



Episode 492: Lew Rockwell and Tom on the Second GOP Debate, 2015

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: It's so funny; I was just talking to you on the phone, and I couldn't contain my laughter when I was apologizing to you that inadvertently I had made you sit through three hours of this. I had no idea the debate was to go on for three hours; like, how could this still be going on? And I said I don't want you to think that I think so little of the value of your time that I would force you to go through this, but anyway, the silver lining is we're certainly going to have fun talking about it.

I wrote down some notes about particular responses that people made that I thought we might want to talk about, but let's start with overall impressions. Of course I'm sure you agree with me that I'm not particularly thrilled with these people, to put it mildly, and there were some reactions from the crowd that were just appalling. I read on your Political Theatre blog, which I'm going to link to on today's show notes page, of course, that these were reliably pro-Bush donor types, so of course they're going to cheer that George W. Bush kept us safe and so on and so forth. But coming out of this, who do you think, from a media or a GOP point of view anyway, comes out the strongest?

ROCKWELL: Well, I think Trump still. They wanted to kill him. In some sense, the whole debate structure and the vast promotion of Carly Fiorina was designed to kill him. So he survived. He was not as interesting or as fun as he was in the first debate, but still, the Drudge poll and other online polls show – I'm not seen written polls, I'm not seeing telephone polls yet, but the online polls show people feel he was by far the winner, and I think that's correct. I mean, he won just by not being killed, as all the other candidates wanted to bring about.

WOODS: Right, although it's just becoming more and more clear that – it's one thing to say that he doesn't have official policy papers. We all know they don't amount to anything. But he frankly really has very little of substance to say at all. I mean, it would be nice to have somebody who enrages the establishment and has a lot of substance to say, but the only person I know who fits that description is Ron Paul, and he's retired.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Isn't it too bad he didn't run again? Not that I would wish that on him.

WOODS: No, that's right. But just Trump, it's just over and over again, it's just, "Things are going to be better" – in fact, I wrote down, at one point he said something – yeah, "We'll have more of everything." "If I'm president, we'll have more of everything." Which, just –

ROCKWELL: More tomatoes? Yeah, no.

WOODS: (laughing) It's incredible. All right, that is just too much – even though every single State of the Union address pretty much consists of the president getting up and saying, well, if Congress acts, we'll have more of everything. So I guess he is rehearsing for the role, I suppose. All right, so Trump comes out looking okay, as you say, because he didn't drop dead. Everybody likes Fiorina, because she's so tough, but in a way, to me she kind of comes off as overdoing it, because, I'm the woman on the stage, so I have to make sure I'm the toughest, so everybody understands that just because I'm a woman, doesn't mean I can't be tough. And she plays this woman card, to me, just way too much. And I've read somewhere that she's given credence to the theory that women are being paid less for the same work. I mean, that's a Hillary Clinton view. They're not being paid less *for the same work*. That's the whole point. People add in the "for the same work" later, but that's not what the statistics show.

ROCKWELL: And when she was running for the Senate against Barbara Boxer in California, she made fun of Barbara Boxer's looks. Okay, with me –

WOODS: Did she really?

ROCKWELL: Yeah, but you know, it's different when a woman's doing it a woman. A man can't do it, even though Carly Fiorina would tell us she believes in sexual equality; everything should be the same; men and women should be the same. But you still can't observe that she's a slightly scary woman, scary person. I thought today she reminded me of Rosa Klebb, the character, the Soviet KGB agent in *From Russia with Love*, played by the great Lotta Lenya. I thought just a few more brass buttons on Fiorina's suit and she would look like she was right ready to become a commissar of the East German Stasi.

