



Episode 571: The FOX Business GOP Debate, Without Rand Paul

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: I don't know if it was just me; I said to you when we started talking to you this morning, I'm not going to say anything about the debate till we start recording. Was it just me or was that absolutely excruciating last night?

ROCKWELL: Oh, it was terrible. It was boring, and I kept thinking —

WOODS: Boring!

ROCKWELL: — if I weren't going to be talking with Tom tomorrow, I would long ago have turned this thing off.

WOODS: I know. Lew, I thought the same thing, but I thought, you know, I made an implicit pledge to tens of thousands of people (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: So all right, first of all let's talk about Rand, who was not there. I think everybody listening knows that Rand was demoted to the so-called undercard debate, and then he refused to participate in that. He boycotted that. And some people in the media, I was just reading in *U.S. News*, speculated that this may actually, you know, on balance, if it's measurable, have done him marginally more good than bad, because he did get a lot of press for hit, he got onto *The Daily Show*, he got a lot of major interviews. And last night he held a town hall from Twitter headquarters in place of the appearance at the undercard debate. And in fact, I saw a Facebook meme, a graphic that had Rand on it, and it said, "The revolution will not be televised," which is probably the most clever slogan — I mean, I know the origin of the slogan — but it's the most clever application of a slogan coming out of Rand's campaign the whole campaign season. I thought that was funny: "The revolution will not be televised," because Rand's not going to be in the televised debate. So I think he did the best he could do under those circumstances.

ROCKWELL: Well, I think it definitely — I mean, I missed him. I think that he adds something when he's in the debate. It would have made the whole thing more interesting. He wasn't mentioned except in the undercard when Santorum was about

to get the buzzer, and he said I know my time's almost up, but I'm going to take a few minutes of Rand Paul's time.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah, that's kind of funny actually. And when I say I think he did the best he could under the circumstances, I mean once he made the decision not to participate, then he I think did the best he could to get media. But I think if it were me — not that it matters, but if it were me, I think I would have done that undercard debate, given that Christie was in it, and he eventually got moved up to the primary debate, you know, the main debate. Likewise for Fiorina. She got moved up. So I think I would have done especially — I would have been the top person in the undercard debate. I would have had the only original ideas in either debate, so I think I still would have done it. And plus, I want to spread the ideas. That to me would have been the key thing. What can I do to best spread the ideas? But anyway, as I say, there are some analysts who say this was a good move by Rand, so who am I to dispute that? I'm getting a telephone call. I mean, no one even knows this number (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing) It's Rand.

WOODS: (laughing) Okay, all right, you know what, I'm going to keep that in.

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: (laughing) I'm not even going to edit that out. I'm going to keep that in. All right, so what did you think about Rand —

ROCKWELL: And I also want mention that I think that the undercard debate is always a far more intelligent debate — and of course, neither of these are debates — a far more intelligent forum, because everybody gets to speak their peace at length. And the so-called moderators are actually moderating. They're not part of the show. So I think it's too bad he wasn't on there. The only time he was mentioned in the regular debate was at one point, some people started shouting about Rand Paul. I couldn't quite understand what they were saying, and in fact I —

WOODS: Oh, that's what they were saying.

ROCKWELL: Initially I thought they were saying, "Black lives matter," and I thought, well, good luck in this crowd, but they were saying something about Rand. But otherwise, you know, he was invisible. I think he would have been far better off being in the undercard debate. I think he would have gotten a chance to say far more in a more coherent fashion than he would ever be allowed to do in the major debate.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah. Well, we'll have to see what happens. I think —

ROCKWELL: I must say, I didn't like also his decision to say, well, the reason the Republican Party is shutting me out is because it's becoming an old, white guy —

WOODS: Oh yeah, what an awful — I mean, first of all, that's just a terrible thing to say, and I know that there are some libertarians who say that about the Republican Party, but you know, fine; they're silly to say it too. But you don't insult the obvious base of the party by saying we're sick of having you people around; we need to diversify the party. Everybody's been saying that since Jack Kemp, and all it does is alienate people.

ROCKWELL: Also, what about the fact that Ron Paul might be considered an old —

WOODS: Was an old, white man.

