



Episode 582: Trump Out, Rand In: Lew and Tom Discuss the 2016 Iowa Debate

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: I think, Lew, this time I'm just going to turn things over to you for your initial thoughts on this, and after I get your initial thoughts, let's talk about Trump's decision not to participate.

ROCKWELL: Well, I think — you know, as usual I put a lot of trust into the Drudge poll, which I noticed this morning had a huge response of about 740,000 people so far, and I always think that it really mirrors, if not the entire Republican GOP primary vote, the vast majority of them. And the big news to me is that Trump is way up. He's asking who's your candidate for president. Trump is way up. He's up to 64%, and the best he was doing before was 52, 53%. Cruz is way down. He's 18%. Rubio's down at 7%. Rand's about the same; he's always been about 5%. Every single other candidate is either Mr. or Mrs. 1%. They're all irrelevant, despite what we're told, that Jeb did tremendously or other people think Rubio did tremendously. I don't think, by the way, either one of them did very well.

But I think it was actually a politically significant event, not only because Trump wasn't there, but because Cruz I thought looked bad, sounded bad, he was nervous. Maybe it's because he had prepared some what he thought was great takedown moments of Trump and was upset about the fact that Trump wasn't there, as, of course, the Fox people were still smoldering that Trump wasn't there. But I thought Rubio didn't do well.

I thought Rand had a good, you know, by and large a very good night. Sounded better, sounded more mature. There was no hint of high-pitchedness, and I thought he was an effective attacker and he was effective at giving his own views — except for the first question. The first question was about whether he — in effect, did he regret having stiff-armed during the campaign; should he have embraced his dad's ideological position. So he didn't answer that question. He said that he loved his dad, that he respected his dad. That was great. Thought his dad was the greatest man alive, and of course that's right.

However, he didn't ever regret the ideological question. He said his dad was the most honest politician of the last 30 years. Well, I'm sure that's right, and that's a pretty low bar, by the way, and I'm sure that's right in many more than 30 years. But he didn't say anything about his dad's political principles, which of course, you know, he's pretended

don't exist. His dad and his principles don't exist, although I think it was very smart to bring his dad out there right here at the end of the Iowa campaign for him and to try to get some of those Ron Paul people. Whether that's going to work or not, I don't know, but I thought, again, Rand didn't answer the question. I understand why he didn't answer the question, but I think it's been a mistake in a number of senses for him to pretend, you know, just that I'm not Ron Paul's son. I'm some entirely different guy. And he is an entirely different guy, but was that politically smart? Well, I guess we'll see at the vote.

WOODS: Well, of course it's not a coincidence — of course we'll have some skeptics of what we're saying, and I think we've been reasonably — as even-handed as people can be in dealing with this particular phenomenon, but there's a reason that Jeb Bush campaign as "Jeb!" and not as Jeb Bush. And so I did not think it was a coincidence that Rand's signs all just say "Rand." Why wouldn't they say "Rand Paul"? It's a very strange decision if you're not looking to distance yourself from your father's legacy.

And the funny thing is a lot of people who criticize me or you for saying that that's what he's doing themselves said that that's what he needed to do. I was at a dinner with somebody I better not mention but who's pretty darn well known who said to me right to my face, he's got to separate himself from his dad. And now the same person is saying, how dare they accuse Rand — but that was your strategy (laughing). I don't get these people.

In response to what you just said, didn't you find it interesting — you mentioned the Drudge poll. It's a Drudge poll about your preferred candidate. It's not a debate poll. You know, he didn't ask — because no one watched it.

ROCKWELL: Well, he wanted to do Trump, and we'll see what the ratings are later today — we're talking Friday morning — but I think there's no question, at least from the early indications, that a lot of people didn't watch the debate. A lot of people switched back and forth between the Trump event, which was on MSNBC and CNN, and then the Fox debate. And a lot of people, I'm told the early ratings show, tuned out the first commercial break. The number of people watching at the beginning didn't continue to watch, and who can blame them? I don't know that I would have watched it if we weren't going to be doing the show this morning.

WOODS: No, no, needless to say. I stupidly kept the TV on to watch — and I had the post-debate commentary by people the rest of the country are condemned to listen to, who somehow haven't stumbled upon the Lew and Tom hour after the debate the next day, but Krauthammer was saying — he said actually a few nice things about Rand. He said Rand has views that are the farthest away from mine, but I will say — and I don't think he particularly improved himself in the standings tonight, but I think it was a good thing to have him on the stage. I think he does inject a valuable perspective. So that's something.