WOODS: Yeah, I know it; I know it. I saw that on your blog. And we might as well, as long as we're talking about that, address the whole – normally I don't care that much about the personal attacks of one on the other unless it's really entertaining, but the way she handled the Donald Trump face comment really reduced him to the closest I've seen to groveling that he's been, where he had to say, but she's a very beautiful woman. Nobody believes a word he's saying, and so suddenly Trump is being anti-Trump.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) When I saw her face during those comments, if she could have come over and punched him in the nose or something, she would have done it. I mean, she was –

WOODS: And by the way, I don't want to assume that everybody listening watched the debate. I think some of them are listening to us so that they didn't have to watch the debate. So let me just make clear what was said. We all know probably that Donald Trump had made a remark along the lines of, can you imagine that face being the face of America and so on and on, and obviously insulting her. So this came up in the debate, and she was asked what she thought about these remarks, given that Trump later claimed that he was just speaking about her overall persona, not her physical countenance. And she basically came back with, I'm pretty sure the women of America heard what Donald Trump said, and she just had this very brief but cutting reply, and then he said, you know, I think she has a very beautiful face and she's a lovely woman, and it was just not his shining moment.

ROCKWELL: No, the whole night was much less entertaining than the previous one, although I like Jeff Deist's point that he really thinks Trump should never have joined these debates, that Trump should have said I don't need the Republican Party apparatus; these debates are designed, among other things, to promote the political class, to promote the Republican Party establishment and of course to destroy me, so I'm not going to participate in them. I have my own audience; I can get on TV when I want; I'm off to New Hampshire or Iowa. And it would have made for very, very — imagine these debates without Trump. CNN last night had the highest ratings in the entire history of CNN.

WOODS: And see, that amazed me in a way, because I thought that the luster of the whole thing would have worn off after the first two-hour debate and that we would have seen a drop off. And yet for CNN to set that kind of record shows that I was wrong about that. It's interesting, your point about Trump possibly sitting the whole thing out and what that would have amounted to. I'm imagining he even, if he wanted to, he could have had his own event at the same time.

ROCKWELL: Well, that's right.

WOODS: And gotten CSPAN to cover it, and then we'd see how CSPAN's ratings did. You know, CSPAN would have like 58 times the level of viewership it had ever had. That would have been very, very interesting. But you know, it's not to be, I guess. So in terms of people who, let's say, not just stayed stable, but went down in the debate, I read on the Political Theatre blog a link over at Zero Hedge, where they said that Carson really sank last night, because he had very little of substance to say, and he just had a poor performance. But I think that's wishful thinking on the part of Zero Hedge, because everybody who's supporting Carson, they already know that about him. Like he's not particularly articulate. He doesn't come across as particularly informed or inspiring. I think there's one main reason everybody's supporting Carson, and it's not because he wows you with his intellect.

ROCKWELL: No, and I must say I find him an increasingly unappealing figure, although I'm very much in the minority I guess of that, but I thought that he didn't do as well as expected. How much his poll ratings are going to fall for example, or maybe not at all as you say. Maybe Trump's are not going to fall either. We just have to see. But it

seemed to me that Carson didn't do well. I didn't like his promotion of higher minimum wage. I didn't like his promotion of the whole vaccine religion.

You know, it's so controversial. Trump had some minor comments to make about the trouble with massive vaccinations for little, tiny babies and sometimes the horrendous results of them. Why is it that vaccines are like a holy subject? I remember that's what ended Michele Bachmann's political career, when she talked about Rick Perry forcing all the sixth grade girls in Texas to have Gardasil, and there had been paralysis and other horrendous consequences for some of these girls. That was the end of her. The pharmaceutical industry is of course extremely powerful, but it's not just that. It's like an official state function. And they also I suppose at some point would like to – who knows what they want to inject us with? But it's just very, very important to them, and I was glad Trump raised a question.

But Dr. Carson took the entirely establishment positions, like you're talking to somebody from the American Pediatric Association about the federal government recommends more than 80 vaccinations from the time you're a little, tiny baby until the time you're an old person. More than 80. And of course they keep coming up with more. So this is a real issue, and I was disappointed that Carson just shows he just goes with the flow; he just goes along with the establishment.

WOODS: Well, also on the health point, I jotted down Huckabee wants a war on cancer, a war on I guess heart disease –

ROCKWELL: There already is a war on cancer. Richard Nixon started it.