ROCKWELL: Is an old, white guy, and he's a pretty great guy. So I wish to goodness he were in this now.

WOODS: And see, what I don't get is the people who say that Rand has to say certain things in order to get votes, so of course he has to sign the Tom Cotton warmongering letter; you know, he's got to do that in order to get votes. Did he have to say that the Republican Party is becoming the old, white man party to get votes? How does that get votes? What black person hearing that patronizing remark would say, well, now he's got my vote. So it doesn't attract anybody. That makes no political sense. I don't — the funny thing is that people will say to me, but it happens to be true. Well, how come they'll let Rand say that true statement and let him get away with it, but they won't let him say true statements about foreign policy. I just, I can't understand the Rand — Rand followers are one thing, but the Rand-can-do-no-wrong people I can't understand at all.

ROCKWELL: And also, we're supposed to think that the solution to this problem is to have a middle-aged white guy in charge.

WOODS: Yeah, right, what are you after?

ROCKWELL: Right, I mean, come on. So I thought — by the way, when you're 53, college kids don't think of you as another kid.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah.

ROCKWELL: I want to break that to Rand.

WOODS: All right, let's get into the meat of this. There was a big confrontation between Trump and Cruz, and that was bound to happen, of course. As Cruz's poll numbers rose, their friendly relations were bound to go sour. I mean, that's absolutely unavoidable. So we should say a little something about that. In fact, let's start there, and then we'll do a bird's eye overview afterward. I will say I'm going to post on today's show notes page, which will be [TomWoods.com/571](https://www.tomwoods.com/571), I'm going to post the relevant passage from William Blackstone, who would have been the contemporary authority on the subject of what it means to be a natural born citizen, because that makes it an open and shut case. I used to think that this was not an issue or that Cruz was in fact

eligible, but you look at Blackstone, who would have been the overriding authority for everybody involved in the drafting of the Constitution and the original understanding, he makes clear that Cruz is actually not eligible. And Blackstone is the key guy. And then Emer de Vattel would have been another one, but the area of his work where he covers this hadn't been translated into English at that time, so maybe you could say, well, Americans didn't know about that. But they certainly did know about Blackstone, and I think this does create a real problem for Cruz. You know, I had an episode of this show where I defended Cruz against criticisms of what he had said about the gold standard, because I don't care what person says it; I care about the idea. So it's not like I'm going out of my way to look for reasons to attack him, but I do think that the arguments against are quite strong. And so Trump's point was that you're putting the party in a very difficult spot, because what if – as Trump said – what if there's even a 1% chance that you're ineligible? There's going to be court cases; you're going to jeopardize the whole party; why would you do that, basically just to advance your own political ambition? I thought Trump came out very strong in that exchange.

ROCKWELL: No, I think so, and to the extent that – I mean, obviously Ted is a very competent debater, but I thought he came across sort of as a snake on the whole thing..

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: I mean, he reminded me of some kids that might be very smart but you don't like them. So you've got to be likeable; people have to like you if you're going to be president. I thought he lost it on that, and you know, again, you're exactly right. This is a real question, and just the fact that, you know, when it came to Obama, we're never supposed to think a negative thought about him in any sense, of course, but, you know. And I understand some people even think that Rubio is not a natural born citizen, because his parents weren't citizens when he was born.

WOODS: Now, let's look at the overall question. At the end of this thing, who's up and who's done? I think Carson continues to slide. Every time you ask him, Ben Carson, do you agree with what so and so said? It's never yes or no. It's always, well, you know, first of all, we have to – he always begins with the politician kind of answer of never yes or no. It's always, first of all this, or we have to bear in mind that. It's never a yes or no, and you would think that the appeal of Carson was that he wasn't a politician. He's a neurosurgeon, so he's going to speak the truth, and yet every time he opened his mouth at the beginning of an answer, it was never to say yes or no, and that drove me crazy.