ROCKWELL: It was a good thing to have him on the stage, yes.

WOODS: Yeah, no doubt about that. But then, in case Rand was tempted to get excited about this, Krauthammer also said Jeb Bush had a good night (laughing), so he's not necessarily the best judge of debate performances.

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: And you're right about Cruz. His Trump jokes fell so flat; it was embarrassing. And in fact, it wasn't even just that the jokes fell flat; the crowd was extremely subdued last night. It was like polite applause. You could maybe hear one-fifth of the audience applauding after people's answers. Very, very little enthusiasm. I wonder how we account for that.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, I think it's interesting that Ted Cruz of course — and I think this is a very suspicious thing, by the way — has no sense of humor whatsoever; therefore he has no conception of what's funny or what's not funny, so all these things that he tells, these yuk-it-up lines turned out not to be. He can't tell a joke, and he shouldn't have tried. Talk about everything falling flat, which was part of his problem last night. He kept trying to make people laugh, and it didn't work.

WOODS: All right, let's go through — let's see, because I jotted some stuff down. Let me get that up here. First of all, I want to skip right to the end, if I may, to the closing statements.

ROCKWELL: Yes.

WOODS: And I want to talk about, if I were working at a high level on the Ben Carson campaign, I would submit my resignation this morning.

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: I mean, not only was his debate performance horrible, but that closing statement. You've got 30 seconds to sum up your case in front of the public, and he stands there and awkwardly recites the Preamble to the Constitution and then says he's not going to comment on it. What? How? I mean, I don't even have any words for that.

ROCKWELL: And also, as you say, he kept pausing, so you were actually worried for him that he was going to be able to remember the whole thing.

WOODS: Yeah, you're sitting there saying, oh please, please, just get through it. (laughing) I know, awful.

ROCKWELL: And he referred to the "benefits of liberty," rather than the "blessings of liberty," which is something he obviously wouldn't have intended to do.

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL: But it was extremely weird, and you know, you would be — of course, you would have won any of these debates had you been in them, but I think your points about how do you use that last 30 seconds, I don't think Rand did really well in his last 30 seconds either.

WOODS: No, very disappointing closing statement. I mean, Rand, his closing statement was, "I like eye surgery, I've gone to Haiti, it's been really amazing being in the Senate, and I'm the only fiscal conservative on the stage. Goodnight." That's — you know, sorry. I would love to hear a Rand supporter try to tell me that was a good closing statement.

ROCKWELL: You know, it almost sounded like — I hesitate to say this, but it almost sounded like a concession speech.

WOODS: Exactly. That is what you would say in a concession speech. And if he wants to give a concession speech, he should stop raising money.

ROCKWELL: Yeah. And you know, he mentioned that he'd done recent cataracts surgery, and that's all great, but come on, it's supposed to be your brief pitch about the key issues and why you're the guy, why you're the guy people should be supporting.

WOODS: Right.

ROCKWELL: And the fact that he went to Haiti, well, that's nice, but is that a reason to support him for president? But really Carson won the weird award, no question.

WOODS: Oh. That was horrifying.

ROCKWELL: There's no there there with Dr. Carson.

WOODS: In fact, let me read what the —

ROCKWELL: Surely the most significant guy in person and in his life, and he comes across in these debates, he comes across as a nothing, a boring nothing.

WOODS: Let me read what *The Washington Post* said about Ben Carson. "Whoa boy. Carson swung from barely being asked any questions to providing answers that often bordered on incoherence. His response to a question about how to deal with Russia simply made no sense — further adding to the narrative that he is far, far out of his depth on foreign policy. At one point, he seemed stunned to even get a question, which isn't the best look for a guy running to be the leader of a 300-million-person country. Carson looked out of his league tonight." So they saw exactly what you and I saw, so I don't think we need to say anything more about him.

ROCKWELL: No, I'll just mention that of course he's a warmonger, and he's been talking about that he would attack Putin, and how it was important for the U.S. to move armored divisions into Estonia to be ready to move into Russia. And he has a very

strange — I know geography is not the typical American long suit ever and especially not these days. How many people live here today that have even heard of Estonia, let alone would know where it is or what's going on? It was just very stupid. His performance was stupid. I thought embarrassing, and I thought, gee, he needs to get back to his regular life.