WOODS: Yeah, Nixon declared war on cancer in the 1970s, so cancer's already been cured. I don't know why Huckabee doesn't realize that. We already cured cancer, because the government already declared a war on cancer. There's a pretty good discussion of this whole thing, about government wars on things like cancer in Tom Bethell's book, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Science*, because in there he talks about a lot of the difficulties with government funding of science and particularly of health science, and just one of them is that you get politicized funding, because obviously there are going to be different medical researchers who have different theories, and some of those theories are going to be mutually contradictory. So in order to justify the spending to the taxpayer, you don't want to be in a position where you have to say, yeah, that's true; we're funding two mutually exclusive theories. Although I don't see what would be the problem of saying that, because maybe one of them's right and one of them's wrong. If we put all of our eggs in one basket and it's the wrong one, then we're just funding going down the wrong path.

And that's exactly what the federal government does. It funds one particular way of looking at a thing, and by giving its imprimatur to that particular way of thinking, it almost by definition makes everybody else out to be a crank. They can't get published in the journals. They're viewed as outliers not worth listening to. So it often does more harm than good, as typical of any government intervention. But yeah, to hear him say why don't we declare war on all these things, there's just no sense of irony with any of

these people. They just got done talking about limited government, and then we're going to declare war on a disease.

ROCKWELL: Well of course it's a socialist war on a disease, and as you and Tom Bethell point out, you have a situation where only the establishment things get funded, and everything else is pushed to the side. So in terms of cancer, you can have surgery, you can have radiation, you can have chemotherapy. That's it. And nothing else is to be considered. Who knows how many people are dead and dying who otherwise might not have been if it hadn't been for the fact that Nixon, who of course was a terrible National Socialist, established this horrendous war on cancer. So to see the boob, Huckabee, proposing all these additional things, vastly expanding the government – but as you say, none of them care about that. They in fact are all for expanding the government. You just have to look at the Republican Party in power. They always expand the government.

WOODS: I want to get, of course, to Rand Paul, and we'll do that in a few minutes, but before that, I want to bring up one thing that I liked that Trump said. And to discover that Trump is being supported by Jeffrey Lord made me very unhappy. I don't know if you remember this, but back in maybe the 2012 campaign – I can't remember which one – but Lord was a huge anti-Ron Paul guy.

ROCKWELL: Yes.

WOODS: He was writing in *The American Spectator*, and he was backing up Mark Levin's attacks on Ron, so I responded to him, both in a YouTube and in an article on your site, LewRockwell.com.

ROCKWELL: I remember that.

WOODS: Yeah. And there he is, a Trump supporter. Ahh, come on. I'm not exactly sure what upsets me about that, but something upsets me about that. But anyway, Trump said this – he was asked about Syria. And I'm sure Trump does not know that much about Syria, but the thing is that sometimes that's better. Like I would rather have somebody who just has instincts to go on sometimes than somebody who knows ever little in and out, because those sorts of people are the ones who think they can micromanage a situation. And Trump says – he was asked what would you do about the Russians; they're getting involved in Syria; they're backing up Assad. Yeah, they're backing up the secular regime. Now, bear in mind, toppling secular regimes in the Middle East doesn't seem to be working too well. The track record is terrible, yet we're supposed to be horrified at the Russians.

So what would Trump do? And Trump said I think I would get along with Putin. I think I would get along with the world leaders. And he said I don't think we get along with them right now, but I think I would get along with them. And then he said secondly, you've got ISIS in there; you've got Assad in there; you've got all these factions. Why not let them just fight it out? Because he's basically implying that we don't really know what side we're on in this whole thing in Syria; why don't we let them fight it out?

Well, that's much better than anybody else on the stage was willing to say. Except Rand, who was actually pretty good on this.

