



Episode 463: Lew Rockwell and Tom Woods Discuss the GOP Debate

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: This is a highly anticipated episode. I've been talking it up all week, so it better be good; that's all I have to say. I actually took some notes last night. My wife and I watched it together, and I took some notes. But before we get into any specifics, I thought I might start off by asking you — bearing in mind that, you know, we're not really fans of these people, and based on the cheers of the audience, I guess I had forgotten how much I can't stand the GOP electorate, to be perfectly blunt about it — what is your impression of who walks away from this debate stronger and who walks away from it maybe seeing poll numbers going down? And then I suppose anybody else would be just treading water.

ROCKWELL Well you know, it's interesting just to mention, first of all, why did Fox put this in a gigantic basketball arena? Of course, because they could have a big audience, and it made a good stage for their show. It made the sound slightly odd I thought. But who was filling those seats? It was all Republican activists from Ohio, not regular voters, and all the employees of the Republican governor of Ohio, Kasich, which is why Kasich did so well in the applause. And of course, this was all just one of the number of set-ups that Fox News had.

So maybe I'll mention first of all the Drudge poll. There's a poll on Drudge this morning where you can vote for who you think won the debate.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL And I think this pretty much represents my views, and it pretty much represents the Republican primary voter — not the Republican Party activist, not the guys who have jobs in the Kasich administration, but just the regular people. And Trump is at 49%; Cruz at 13%; Rubio at 9%; Carson, 8%; Paul, 7%; Kasich, 4%; Walker, 4%; Huckabee, 3; Bush, 2; Christie, 1.

Although I also want to say I would give a sub-zero to the three creepy, so-called moderators of Fox, who of course were not moderators at all; they were attack poodles for Rupert Murdoch, and their job was to kill Trump. And that's what they set out to do. It turns out that the people from Fox are just as liberal and maybe liberal in the exact same sense as if they were from the *New York Times*. They're militarists, of course, warmongers, but concerned about sexism and those sorts of things.

So I think they tried to kill Trump. Trump did not do as well as he should have done; on the other hand, as Rand Paul's campaign manager keeps reminding us, this is a marathon, not a sprint, so there are 10 more debates, and I think we'll see things a little bit differently next time, and I'm sure it's not Fox, although it will be some other evil network doing it. But I thought Trump did okay. Charles Krauthammer, the neocon with the wonderful Dickensian name, said Trump collapsed; he's through; he's over; he's gone. I don't think that's right, and I think Trump, as I said, Trump did okay.

To me the startling thing was how badly Bush did. You know, this was the guy we're told who is going to be the presumptive candidate, and he raised all this money. He still looks like Baby Huey. I mean, I never thought that I would say that somebody makes George W. Bush look good — that's Jeb Bush.

WOODS: See, that's why I took this as a slight victory for Jeb Bush, actually, because my expectations of what he would be like were so low because of George W. Bush, that the fact that he can memorize his lines and deliver them convincingly seemed pretty good to me.

ROCKWELL Well you know, I think there's no question he's got a higher IQ than George W., but he's got no presence. I mean, he's a tall guy, so that's good. He's as tall as Trump, and he's got a good presence in that sense, but he still really comes across I think as an empty suit, as so many of these guys do.

And Christie did very badly. 1% in the Drudge poll, and I think that's about it, and he had some run-ins with Rand Paul. Rand, as I think was the conventional wisdom, had to go on the attack last night, because he's had such a horrendous summer, in terms of plummeting polls and terrible fundraising and so forth. So he started right off by attacking Trump for the fact — and I guess it was a set-up question by Fox — oh my gosh, here you are on a Republican platform; do you mean to tell me that you're not going to pledge to totally support any Republican who's nominated? And he said he would not.

So all the functionaries in the room booed him, but otherwise all these people are telling us, hey, we have to reach across the aisle; we have to be bipartisan; we can't just be partisan. And the people at Fox, the people in that hall I think don't realize that regular Republicans, GOP primary voters hate the GOP, in the sense of the party establishment, the party leaders in Washington — Mitch McConnell and John Boehner. They hate their guts. So the fact that somebody's not a puppet of those people is actually not a negative, even though it was a negative in that hall.