ROCKWELL: I thought it was interesting that the poor guy tried to make a joke about his being sleepy, when clearly once again last night he was Dr. Narcolepsy.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: I mean, this guy is entirely out of it. Why he's in the maincard debate, I guess it's because of the polls, but I think after Iowa and New Hampshire, he's going to

have to go back to Massachusetts or where he lives — Maryland I guess it is, sorry. And he's just entirely irrelevant. He's not — it makes you wonder why the heck is he up there, why the heck is he running, who the heck is he, was he really a neurosurgeon. I mean, he's not an impressive guy.

WOODS: No. No, no way.

ROCKWELL: And I noticed in the Drudge poll he came out 1.5% of the people, and I think of the Drudge voters when I looked at this, it's about 325,000 people. I think of them as being GOP primary voter types, at least of the conservative sort, and they give him 1.5%. The only one lower was Bush at a couple of tenths of a percent lower. So no, Carson is irrelevant, and I think has been irrelevant since the very beginning. I don't think there was every any there there, but now it's certainly tough to hide the fact that that's the case.

WOODS: Now, I'm calling up Drudge right now, so let's see. The headline is, "Drudge Poll: Three Left Standing." So let me view the results. I assume — yeah, so it's Trump, Cruz, and Rubio. And Rubio is way, way behind.

ROCKWELL: Way, way behind, and I think justly so. I mean, really, somehow he's just not an impressive guy. He memorized a lot of I'm sure stuff that they felt was going to be effective, and of course he hates Cruz and Cruz hates him, and that's all to the good, but he's just not impressive.

WOODS: Oh no, no, and he talks like a politician.

ROCKWELL: And I have people who — I'm not going to give any hints, but people who actually know him and have dealt with him tell me he's a moron, that he's actually able to memorize a lot of things, and he has a very good memory and is a nice looking guy and all that sort of thing — he wears high heeled shoes —

WOODS: (laughing)

ROCKWELL: He's just not impressive intellectually.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: But on the other hand, neither is Obama, so he became president, so maybe that's not a block. But generally presidents, as evil as they may be, are smart guys. Rubio, he just doesn't have it.

WOODS: Yeah, I think Obama's smarter than Rubio. I really think Rubio is just memorized stuff, and Obama does some of that, but —

ROCKWELL: Tom, we need an IQ test administered by an independent party to find out the truth about that.

WOODS: Exactly. I will say one thing that Rubio may have memorized that he said last night that I actually was glad somebody said was that I'm tired of all these people who say I'm going to abolish the IRS and instead have another national tax.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Yeah.

WOODS: And then Rubio made the obvious point: who's going to collect that tax? I don't care if you call it "the IRS," you call it something else; it's still a national tax collection agency.

ROCKWELL: Of course. Rand does the same thing as Cruz. They're not abolishing the tax collection agency. They may change — they're going to change the name of it. One thing that I thought was very interesting when Cruz was talking about his horrible VAT/flat tax, he was very — and of course this guy's Mr. Goldman Sachs, as we found out that he didn't declare his loan from Goldman Sachs, and of course his wife is vice president of Goldman Sachs and a member of the CFR and all that sort of thing. And he said that his business tax of 16% would not apply to exports, only to imports. Well, of course the exporters are all the clients of Goldman Sachs and similar very politically powerful investment banks, and these, as Murray Rothbard pointed out, these investment banks have been very powerful and very deleterious politically for a very long time. So his whole tax plan is a big support for exporters and punishing of people who import, and who are they importing for? Americans. So it's a tax punishing of Americans in order to benefit the clients of Goldman Sachs. And I'm sorry nobody made that point last night, but it struck me, because I think the Cruz tax plan, like the Rand tax plan, like the Carson tax plan, these all are not exactly in the interests of the American businessman or the American consumer.

WOODS: I'm going to also link at TomWoods.com/571 to an article on Chinese currency manipulation and what the real truth of that is, because I think there was a lot of demagogic discussion of that, so I'll try and set the record straight on that. I do want to — let's see, first of all, as you say, as you can see from this Drudge poll, nobody else is a factor. Kasich didn't have any breakout moments.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Kasich's too boring to be president.

WOODS: And you know, my 12-year-old was actually doing homework in the background while I was miserably watching this, and I don't know why she picked this one person out, but the way Christie talks such a tough guy talk, she actually looked up from her homework and said, "This guy scares me."