ROCKWELL: Well and of course, the U.S. has been funding a number of sides in a number of wars for a long time, and it's, in my view, absolutely no coincidence that they overthrow the secular regimes. The anti-Islamist regimes get targeted and overthrown and their leaders murdered by the U.S., whether it's Iraq, whether it's Libya. That's what they want to do to Syria, and the rebels, the moderate rebels who the U.S. has been funding are very open about the fact that they want to ethnically cleanse every Christian out of Syria — and of course there are a lot of Christians who already had to leave Syria, even though for 2,000 years they've been living there peacefully. And also the Alawites, that is the smaller semi-Muslim group to which Assad's family belongs, they're going to kill them all, they say. Put them all up against the wall and shoot them. A

nd also, why would anybody think — after all, the war in Iraq, Trump also pointed out, has destabilized the whole Middle East, as all of us of course predicted at the time. The refugee crisis in Europe is caused by this. So you have this horrendous crisis of all these Syrians showing up in Europe and expecting to go on the welfare rolls and wreaking what I think is horrendous damage, and we're supposed to think, "Bomb them more." You know, that'll fix things. Let's bomb more.

WOODS: Yeah. Well, unfortunately, Trump then forfeited a lot of the goodwill he had earned with me when he was then asked about the subject of the refugees, and did the U.S. senators who voted against using force in Syria bear some moral responsibility for the refugee crisis. And he thought that basically they had some responsibility.

And then he was asked about Obama drawing this red line and Assad crossed the red line and so on and on, and Trump started off well. He said, well, first of all, I wouldn't have drawn any red line. Good. Right. That's the correct answer; no one else would say that.

But then he goes on to say, look, if we had just gone in there and used a whole lot of force, massive force, we wouldn't have had any refugees. All right, let's try and go back into the distant past, all the way 2003 if we can, and think about shock and awe. And I guess that didn't lead to any refugees; only between 2 and 4 million of them were caused by the war in Iraq by using massive force. But massive force in Syria wouldn't lead to refugees apparently. That's not good. Like, that is just — that's not a serious person.

ROCKWELL: I'm not even sure that Trump understood the red line business. At one point, he seemed to think that Assad had drawn the red line and then gone over it, as versus Obama drawing the red line.

WOODS: Ah, okay, but it sounded it to me like he got the Obama part, which made his response all the better. But then the, if we had used massive force, there'd be no refugees. Well, let's turn to Rand, because —

ROCKWELL: Because they're all massive force users.

WOODS: Yeah well, indeed. Because I thought Rand was better in this debate than he was in the first one, and I thought there were some answers he gave that were just right on, and there were some that could have been better. So first of all, he did I think give a good – he did a good overview. He said we have this history of toppling secular regimes, and the result is always destabilizing, and the bad guys get into power, so that's the debate that we should be having, is whether or not we should intervene at all. That's really good. But unfortunately it's probably 20% too subtle for this audience, so it's got to be more like, look, you know, the people on this stage, maybe they have their merits on certain things, I don't know. But their foreign policy is a cartoon. It's a cartoon with people with horns, and this is beneath us. They think that if we just bomb a bad guy, that there's some sweet, wonderful person waiting in the wings. Well, I'm not as naive as these people are. I don't think there are such sweet people waiting in the wings.

So anyway, I would do that. I'd be much, much more on the attack against them and say that basically everybody on this stage believes in a cartoon version of what's going on in the world, and as conservatives, we're supposed to be a little bit above that. So I would have done that. So that was an okay response. I thought his exchange with Chris Christie was pretty good on marijuana, but I thought he focused way too much on medical marijuana, when after Christie was more or less conceding that point, I thought he was hitting that too hard. You could also say – there's plenty you could say about the drug war itself, and I thought it got just way too bogged down in medical marijuana. But anyway, what did you think about that?

ROCKWELL: Well, I thought first of all his demeanor and his voice were a big improvement over the first debate.

WOODS: Absolutely.

ROCKWELL: He didn't raise his voice, and he didn't raise the tone of his voice as well, so I thought he sounded serious and persuasive. The only thing I'll say is it seems like every time he's discussing something, he just wants to be a hair to the good side of the Republicans. And so things can be slightly unclear. I mean, I don't know – you and I understood what was going on last night. Did the average Republican person watching this? I mean, it seemed to me, as you say, far too subtle – I don't know if that's quite the word – but I didn't think it was effective, except to libertarians. Libertarians knew what he was doing. Maybe they thought he wasn't going far enough.