But I would say that Rand helped himself by jumping in and immediately attacking Trump. But then he of course attacked Christie too, and I think he won that one as well, Christie of course taking the entirely totalitarian position that the government should know everything about every single person; Rand saying, well, they should only know about the terrorists. Now, Christie said that was not a practical kind of an argument. I think it probably *is* not a practical kind of argument. On the other hand,

he argued for the 4th Amendment and getting a judge to give a warrant and so forth. So you know, that was good.

WOODS: Yeah, let me jump in on a couple of those things. I liked the fact that of course Trump put his hand up as the only one who would not take the pledge to endorse the nominee and so forth, because for one thing, it shows that he has guts, and I think that, even though he knows it hurts him with the functionaries, the fact that people are watching him take a position that he knows can hurt him with some segment of the electorate is an indication of the reasons that the people who like him like him. Secondly, I like the idea that it gains currency, that it's possible for a candidate in a primary election not to go on to endorse the nominee. And that's an altogether healthy development, and of course it continues in the honorable tradition of Ron Paul himself, who as far as I know — in fact, he told me this over the phone — he said, I haven't endorsed the nominee since like 1980 or something. So don't worry that I'm going to endorse any nominee. There's no chance of that happening.

ROCKWELL Nor, by the way, has he voted for a nominee.

WOODS: Oh okay, well that I didn't realize.

ROCKWELL So that's the independent man.

WOODS: Right. Anything that keeps the party machinery off-balance has to be a good thing. Then secondly — oh and by the way, that's another reason that Bernie Sanders is such a fake. It goes to show that Sanders is not 1/1000th the man Ron Paul is, because when push comes to shove, he'll get in line behind the Democratic nominee.

ROCKWELL That's right.

WOODS: The same way — Dennis Kucinich had his merits, but when push came to shove, he got right behind Obama. It's very, very hard to just stand right up to the whole establishment and say, no, I'm not going along, no matter what you bribe me with, and that was Ron's position.

Now, in terms of Rand, Fox News frankly handed him a gift on a silver platter by pitching a question to Christie that obligated him to attack Rand. Rand needed an attack last night. And as you say, from the start, he knew wasn't going to get that many questions; he knew he wasn't going to get that much airtime. He did his best to go on the attack. And it looked to me a little desperate, but in his shoes, it's exactly what I would have done anyway. You have to at least try.

And you're right, I think he came off much better in the Christie exchange, particularly because we know based on Facebook comments and website comments that pretty much everybody sides with Rand. I mean, there are a few neocons who don't, but basically everybody sides with Rand. And I thought that his statement about hugging Obama was very effective for that audience.

ROCKWELL Very effective.

WOODS: You know, you've hugged Obama; you want to go hug him again? Go right ahead. I mean, that was below the belt. Well, while we're talking about Rand, let's run down a few of the questions that were directed his way, and then I want to talk about Trump, because, as I said, I think Trump did well enough to keep on going, and as you say, he's got time to maybe tweak his performance. But I thought it was oddly a let down — again, just from the point of view of political theatrics.

But let's say something about Rand. He got a question about ISIS, saying, look, you said that the Republicans in some way were to blame for ISIS. Why do you think your own party is to blame? There was his opportunity, if you ask me. There was his opportunity to be different. I mean, yes, it would be very, very controversial. It would be worse than saying you're not going to endorse the nominee, but it would get attention, and what he needs desperately right now is attention and differentiation. And unfortunately, he more or less ran away from his comments, which were eminently defensible. Scott Horton could certainly brief him with all the information he would need to defend that position, and he kind of ran away and was left looking, frankly, kind of empty on that question.

ROCKWELL No, that was a bad moment for him, but of course, I think for some time, despite his earlier comments, he's taken just the standard militaristic neocon line on ISIS. And ISIS, a very interesting organization, there are some people who think that the CIA and the French and the British and Israeli intelligence agencies had something to do with creating ISIS. It's very convenient, of course, for the U.S. empire. So I think there's a lot to be said about ISIS. Granted, he's not going to be able to go into that kind of stuff, but his original comment about how the Republicans were responsible was excellent. Too bad he backed down from that.

WOODS: Then, let's see, the question on the Iran deal. Now here's the thing: this was the straw that broke the camel's back for a lot of Rand supporters. And you ran Dan McCarthy's article from the *American Conservative*, saying that basically, he's got to embrace this Iran deal if he's going to have any chance of really getting his father's followers to embrace him and to — remember, his father's followers, a lot of them dropped their jobs for nine months to go work for this guy for free. And Rand could use a dose of that kind of enthusiasm.