ROCKWELL: He is scary.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: And you know, he's articulate and he's well spoken, but he's just not a factor. And I noticed that as recent — although he was doing relatively well in New Hampshire, I think at eight points at one point, he's going down in the latest polls. I

think Christie can just forget it and go back to Bridgegate. He'd better go back to New Jersey, because thank goodness he's out of it, and I was especially outraged by his horrible comments about marijuana last night. And horrible Obama, horrible, he let's the states, if they want to legalize marijuana even though it's illegal, he's okay with that. So Christie's unsound on the nullification question, Tom, that you're such an expert on.

WOODS: Yeah, how about that? As it turns out —

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Shocking to you, yes.

WOODS: (laughing) That's right. Now, the Iowa caucuses are taking place on February 1st, so that's coming right up in just a matter of two and half weeks, and according to the schedule that I'm looking at, there's one more debate before then. It's supposed to be January 28th, and I don't know if this schedule is out of date or not, so just before the caucuses. So the question is do you think there's any way that Rand would be able to get back into this thing, into the debates, into that key one on the eve of the Iowa caucuses?

ROCKWELL: I think so, because you know, he actually qualified according to the FOX criteria with the latest Des Moines register poll, but they didn't release it, very unusually apparently for these kinds of things, until several days after they had the results compiled. So some of the Rand people think this was deliberate; it may very well have been deliberate, who knows? But I would say he has a very good chance to get into that, and I think it would make it more interesting. And certainly, I mean, I guess Carson will be in there, Bush. By the way, I thought Bush — because I think this every time. I think this was Jeb's funeral last night, because, you know, he's the CFR's idea of Mr. President. I mean, he was pretending his, yes, you know, calm and deliberate and serious and not like these other guys. He was like a — I don't know, it was like putting a little bit of water on the street in Florida with the hot sunshine. Whatever he said, whatever he did, however he looked, everything just evaporated, and you immediately forgot everything he'd said. I mean, he's just Mr. Forgettable. Trump really just got rid of him by saying, you know, we don't need a weak president.

WOODS: Yeah, and that's what we'd have with Jeb. Yeah, that was — ugh.

ROCKWELL: But you know, it's so effective, because it's obviously true. So Jeb, I know all the establishment loves him, and of course they're hoping for a contested convention, where after the first, sometimes it's one ballot, sometimes it's after the first two ballots, the delegates are released, could be pressured to get together and have like a Bush-Paul Ryan ticket. You know, some unbelievable evil thing like that. But Jeb just hasn't got it. I'm not a fan of the Bush family, to put it mildly, but W. had a certain appeal to people.

WOODS: Yeah, he had a kind of a folksy quality.

ROCKWELL: No, Jeb — and of course he became that, because instead of being a Connecticut Yankee like he is, he made and transformed himself into a Texas guy who would sometimes misspeak. Now, I don't know if this is deliberate on his part. It was certainly deliberate on the part of Dwight Eisenhower, who was in private unbelievably precise, every sentence a sentence, every paragraph a paragraph. In public, he was slightly bumbling, and some scholars think that that was because he didn't want to answer a question. So who knows what the story — I think with George W., if it was indeed intentional, it's just to make himself folksy, not to be like his dad, to seem like a Texan rather than, again, a Connecticut Yankee.

WOODS: Well, in fact, there is — apparently Eisenhower said in private to somebody — I don't know if it was Dulles or somebody — that don't worry, if they ask me any questions I don't want to answer, I'll just confuse them (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: Which sounds like right out of George W. Bush. All right, what I want to do is, I do want to also, even though it isn't directly part of the Republican debate, I'd like to say a little something about the situation between Hillary and Bernie Sanders, but before we do that, I'm going to pause for a message about how, with my inbox filled with email, I managed to get my sanity back. So check that out, and we'll be right back.