But I'm not even sure Rand believes in the legalization of medical marijuana, for example. I think he believes the states should be able to do that, and in fact, the states – he mentions Colorado – should be able to legalize it entirely if they want to. So that's very good. But I don't think he believes that the feds should stop their drug war against medical marijuana or anything else.

WOODS: Well, there was, I think it was Christie who made the comment about marijuana being a gateway drug, and that is such a bogus theory. There's no support for that. As far as I know, the only support for that, if you can call it that, is that people who do use heavy drugs have used marijuana in the past. But that doesn't mean that if you use marijuana, you're going to wind up using these heavy drugs. And they've got it completely in reverse, but no one bothers to stop and look, because Christie is appealing to the 75 and overs in the audience who –

ROCKWELL: Also, they've all used alcohol. In fact, everything Christie talked about applies to alcohol in spades, so I presume that he's not wanting a prohibition of alcohol to add to the prohibition of drugs. But who knows with these guys? If they thought it was in the interest of the government and in their own interests, they would absolutely be for prohibiting alcohol again.

WOODS: Now, Rand also said at one point, why are we the patsies of the world fighting everyone's wars for them? Okay, another good theme. He could pound that one home.

ROCKWELL: Well, yeah, and not actually true of course. I mean, the U.S. is fighting these wars for its own imperial reasons. The U.S. government is not a charitable enterprise.

WOODS: Yeah, I get that. Of course we have no disagreement there. I'm talking about, how do you reach that type of audience? How do you get an entry point with that type of audience? And you get them thinking that maybe other people should fight wars. Certainly the ISIS example is an excellent one. If people in that region want to take care of that issue, that's their decision, but there's no reason that automatically the United States has to be involved in that. So that's okay.

ROCKWELL: No but of course, if the United States had a hand in starting ISIS, of which there's some evidence, you could understand people of the region might feel it has a hand, in fact. Of course it's not in anybody's interest in the Middle East for the U.S. to be making more war and killing more people, and we should just get out obviously.

WOODS: Let me say a quick thing, because I've got it written down here. One quick thing about Rubio, because that's all the time I want to spend on Rubio. But I have to say, there was one thing he said last night that I thought was very well said, and that was on climate change. He had exactly the correct position, which was that, regardless of whether you think there is manmade climate change, the point is that no matter what the United States does, it'll be a drop in the bucket anyway. It won't even be noticeable in terms of environmental impact, because you've got China, you've got all these other major countries that aren't going to do a thing. So all we would be doing is shooting ourselves in the foot for nothing, for no return at all. All we would be doing is making energy more expensive for everybody and the United States less competitive. That was a perfect answer, and if he had been anybody other than Marco Rubio, I would have clapped my hands. But then I couldn't help thinking this is Marco Rubio; maintain your composure.

ROCKWELL: My favorite part of that was Jake Tapper being shocked, shocked that anybody could disagree with George Shultz.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah.

ROCKWELL: You know, he was, Reagan's this and Nixon's that. This is the guy, by the way, who invented affirmative action as Labor Secretary in the Nixon administration. He's a leftist and a crony capitalist across the board, and I'm not at all surprised that he's in favor of "climate change," laws against climate change and a massive worldwide bureaucracy, U.S. bureaucracy. Absolutely disastrous economically and in any other — and of course as we know, this is all based on phony science. But even it weren't based on phony science, the idea that you should empower the bureaucracy in Washington to run the world climate and do whatever they want, seems to me not just a mistake, but actually insane.

WOODS: All right, I think I'll put some climate-related episodes on today's show notes page, which will be TomWoods.com/492. I've talked to a whole bunch of people on this, on carbon taxes and all that stuff, sorting all that out. Let's say a little something about — well, first of all, I was going to say the opening and closing statements. I have to hand Jeb Bush one point, which is that, unless somebody fed him that question about what would you want your Secret Service codename to be, I thought he handled that hilariously. I thought the ever-ready thing and high energy was probably the most charismatic thing he's said or done in the whole campaign. Very clever, thinking on his feet with that answer. I thought that was a great answer.

ROCKWELL: Well you know, forgive me if I think it was staged.

WOODS: Yeah okay, because it seems too clever for Jeb Bush?