And what he was reduced to saying was, look, in principle I'm in favor of negotiations, as if that was enough of an enticement for libertarians. And then he had to go along and make a weak criticism of the deal. And then right after that, Huckabee made a very strong statement against the deal, rhetorically very strong, and Rand's answer is totally forgotten. And the idea that he's going to insert 3% nuance into an answer like that and think that's going to propel him is not reasonable.

ROCKWELL Well, I thought Dan McCarthy made an excellent argument in his *American Conservative* article, that this was maybe Rand's last chance to come out against the Iran deal, and if he'd said some good things about foreign policy, but he's decided to

not. And so the volunteers, I always remember early in the campaign, one of the Rand functionaries saying, you know, we're very concerned about all the volunteers and the grassroots people who were so much trouble in the Ron Paul campaign — oh yeah, so much trouble; so much help, needless to say, so much heroic help — so we're going to take care of them; we're going to handle them; we're going to control them. And of course, they haven't been there, for the most part. You don't have anybody. And as you say, both of us know people who took a semester off from school, who took time off from their jobs, on their own dime went to New Hampshire, spent many months volunteering for Ron Paul. I'm not sure that's ever happened, certainly not in my lifetime, to any other candidate besides Ron. But poor Rand, he's not had that kind of enthusiasm.

WOODS: No, that's for sure. He was asked about gay marriage, and specifically about the question of religious freedom — like, what would you do to make sure that people aren't forced to violate their consciences? And it seems like this is an easy answer to give, that you can say, look, sometimes there have been gratuitous cruelties shown toward people who are homosexual, and certainly no one of good will supports any of that. But this needs to go both ways, that, in the same way that we shouldn't show hatred toward anybody for that reason, likewise, people shouldn't show hatred to anyone because they run a business, and they feel like, I'm a dance instructor and I don't want to be a dance instructor for a homosexual couple. Well, that's your business and it's your property, and you ought to be able to make that decision, and we ought to leave them alone. And I'm afraid that there is becoming a fanaticism on the other side that's seeking to destroy people who disagree on this, and I could not possibly oppose that enough. That would have been a perfectly good answer. I don't even remember his answer.

ROCKWELL Well, he said — and of course all these guys were giving canned answers, memorized answers — so what Rand said was, I don't want my marriage or my guns to be registered in Washington. Well, okay, yeah.

WOODS: So all right, it's a slogan, but fair enough.

ROCKWELL Yeah, it was not an answer. And when we think of gratuitous cruelties, Christians have been subjected to gratuitous cruelties for millennia. And we're seeing the rise of the hatred of Christianity, with the state on the side of the real haters, so yes, it's absolutely a moral duty, a libertarian duty to defend the rights of property owners to discriminate. It's a basic human right to be able to discriminate. If there are people you don't want to be associated with, that's your business; that's your right. But of course, nobody on that stage would say such a thing.

WOODS: And of course, we know why they can't say that.

ROCKWELL Well, because of a very powerful interest group, an extremely powerful interest group that would want to slit their throat.

WOODS: But moreover, they would specifically be then confronted with this: well, so okay, you're telling me that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a mistake, because that's really what that was all about. Nobody wants to walk into that minefield, so they're reduced to this pathetic argument about religious freedom — which, it shouldn't have anything to do with religion, per se; it has to do with property. And nobody wants to say that. And really, the whole issue boils down to, should we have interactions if only one of the two parties involved wants the interaction to take place? That's what it boils down to. Should you force people into interactions that they don't want? Now, I understand that it's a lot to expect a politician to say that these days. Ron said it.

ROCKWELL That's right.

WOODS: Ron said it, even though he knew that it would make his life more difficult and that the media would go after him. But the kids kept jumping on the bandwagon; the kids kept joining the campaign. It just didn't matter, because he was just so plainspoken, and he just said, look, this is my position. I don't think people should be forced to do things they don't want to do. I mean, you're going to tell me that's wrong? No, people should be forced to do things they don't want to do. I mean, put them on the defensive; say, "Is that really your position?" So, as I say, I saw Rand make an effort, given the limited time he had to jump in here and there, but otherwise, given how, frankly, loud some of the other candidates were, and given how skilled they are as speakers — I mean, I don't like Mike Huckabee, but he's got a stage presence —

ROCKWELL Oh yeah.