[Sponsored content]

All right, it's time to talk about Hillary and Bernie Sanders for just a minute, because I just feel like doing it, and we've been getting some requests to do these episodes for the Democratic debates, and it just basically comes down to that, at some level, the show has to be about me at some level. If there's something I just intensely dislike doing, I just really don't want to do it. So I just don't want to do the Democratic debates. However, I hope you would be game for when the general election debates take place, and there will be a Democrat of course in those. Are you game for continuing to do these programs?

ROCKWELL: Are you kidding? Of course.

WOODS: Yeah, okay. All right, great. Great, great. So we'll have plenty of time to comment on Democrats during that time, but the question is which Democrat will we be talking about. Now, the issue has come up that, you know, Sanders, his campaign has been surging and Hillary's been hemorrhaging, but the thing is Sanders, it just doesn't seem like there's any real chance for him in the long run, because — I forget who I was talking to who was telling me — gosh, I'm sorry my memory is so bad lately. But by the time you get to the Southern states, Hillary's going to win them all. Oh yeah, that's right, it was Paul Gottfried. Yeah, Paul Gottfried, I was just talking to him, so that's actually not going to air until next week, so I'm taking away from one of my own episodes. But he was saying that the fact is that all the black political machines in these states, Democratic black political machines are all in Hillary's

corner, and they're going to deliver those votes to Hillary. And the infrastructure just doesn't exist for Sanders in those states. But the thing is if Sanders makes a strong showing in Iowa and New Hampshire, isn't there any way that that changes things?

ROCKWELL: Well, maybe, and I think it's becoming clear to people, if only in an inchoate fashion, there's something wrong with Hillary. I don't mean ideologically; I mean there's something physically wrong. Is it, as was speculated at the time when she had her brain clot after her fall, which was the official explanation, so some people think she had a small stroke. You know, who knows? She had a growth on her neck. Was it cancer? They said no. Some people think it was, but there's something — of course, this is not the poor lady's fault. There's something physically wrong with her. She just doesn't — she's, if I can copy Trump, she's very low energy. I mean, she's just so — so's Bill, for that matter. They're not the same dominant figures that they used to be. So I must say I find it difficult to think that she's going to be the nominee. On the other hand, I certainly don't think Sanders is going to be the nominee. He's just this — he's probably too ethnic for American politics, and we'll just see. But I think he's obviously got a very good chance to beat her in Iowa and New Hampshire, but Paul's right —

WOODS: Isn't it way too late, though? Isn't it way too late for somebody to jump in at this point, get a whole campaign infrastructure going with the Iowa caucuses not even three weeks away?

ROCKWELL: No, because the Democratic Party — the Republican Party's got some of this, but the Democrats especially have what are called superdelegates, and these are people in the Democratic establishment who are delegates to the convention because they're important people in important jobs. So that's a huge number of delegates. So if the party establishment decided that it just can't be Hillary, it's got to be Elizabeth Warren or Joe Biden or — I can't see Biden, but whoever, what actually happens in Iowa and New Hampshire — I know this is going to shock everybody — is entirely irrelevant. It doesn't matter how the people vote. The superdelegates can determine things. So I don't think it's too late at all. On the other hand, you know, maybe she'll be revived. Some people think that the recent excursion of Chelsea into quite nastily attacking Sanders is an indication of the desperation, because Chelsea's role before has always been, oh, the sweet granddaughter and the sweet daughter with the sweet baby, showing Hillary as a sweet grandmother and a sweet mother.

WOODS: Oh yeah.

ROCKWELL: Talk about a con job. But anyway, that's been the intent. Now she's seen as just an attack dog or an attack daughter or something. So a lot of the Democrats apparently think this was a huge mistake, again showing desperation. I think they are desperate. So I don't think it's by any means, no matter where it is on the calendar, it's not a sure thing for Hillary.

WOODS: And of course, even if it is the case that Iowa and New Hampshire aren't the deciding factor, you know, I was also saying Pat Buchanan had a column that I think

you ran, where he talked about the significance of the New Hampshire primary, that it doesn't always mean that this is the nominee, but if you don't win, it can certainly damage you.

ROCKWELL: Yes, that's right. No, it's true. It's very important in that sense, and if she loses both of those, which is a possibility — I think she's very likely to lose New Hampshire. It's a possibility she'll lose Iowa. Very negative, especially since her entire appeal is based on the fact she's inevitable.