ROCKWELL: Yeah, I think he knew about that. My favorite — speaking of his thinking on his feet, the *Daily Mail* had a great story today about Jeb standing on his tiptoes when he was standing next to Trump in the group photo and otherwise to make himself appear even taller than Trump.

WOODS: I saw that. So you can actually seem him doing that?

ROCKWELL: Yes, they have photos of his feet. He's standing on his tiptoes. So it seems to me that says something not very good about his self-confidence. He's already taller. He's the tallest guy in the room. Very odd thing that he would be standing on his tiptoes in a group photo to make himself taller still. I mean, very odd.

WOODS: Yeah, very odd indeed.

ROCKWELL: Very odd guy.

WOODS: I want to say something about opening and closing statements here, because everybody knows they're going to get an opening and closing statement. They all know

you're going to get an opportunity to introduce yourself. And then at the end, whatever the final question is, you can turn it into a closing statement. Like last night: "How would the world be different if you go elected?" So that's basically your closing statement anyway. So there's no excuse not to have a really, really compelling closing statement, rehearsed, down cold. Now, I know that there's some value to total spontaneity and so on, but not in a 30-second closing statement where I have the attention of the entire U.S. You'd better believe, Lew, if I were up there, I would have rehearsed that thing, I would have written that thing over and over and over again, and it would have been the best I could possibly produce. And that's why I thought —

ROCKWELL: Tom, you would win the debate if you'd been up there by a mile.

WOODS: That's very good of you to say.

ROCKWELL: Of course.

WOODS: But when I look at Rand's opening and closing statements, this is where he's got his chance unimpeded. He's got the floor; no one can interrupt him. He gave very conventional opening and closing statements that no one is going to remember. He says I support the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution is meant to control the government, not the people. Just throw away lines, totally forgettable, that could have been uttered by anybody else on the stage. And the closing statement was so forgettable, I don't remember a thing about it. Like, there's no excuse for that. I can understand you're a lower tier candidate at this point, you only get half the amount of time, there's only so much you can do about that. But this is entirely in your hands, so there's no excuse for not smashing that out of the park.

ROCKWELL: Speaking of these statements, why did Rubio think that in the California very serious drought situation, that his opening joke should be he brought an extra bottle of water, because he thought maybe he would get any water? So he clearly thought everybody's going to laugh, and of course nobody laughed.

WOODS: Nobody laughed.

ROCKWELL: It was a dumb remark.

WOODS: Right, nobody laughed. And of course it was a reference to his, when he made the response to the president and he took a glass of water in the middle of his statement, and so that was a reference to that old thing.

ROCKWELL: But who remembers that except for Mrs. Rubio?

WOODS: Exactly. Exactly. You'd have to be a political junkie to remember that reference. So now it just looks like he's making fun of California for no reason.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, for something that's not their fault for once.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah, exactly. That pretty much exhausts my particular impressions. What have we not touched that you think is interesting? And of course Ann Coulter, I, again, it's only because I read Lew Rockwell's Political Theatre that I know half the things I know about current events. I'm going to link to it at TomWoods.com/492, but of course you should go to LewRockwell.com and click where you see "Political Theatre." You'd just love it. Every day it's the best, most interesting, funniest collection of articles and links you're going to find anywhere. And Ann Coulter I guess tweeted out something –

ROCKWELL: Got in trouble.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah. Pretty outrageous, but very funny, especially for her. What she was referring to was the obvious pandering of all the candidates, especially in the closing statement, when they're asked how would the world be different – like, how would you make things better? And everybody was like, "Israel, Israel, Israel." She said all right, look, all right. We already know where you stand on Israel. You've only been repeating it for three hours. So at the end, when you get your opportunity to sum things up, it's still "Israel, Israel, Israel"? I mean, really.

ROCKWELL: And she pointed that Chris Christie was supposed to address how would America be different, and of course he talked about Israel. So it's, uh, yeah.

WOODS: I mean, that's weird. I don't care where you stand on Israel. That is weird. Nobody in Israel, when asked, "How will Israel be better after you're prime minister?" nobody talks about America. That doesn't come up. Wouldn't even come up. So anyway, do you have any other thoughts that I didn't get to? I mean, I'm sure you're dying to talk about Kasich or something.