WOODS: — and he doesn't trip over his words. He's effective; he connects with his base very well. If Rand's not prepared to do that, and if the only way he's going to distinguish himself is by yelling out of turn at Donald Trump, that's not a debate strategy.

ROCKWELL Well, it would have been nice to hear him defend private property rights. He got in trouble earlier in the campaign, and of course his dad always had just a magnificent way of phrasing things, too. And it's one of the areas in which he had a huge educational effect on young people, because they'd never heard such a thing, of course. They always, without really thinking about it, accepted the idea that forced interactions were moral. And when he explained to them from an economic standpoint and from a moral standpoint, a political standpoint, why this was disastrous, he changed people's minds, changed their hearts. And I still notice that effect, of course, not only in that issue, but in many, many other issues, that Ron Paul had a permanent effect on so many people. Whether anybody on that stage is going to be in that same category, I simply don't think so.

WOODS: Let's say a little something about Trump. I expected him to mop the floor with everybody, and he really didn't. I thought there were some of his answers that sounded very conventional —

ROCKWELL Yes.

WOODS: — or at least in politician speak, and demagogic in a dumb way — not demagogic because he's talking about immigration per se, but just because it was just, we need to do this, and this country doesn't work, and we're losing, and this and that. So I thought that was unfortunate, and I thought he came off kind of looking like the caricature he's been portrayed as, which is that he's got no substance; he's got no specifics. He's just a clown. And unfortunately for him, I think a bit of that came through last night. And secondly, he didn't really go on the attack.

ROCKWELL Yeah.

WOODS: I thought the way that he would really distinguish himself was by saying, look, this one just gave you a pretty speech, but let me tell you the truth about this guy. I don't think he maybe had that information at his fingertips.

ROCKWELL He also seemed to be slightly nervous. I know that's a very odd criticism to make of Donald Trump, but he was uncomfortable. And of course, they were after him, but that could hardly have been a surprise to him. So I think he did say some good things. He said that he was the only guy on stage to have opposed the Iraq War and to have predicted it would be a total disaster and would destabilize the Middle East, and of course —

WOODS: Exactly. And apparently that didn't hurt him in the Drudge poll any.

ROCKWELL No. And I also liked it when the evil Megyn Kelly was listing all his terribly alleged sexist remarks, and he said, well, I only said that about Rosie O'Donnell. And the crowd cheered him, and Megyn Kelly was so upset, so viciously upset, I mean, she clearly just wanted to stab him over that.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL And it showed the truth about her. And he said, look, I don't have time for political correctness and neither does this country.

WOODS: Yeah, the fact that he could take a question like that and turn it around in his favor obviously annoyed her, with the funny remark about Rosie O'Donnell. Like, don't you know you're being sternly lectured to for your bad behavior? Shut up and sit there and take it.

ROCKWELL (laughing) No, it's true.

WOODS: All right, so I wrote down a list of names here as I was watching, like, who were the ones who really looked strong just as debaters — again, not that I would vote for these people. But just in terms of what the debate was all about, who came off the strongest? And I have to say, from my opinion, the two strongest really were Rubio and Cruz, and I don't want to say that, Lew. There's no bone in my body that wants to say that, but I thought Rubio came off as very polished and very much in command and connected very well. And his statement about, how's Hilary Clinton going to come

after me as somebody who doesn't understand what it's like to live paycheck to paycheck; that's how I was raised. Now, they all to some extent, have the schmaltz about how they were raised, but I thought it worked very well for him, and I thought, you know, he hit on Dodd Frank; I mean, he hit on some pretty decent points — leaving foreign policy aside, which was a total disaster last night. Ted Cruz said the Iranians were on the verge of getting a nuclear weapon.

ROCKWELL (laughing) Yeah.

WOODS: (laughing) I mean, there is no intelligence agency on this planet or any other that would back him up on that. But his debate skills and his forensic skills from Harvard came out, I thought, very clearly. And I think he's going to get a real boost from this, Ted Cruz.

ROCKWELL Well, I think, and the Drudge poll would bear you out. Cruz and Rubio were number two and three, and I think —

WOODS: Yeah, so when you said that, I hadn't even seen the Drudge poll, and I think that Trump's finish in that poll is just because people want to support Trump. It's not really because he thought he was the winner. So the fact that those two came out strongly, you're right; I think that does support that.