WOODS: Yeah, that's it.

ROCKWELL: That's 100% of it. So if it turns out she's not inevitable, then I think she becomes like the statue of Ozymandias.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: She's just lying there in the sand.

WOODS: "The lone and level sands stretch far away." Indeed. Now, there's a funny video that I saw the other day; I posted it. I think it was put out by the Leadership Institute, and it's a guy going around with poster board with four mansions on it. And he says, all right, one of these houses belongs to, you know, Donald Trump, and one's Rubio, and one's this or that, and I want you to try and pick who's house is whose. And they said I think this one must be Trump, and this one must be — and he says — actually, these are all houses people have lived in, and which one has each one lived in. And it turns out the answer is all four of them, the answer is Hillary Clinton. So this shocks these kids who, for some reason, they're dumb enough to think that Hillary must be a regular, working stiff like them. But what's so demoralizing about them is that they all say that would change the way they think about their vote. So in other words, if you have a big house, I automatically assume that I can't possibly vote for you. So they have no philosophy at all. But at the same time, it was kind of funny to watch their jaws drop that they're all Hillary's house.

ROCKWELL: Maybe, Tom, they're making actually a libertarian point. It's one thing to have beautiful homes that you've earned the money for —

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL: — it's quite another to have beautiful homes that you've stolen the money for through politics.

WOODS: Lew, if only these young kids were making fine distinctions like that, I would agree. Maybe I'll put that video also at TomWoods.com/571, because it is kind of funny to see their naive little reactions to that. All right, let's jump back into the Republicans just for a minute. The New York values question came up, because of course Trump is a New Yorker, and Ted Cruz isn't. Why don't you tell us about that?

ROCKWELL: Well of course, Cruz famously said recently that Trump was born in Manhattan and he was an embodiment of New York values, people being concerned about money, about media, being for gay marriage and being for abortion was the four things he picked. Turns out that his polling people have been testing this in Iowa, and their test must have shown that it's effective with some people, and so that's why he's brought it up. But I thought Trump was becoming a better debater in the classic sense, was very effective in smashing him, talking about, of course, 9/11 and great people rebuilding New York and all that sort of thing. But it made Cruz look bad. And also, how shall I say? This is not a guy who he and his money have been unconcerned with money and media. I mean, what does he — oh, I see, criticizing an entire city because people are interested in money and media, unlike the Franciscan monk, Ted Cruz.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah, who's utterly unaffected in these things.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, and again, I think he did himself damage in the long run, even though he comes in number two — Trump 54%, Cruz 31% — on the Drudge poll, I just think he came across as a very unpleasant guy. Not at all the kind of guy you'd ever want to have a beer with, whereas you'd love to have a beer with Trump. Everybody would love to have a beer with Trump. So I think he's done himself some damage. I was reminded of the first time I ever saw Cruz. He was brought in as a speaker to a convention of Middle Eastern Christians in Washington. These are people who are representatives of communities themselves, a lot of times having suffered ethnic cleansing, religious persecution. There were bishops there, priests, lay people, and he spent his time denouncing them as a bunch of vicious creeps because they didn't like Israel enough.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: I thought, come on. You know, so of course, Mr. Panderer, needless to say. But it was a very nasty, vicious performance. Of course it was articulate. He's always articulate. But he just came across as a snake, and I thought the snake emerged from his hole last night too.

WOODS: Yeah, that snake — that was obviously so that he could have a video clip so that everybody would know where he stood on that and that he was a tough guy and everything, and to do that to these people who were not going out of their way to talk about Zionism or anything. I mean, they were not being impolite, they weren't talking about Israel. They were just saying we're Christians who were suffering in the Middle East, and he takes this is an opportunity to get up and badger and lecture them. I mean, that is in extremely poor taste, and it's obviously self aggrandizing, so it makes you wonder about the guy in general. I mean, I am sometimes — I'm going to be honest, I mean, I'm a human being. I sometimes get caught up in things, and sometimes I'm inclined to sympathize with him because of some of the things he says —

ROCKWELL: Sure.

