order of $22 million annually. What does she care? None of this affects her. They live in this rarefied environment.

And it's a short-term environment. You get to the apex of the corporate food chain, you're pretty much at the peak of your career. There really isn't anything much after that. You're going to be there for a few years and then you're going to check out and live your nice life on your $22 million a year that you earned during that time.

So, I think that's part of it. And the other part of it is, I guess they feel that they aren't going to be the ones to stand up and be hammered down. This cowardice, this unwillingness to stand up and say something – now, there have been a few exceptions.

Akio Toyoda said something. Also, Sergio Marchionne, who died a year ago, who was formerly the head of what's now Stellantis, that owns the Jeep, Dodge, and Ram brands. They came right out and said this is at the very best premature. This is being forced. This is bad news.

The rest of them have been all in. And now that I think about it, what is probably driving this to a great extent is – remember when we had the big bailouts after the last crash back around 2008? And the government came in and rescued General Motors and rescued Ford and pumped a lot of money into those businesses.

And of course, there's always strings attached with that. And that's really – you can see the turning point. After that point, these corporations became kind of adjuncts of the government. And not only do they do what the government wants, they're kind of eager.

And it's insane. You've got Jim Farley, who's the CEO of Ford Motor Company, publicly saying that they anticipate losing, I think its $3.7 billion on EVs. No let's double down. Let's keep on going, and eventually we might make money, maybe, sometime around 2027.

It's just – it's surreal.

**WOODS:** And yet here we are. Now, on the other hand, I remember in the worst days of Covid with the proposed VAX mandates – well, implemented in many cases, but also the proposed VAX passport systems, some of which went into effect briefly.

But we had no way of knowing whether those were going to be permanent or not. There was no way of knowing where they were going with any of this. And the good news about that – and I know a lot of our folks are very black-pilled and it's hard for them to hear good news.

But we have to. As human beings, we've got to hear some good news. And when it's there, we have to appreciate it instead of trying to undermine it 12 different ways and explain to me why it's actually not good news. It is good news that those systems failed.

They really did fail. They had to be reversed. In one city after another, whether it was Boston, New York, Chicago, all down the line, New Orleans, they had to get rid of them. And there are a number of reasons they had to get rid of them. They did not succeed.

And yet that was something – they were more obsessed with Covid and those shots than they ever have been about electric cars. Way more. And we just said: *Well, we're just not doing it.* And it just didn't – even without just that minority of us who wouldn't go along, they could not make it work.

And so, that made me think: *Well, it is possible in some cases. Even when there's a really, really deeply held elite obsession, it's possible to resist it.*

But here it's not obvious what avenues the resistance could take.

**PETERS:** Oh, actually, I think it is.

**WOODS:** Oh, tell me. Tell me.

**PETERS:** Well, I think the obvious solution is to simply not buy in. And that's what people are doing. They are keeping their non-electric vehicles. I was going to mention – you had talked earlier about how long people keep their cars.

Did you know that the age of the average vehicle that is in use today as a daily driver is pushing 13 years old?

**WOODS:** No, I did not know that.

**PETERS:** And it has to do with the fact there are a lot of people out there who do not want, not only an electric car, they don't want a car that's spying on you, that's data mining you, that has all of these advanced driver assistance features that they're putting in cars.

A lot of people are really turned off by that and they just don't want them. And then there's the monetary aspect. A lot of people just don't want to get into hock and spend $40,000 and $50,000 on a car. It's madness. People can't afford that. It's absurd.

So, rather than do that, what they're doing is holding on to these older vehicles and fixing them as they go. And it makes a lot more economic sense for them to do that.

And that's what worries me. Because I think that the next shoe to drop in this EV saga is that they're going to do something to eliminate the alternatives to electric vehicles.

I foresee them doing something like greatly increasing gas taxes or registration fees and so on for vehicles that aren't electric. And they might even go so far as an outright ban. Though I think they won't do that, because again, it's much more effective and sly for them to say: Oh, you can continue to keep whatever it is so long as it complies with X, Y, and Z.

**WOODS:** So, how do we want to leave people with this in terms of the prospects for the future? First of all, I want to urge people again to check out EPautos.com, EricPetersAutos.com. I support you. I give a little donation every month because the work you're doing is really important.

And I'm not even a "car guy". And what kills me is that I have a lot of listeners who think of themselves as not being "car guys", so they won't listen to episodes I do with you because they think: *Eh, I dunno. I'm not interested in that.*

So, I have to somehow disguise them and trick them into listening by coming up with very clever workarounds in the episode titles. Saying: *Look, I know you might not be at "car guy". But you're a liberty guy, and we need cars to get around. That's pretty essential to liberty, so tune in and listen.*

But anyway, you should check out what Eric is doing. But what are the final thoughts you can leave us with?

**PETERS:** Well, again, I think you just elaborated essentially what the solution is. During the pandemic, those of us who decided: *Nope, we're not doing this.*

Whether it was wear the masks, or take these drugs that they marketed as vaccines, we just refused. And enough of us refused such that it became impossible or untenable for them to continue to try to impose it on people.

And I think, very similarly, if enough people just say: *I'm not going to do this. I'm going to continue to drive a vehicle that makes sense for me.* And again, I'm not anti electric car at all. I think that the market should decide.

And I think that if an electric car suits the needs, wants, and budgets of other people and they want to buy them? Hey, that's fine. Who am I to tell them that they shouldn't buy an electric car? And who am I to tell a manufacturer not to build it if there's a demand for it?

What I vehemently oppose is this one-size-fits-all, totalitarian, top-down idea that we must all do the same thing, and it works for everybody just the same. No, it doesn't. It's wrong and it's tyrannical.

**WOODS:** Well, with that, we're going to wrap up for today. And again, I'll tell people, check out EPautos.com. Because not only do you get a lot of great information, but I also just like Eric's style. Eric, in a way, I feel like your writing style is not a million miles removed from my own.

**PETERS:** Well thank you. That's a high compliment.

**WOODS:** Oh, well, thank you. But I mean, you're conveying information, but you're conveying it with – you've got a combination of humor and indignation and sarcasm and a sledgehammer, all put together. That's exactly what I go for.

**PETERS:** Well, me too, because I think humor actually is a very effective weapon. The left has long understood that. It has long understood that ridiculing its target is highly effective. And I think we should turn that around and use that weapon against these people.

**WOODS:** Well, indeed, indeed. It's long past time we did. So, thanks again, Eric. I appreciate your time today.

**PETERS:** Thank you, Tom. I appreciate being on.