ROCKWELL Yeah, and Carson, by this polling anyway, did some good for himself. I was not entirely impressed. He said a couple of interesting things. I don't find him impressive.

WOODS: No, I thought he was very weak, very unsure of himself, not well prepared. He came off as a lightweight, and I had never heard him speak before, but I thought, well, the guy's a neurosurgeon; he must be pretty sharp. And certainly, in brain surgery, he may be very sharp, and it's maybe too much to expect him to be a politician on a debate stage. But when they asked him, "Would you have intervened in Syria?" we never got an answer. We got the answer that the military has been gutted, and so, because it's been gutted, of course Obama couldn't intervene. So do that mean he should have? Does that mean you would have? We got no answer whatsoever. I mean, that is what we kind of expect from politicians, but that was just really bad. And his answers, he would occasionally have a cutesy answer, like his answer about race, and I'm a neurosurgeon and that's why I don't talk about race — you know, that was pretty good. But otherwise, he sounded, frankly, like a sixth grader giving a book report. Very unimpressive.

ROCKWELL Yeah, and of course Rand did next best after Carson and beating Kasich pretty significantly in his poll. And one of the goals clearly of Fox and of the GOP was to promote Kasich last night, because he's a beloved establishment figure, just as beloved, maybe more beloved, than Bush, and since Bush is failing so badly and the Koch candidate, Walker, is not doing as well as people would like, I think there's a reason Kasich is on the move in the polls and why he got so much attention last night, so much speaking time and so forth. They love him; they want him. He's a horrible,

horrible statist, a real totalitarian, no better than Christie or some of those guys. But beloved by Fox and the rest of the neocons.

WOODS: It reminds of, I guess it was two cycles ago, when some people were pushing another governor, Tim Pawlenty, because I remember the first debate Pawlenty was going to be in, I'll never forget Sean Hannity saying, well, all eyes are on Tim Pawlenty, and I thought, Sean, speak for yourself. All eyes are on the greatest establishment bore in the history of the world? What are you talking about? And of course he sank like a stone. And I think Kasich and Walker both came out pretty much staying the same as before. I mean, the Drudge poll may have some of the pulse of America in it; I don't know for sure. But just on the merits, I thought they pretty much stayed the same.

And with Huckabee, he sounded exactly like he's always sounded, and for Ron Paul to sound exactly like he's always sounded is bracing and refreshing, because he's iconoclastic and busting myths and saying the opposite of what people want him to say, but Huckabee just seemed like the same ol', same ol' guy, you know, just nothing new there.

And Christie came on, and I thought, at times I would say, well, I think Christie just gave a strong answer there, even though I don't agree with it. And my wife would say, oh no, he comes off as the reason you move away from the northeast, is to get away from a guy like that.

ROCKWELL (laughing) No, I think nobody likes Christie, and even though he was promoted by the same people promoting Kasich and Walker now, he just couldn't carry it off. And then there was the Bridgegate scandal and all that, and he's just through. He was never there. Somebody else who's through in the undercard debate yesterday was when Rick Perry referred to Ronald Raven —

WOODS: Ugh.

ROCKWELL — and what he'd done in immigration and sort of just fed into what everybody thinks about Perry, is he's got at least a screw loose, and he's a horrible neocon too. So I would say he's gone; that's a good thing. I did notice that Rand, never heard him say this before, defined himself as a "Reagan conservative," that's what he said.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL And of course, as we know, Reagan was a monster. I mean, he was a warmonger; he raised taxes six times; he vastly increased the deficit, vastly increased spending, vastly increased government intrusion into our lives, vastly increased surveillance. I'm sure what Rand means, I'm a Reagan conservative in the rhetorical Reagan sense.

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL In the Reagan sense of the things. But Reagan didn't do anything good.

WOODS: Yeah, and the trouble is, I understand the reason that he made that reference there. It was to say that Reagan was not as much of a warmonger as you people. I understand that limited reason. The trouble is that everybody on the stage is a Reagan conservative, so again, why do I pick this one, who sounds a little bit off to me on some things, and I've got a whole stage full of Reagan conservatives I can go for? So there's that.

Did you notice that, I haven't looked at any figures on the total amount of time each candidate got, but it sure seemed, based on his poll numbers, that Rubio got a whole lot of face time.