WOODS: — and then I remember that particular incident, which speaks volumes about the guy.

ROCKWELL: And of course it's true he said some good stuff about the gold standard; he said some good things against the Fed, although I know that Rand has made an issue of his not showing up to vote for the procedural vote that might have led to a Audit the Fed vote. It lost by five votes; if Cruz had come, it would have lost by four votes. But you know, I don't think that anymore than accusing Rubio of not making his votes. I must say I don't find that an effective issue. But Cruz has got a lot of ability; he's got a beautiful family, but I think he's a nasty guy. And they're all, politicians — I don't want to shock everybody — politicians tend to be very nasty people. Ron Paul is a shining exception to that, but he's very much an exception.

WOODS: But if it ever came down to Cruz versus Hillary, the nastiness factor would cancel itself out.

ROCKWELL: That's right. Yeah, well, they're both very nasty, of course. That's right. And Cruz, of course, is much smarter, and these days much faster on his feet. And of course the establishment, by the way, and you can tell it by the news coverage — hey, great Cruz, Cruzy, you know, hurt Trump and so forth. They're all clustering around Cruz, because, although they don't like his style, he is a neocon warmonger. He's totally in support of Wall Street and all the worst aspects of crony capitalism. They're happy to have him as versus Trump. So we're going to see a lot of them — because all of their fair haired boys have of course ended up in the mud where they belong. So I think we're going to see a lot more promotion of Cruz. Will the real Ted come out? We'll see.

WOODS: I don't keep up with anything Bill Kristol says, but I have to say I'm slightly curious — not curious enough to actually do a Google search, but I'm curious to know what he's been saying about the election, because he would also have to hold his nose and jump in for Cruz if he hasn't endorsed Hillary first at this point.

ROCKWELL: Well, it's true, and you know, the neo — but again, Cruz is a neocon. He's a terrible warmonger. Rand has been pointing out in an ad that he said he would bomb ISIS until the sand glowed. Well, that's a reference of course to nukes. I think Rand is right, a very alarming reference to nukes. Ted Cruz, aside from the style questions, fits right in at *The Weekly Standard*, so I'm sure there'd be a meeting between Kristol and Cruz, and Kristol would, yeah, endorse Cruz. And John Bolton and all the neocon thugs would be clustering around him wanting jobs, and they'd probably get jobs in a Cruz administration.

On the other hand, just an interesting note on Trump, I know some people who themselves have worked — great removed, not executives for Trump, but I mean worked at his golf courses and that sort of things, and I know other people whose family members have worked on golf courses and hotels of Trump, and universally they say he's a great guy, that's easily approachable by employees, that he's always polite, always friendly, always makes a point to speak to everybody, is very generous with

bonuses, and all the people that work for him think he's a great boss. So that doesn't mean he'd be anything good in politics, let alone to be ruler of the world as the U.S. president, but somehow I don't think that anybody would say that about Ted Cruz.

WOODS: Or about so many of them. We've heard that Bernie Sanders is just horrible to work for —

ROCKWELL: Yes.

WOODS: — that he treats everybody like garbage. Hillary is just legendary. Like no one's allowed to be in the hallway as she's walking down.

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: It's completely bizarre. I've heard the same thing, by the way, about Bill O'Reilly, that maybe you can be in the hallway, but you can't make eye contact; you know, he's going to go down the hallway, and no one can touch him. It's crazy, these —

ROCKWELL: By the way, Stalin had that same rule.

WOODS: (laughing) Right.

ROCKWELL: He did.

WOODS: All right, well listen, we're going to get ready for — we've got another one of these coming in a couple of weeks. We're going to be right on the verge of the whole thing getting started with the Iowa caucuses, so in a way I'm looking forward to it, because even though they're all crazy, there is still a kind of bizarre kind of excitement level that comes with it, so I'll look forward to our next conversation in just a couple of weeks.

ROCKWELL: Tom, at least we have fun with it.

WOODS: (laughing) We sure do. As I say, the download figures indicate that the listeners do too, but I would like to do this with you over the phone regardless. Anyway, thanks again.

ROCKWELL: Thank you, Tom, buh-bye.