ROCKWELL: Kasich, of course, I think is a weird guy. He's the establishment favorite after Bush. I think he made, not a bad impression – no impression. He just is not interesting, and his position in the polls show that, despite unbelievable pumping up of him by the media and by the GOP.

WOODS: Yeah. He's this year's Tim Pawlenty. All this pumping up, and then you meet him, and he's a bore.

ROCKWELL: No, so that's him. And of course you have – I don't think any of them, none of those guys – I also kept thinking, because several people had said to me during the debate it looks like a lineup, only the close are better.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: Looks like a police lineup. And they are really a – you know, I kept thinking, would I hire any of these guys to mow my lawn, let alone anything more significant. So I think it helps for people to see this stuff. I think it undermines the interest or the willingness for people to be ruled by such people as were on that stage last night. Or any of the earlier, when you had the horrible Lindsay Graham and the

others, these really are a despicable bunch of people. I also thought that it was good that Jeb Bush got nothing out of this. I noticed in the Drudge poll, 1% of the people thought he did well. He does not make an impression, and he's got, you know — and it also came out, the *Daily Caller* had an article, and Jeb was demanding that Trump apologize to him for saying that he had his views on immigration because his wife was Mexican, and what an outrage, and he should immediately apologize to his wife. And Trump refused to do so. Well, the *Daily Caller* said, well gee, the first part of Bush's book in immigration is about how his wife changed his views about immigration.

WOODS: Yeah, there it is.

ROCKWELL: But I think he still likes Baby Huey, even though he's lost weight. He looks goofy. And you know, George H.W. Bush, his father, the senator, was a very impressive looking guy. Of course a total monster, but impressive looking. George H.W. Bush, an impressive looking guy. W. seems like a friendly guy you'd want to have a beer with. These guys are all murderers of course, but I mean, that's just the public persona. Jeb just hasn't got it. There's something wrong. And does he not have self-confidence because his mother was mean to him? I thought maybe something — because Barbara Bush is a famously — how shall I say? — nasty lady, and a couple years ago, she was asked about Jeb running for president, and she said no, we've had enough Bushes in the White House; we don't need another Bush.

WOODS: Oh yeah, and I saw on your Political Theatre thing that Trump made an ad out of that.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Yeah. So is that a touch of the way she's treated Jeb all his life? Was he always the son that she wasn't proud of? For that reason does he lack self-confidence and has to stand on his tiptoes?

WOODS: Ahh, yeah, I wonder.

ROCKWELL: I hate to be a psycho babbler, but it just struck me that that's a possibility. A very tough lady.

WOODS: Yeah, that's not implausible at all. Yeah, I can see that. Listen, before I let you go, let's say something about the event coming up — we're speaking in 2015 for anybody listening to this way in the future — coming up in Dallas on October 3rd, the Mises Institute is up to no good down there. What's going on?

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Oh, we're going to talk about political correctness, which of course is not politically correct to talk about, and this is a Mises Circle and great, of course, to have Tom Woods with us, and we have a lot of people coming. There's still room; we have, as we speak today, two weeks left, and anybody listening who's in the general Dallas-Fort Worth area, we'd love to see you. Just take a look at Mises.org, and you can see the Events page. You can see about all of this, and it's very cheap, a lot of fun. It's less than one day. And I can guarantee you on this one, you're going to

hear a lot of hot stuff that you don't normally hear. We're going to put Donald Trump to shame on the political correctness question.

WOODS: (laughing) Well, I have no doubt it's going to be a lot of fun. You'll be there; I'll be there; Jeff Deist will be there, and Tom DiLorenzo, who's also a listener favorite, will be there. So I know for a fact I'm very much looking forward to it, and I know it'll be a great event. Well, Lew, thanks a lot. I know the next debate is actually a Democratic debate. I don't know if I have the stamina quite to sit through that, but you and I will stay in touch about how we're going to handle future debates.

ROCKWELL: Tom, thanks so much for having me on your show. As always, it's an honor.