ROCKWELL Yes. Of course, Trump got the most; Rand got the least.

WOODS: Yeah, I knew Rand got the least, and it wasn't for lack of trying. As I say, Rand was trying to jump in the best he could, and then he attacked Trump on single-payer, when Trump had said that he no longer supported single-payer. If you're going to interrupt, you should have said, well, what in the world changed? I don't understand your answer; it's incoherent, that single-payer might have worked in a different age? What does that mean, a different age 20 years ago? What does that even mean? That's not an answer at all.

ROCKWELL How you could ever have supported that sort of socialist program, is what he should have said.

WOODS: Yeah, how are we supposed to believe that you have seen the light? And then of course, Trump's answer about bankruptcy was not super great, because basically he's saying, look, I only stiffed my creditors four times.

ROCKWELL (laughing) No.

WOODS: And don't worry; these aren't little old ladies. These are big guys who can take it.

ROCKWELL And I never personally declared bankruptcy; I just declared it four times for my business.

WOODS: Exactly. Yeah, that was the only time I felt like Chris Wallace actually said something useful, which was, "Oh, come on!" I mean, this is a distinction without a difference here.

ROCKWELL Yes.

WOODS: Now on foreign policy, there probably isn't that much to say, because it's so predictable. Walker was saying that the day he gets elected, he's going to get rid of the agreement; he's going to impose stiffer sanctions. Oh, good grief, it was just that

from every single one of them. There was no — and of course, how could you expect it? There was no sense of, well, let's see, everything we've touched has turned into a disaster. Every single country we've touched has gotten vastly worse after we've touched it; let's keep touching — seems to be the lesson they all drew. And everybody clapped and cheered and —

ROCKWELL Let's kill another million men, women, and children. That'll be great.

WOODS: Yeah, that'll be great, because after that, it really should work. And they don't realize — or maybe they do, and they just don't care — they sound exactly like the Left on, well, let's see; we've tried planning the economy to this extent or the other; we've kept interest rates historically low for 15 years; we've had stimulus programs and deficits, and it's produced zero net breadwinner jobs during that period. But if we keep on doing it, maybe it'll turn out okay. It's the same thing.

ROCKWELL Not enough troops were involved; not enough vicious weapons involved; not enough people killed; not enough starvation caused, sickness. And all these people are proclaiming, of course, their attachment to Christianity: I was saved by the blood of Jesus and so forth, and let's murder everybody in the Middle East.

WOODS: Yeah, nobody bats an eye.

ROCKWELL That was Walker's comments.

WOODS: Yeah, he wants troops on the Polish border. I don't know if he just wants to send weapons or troops to Ukraine —

ROCKWELL Weapons, I think he said, yes, but —

WOODS: It was weapons? Okay, yeah.

ROCKWELL You have to have trainers, too, right?

WOODS: Yeah, right, exactly. What's that? Oh yeah, there was one other question we have to look at: Rand on Israel. I almost forgot. I wrote that down later, because I think that was one of his last questions that he got — that he had changed his mind on aid to Israel, and what does he think about that. At least part — his answer, that we can't give money that we don't have, is a reasonable answer, and he tried to start off with, I don't want to give foreign aid to our enemies or people who burn the flag and so on and on. I understand that's his standard talking point, but that's not going to work when they've just said the word "Israel," and they know you need to talk about Israel specifically. At least he stood there and said we have to put everything on the table, and at least I'm trying to give specifics. I mean, that was better than he might have done.

ROCKWELL Yes, but the only answer that's acceptable in the Republican Party is we're going to sell Ohio and send it to Israel. I mean, you can't put Israel in the same

category as the other foreign aid recipients. And in fact, this is an ongoing project within the Obama administration, as it was within the Bush administration, to put Israeli foreign aid within the Pentagon budget and not in the foreign aid budget, so it can't ever be touched.

WOODS: All right, let's wrap up with, going forward now — I don't know when the next debate is — do you offhand?

ROCKWELL Well, it's one a month, so the next one is in September, but I don't know the date or the location or the network.

WOODS: Now, I just, maybe I've blocked it out, because I choose not to remember it, but I don't remember from the previous two cycles, the stage at which candidates start dropping out. I know obviously after a poor showing in a primary, you drop out, some people do. But are there some who don't even get to the primaries? There must be some. They just don't have the money, and the poll numbers aren't good enough, and they just quit.

ROCKWELL I think that's right — when that's going to happen this time — but how can somebody like Christie continue to run? Somebody like Huckabee, who is not raising any money at all, just very, very — just pennies, in terms of political contributions. So I think and hope — certainly it'd be great to get rid of them. I should also add that I had a very tough time watching the entire two hours, because I find most of these guys boring in the extreme. And two hours' worth and the horrible people from Fox and the horrible people in the audience and the horrible people up on the stage was pretty difficult. And I wonder how many Americans actually watched two hours. You watched it; I watched it. This is still, despite all the glitz and the auditorium and the lighting and the colors and all, very boring. Very boring. And these guys are all lying or they're just giving canned talking points. Very, very seldom was any truth told. I don't know, I mean, I watched the debates last time, because Ron Paul was in them and just a spark of light and of truth and of justice in the darkness of the Republican Party, but we don't have that this time. What's your view? Do you think people are going to find these debates as riveting as we do?

WOODS: Well, I think now that they've seen a debate with Trump in it, which I think was the key draw —

ROCKWELL Yes.

WOODS: — I think the novelty wears off, especially because he, from my point of view, was a disappointment, because I thought he at least would carry me through the two hours.

ROCKWELL I thought exactly the same.

WOODS: That he'd come out swinging.

ROCKWELL Yep.

WOODS: And at least he'd have some people who could feed him some good dirt on the positions of the other candidates or the actions the other candidates had taken, and he could call them out as being hypocrites or inconsistent – something interesting and fun. I mean, the guy who gave out Lindsey Graham's phone number should keep me entertained in this debate, and he sounded too much just like an angrier version of the other ones, which was too bad.

ROCKWELL And he even backed off on immigration, after he talked about building his wall, he said, and I want to have a great big door for the legal immigrants. Well, there are too many legal immigrants. There's never been a debate in this country about what was set out in the '65 Immigration Act to change the demographics of the country. It's never been allowed to be discussed why, for example – you know Guido Hulsmann, as I do; great German economist, Austrian economist, brilliant intellectual – we were never able to get a work visa for him, despite hiring expensive lawyers, having a lot of help from the university and our own people. You can't get a German here. Germans are barred. So are Spaniards, so are Irishmen, Englishmen, Italians, Poles, Romanians, Danes, Swedes. They're all barred. Why is that? What was the reason for that? And of course it was to bring about the demographic revolution that we're seeing, and it's stepped up under Obama, so it was a great thing that Trump was raising this issue. Is he backing off? Is he becoming more politically correct? He was a disappointment as a performer last night; maybe he's going to even be – I noticed Anne Coulter, who I don't agree with on virtually anything, but she said she was terrified that he was going to back off. And seems to me maybe she was right, maybe he is backing off, which would give you, it seems to me, no reason to root for Trump whatsoever.

WOODS: All right, let me – and you know, when we say, "Root for Trump," we just like watching him.

ROCKWELL Of course.

WOODS: His policy positions are just horrifying.

ROCKWELL No, you don't want to root for anybody's election. Anybody who wants power over us is disqualified from having power.

WOODS: Yes, of course. Right, right. But at least keep me entertained. If you can't even do that, what are you good for? Well, what I'm going to do is on the show notes page for today, which is TomWoods.com/463, I'm going to link to a few things that'll be of interest. I'll link to that Dan McCarthy article on what Rand ought to do that you and I both liked. I'll link to Rothbard on immigration, his views toward the end of his life, the article that he wrote for the *Journal of Libertarian Studies*; I'll link to that, showing how his thought evolved on what an anarchocapitalist should think about immigration, so I'll put that. And also, of course, I'll link to your Political Theater blog, which people can reach by going to LewRockwell.com, clicking on "Political Theater." I am addicted to this blog. It's getting me through the election season, because you find

the most interesting pieces. Your commentary is absolutely unique in the political world. I love it; I'm starved for it; I want you to blog three times as much as you do. I mean, it's just great. And the kind of chitchat that we've been having is the kind of stuff you read on Lew Rockwell's Political Theater blog every single day. So I will link to that as well at TomWoods.com/463. Well, Lew, maybe we have to put ourselves through this exercise once a month until they stop doing this to us, but I sure appreciate it.

ROCKWELL Let's hope we have some entertainment next time.

WOODS: That's right, that's right. Thanks a lot.