WOODS: Before we go on, I want to jump in on what you said about Rand's first answer about does he wish that he'd embraced his father's legacy more and so on and on. What I thought about his answer — I mean, the answer that he gave, he said, look, I am the liberty movement candidate and for the following reasons, but he gave two reasons that at least to me seem really boring.

Like, auditing the Fed? I mean, Lew, I'm the guy who testified before Congress in favor of auditing the Fed at Ron Paul's invitation, so I have a little background in this, and even I find the issue boring. I mean, if you want to talk about the Fed and rally the liberty troops, you've got to go beyond auditing the Fed. That's a bore.

Secondly, he talked about NSA spying. Okay, yeah, right, but it's not really an issue that you vote on. It's not a — you should instead say, you should talk about foreign policy. At this point, what on Earth have you got to lose? Cruz is not good on foreign policy. He might be 3% better than Jeb Bush, but that was where you smash him if you want to have a memorable moment in the debate. If you want to have a snooze fest, then you talk about auditing the Fed. Nobody even knows what that even means outside of our circles. Hardly anybody even knows what that means, so that was definitely a missed opportunity.

ROCKWELL: As you say, it's not an exciting issue; it's about getting the government to audit another part of the government. Well, okay, yippee. I'm not against it, but who would actually think that that's the answer? And who wouldn't think, by the way, they'd keep anything in the audit top secret that the Fed didn't want revealed? I mean, it's just — it's "end the Fed," as the title of Ron Paul's great book puts it, the key point. And in fact, Cruz actually had a better statement about the Fed, and the fact that Cruz missed the vote, not on auditing the Fed but on a procedural vote to allow a vote on auditing the Fed — which lost by five votes; it would have lost by four votes if Cruz had been there — this is not an issue that stimulates people either to hate Cruz or love Rand, so why talk about it?

Again — you've talked about it many times — why use that time, very limited time in this debate to talk about that? So it's one thing to talk about going after the Fed, what the Fed is doing to the economy, what's it doing to the world economy, what's it doing to the livelihood of every American, their savings, their futures, their kids' futures. There's great stuff you can say about the Fed, even if you're not going to go to the extent of taking the correct position of wanting to get rid of it. So a procedural vote on auditing the Fed that Mitch McConnell had set up and so forth, nobody's going to go to the barricades for this.

WOODS: Right. I think the main debate participants should be thanking their lucky stars, in a way, that Trump wasn't there because of the way they all handled the immigration question. It all boiled down to, well, I hold this view, and a few years ago I held a view that was a little bit different, and then a few years before that it was a lot different, but I have a right to change my mind. But no, I didn't change my mind; you changed your mind.

And no one can possibly make head nor tail of any of it. You can't make sense of any of it. Nobody knows at the end of that who believed in what. Other than Ted Cruz seems a little bit slippery on the issue, you don't know what in the world is going on. And by the way, that was Chris Christie's best moment, when he jumped in and said, all right, I obviously need a Washington to English lexicon here, because I've been standing here, I have no idea what anybody's saying. And I feel like that would have been Trump's line if he'd been standing there.

ROCKWELL: No, and of course Christie actually typically makes the point that, you know, this is all these senators just blabbing away, they're going to introduce an amendment or whatever, but it actually means nothing, as versus me, the executive, I've actually done things and so forth. But of course Christie, he's like the SNL parody of himself. Every question he's asked, he doesn't actually answer the question. He denounces Obama or he denounces Hillary, and they're both eminently denounceable, but he's a self-caricature, and I think he's going nowhere. I don't believe he's going to get some huge vote, even in New Hampshire, which has got all the former Massachusetts liberals now and some of them voting Republican.

Nor do I think Kasich is — one of the good things about last night was Kasich was definitely diminished. They didn't allow him to go on and on and on past his buzzer time and give these long speeches about why when he was chairman of the House Committee on XYZ, he balanced the budget or whatever other claims he's making. So that, you know, it was good that Kasich was diminished, and he's really terrible. Kasich is terrible. He even implied that his wanting to expand Medicaid in Ohio was living up to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

And by the way, there must be some controversy about Rubio and religion, because I noticed several times recently he's sort of said, by the way, I'm a Christian. So that's fine; that's good, but I don't know what the charges were being made against him.

WOODS: Yeah, I don't know. There was definitely a weird — well, first before I forget, *The Washington Post* — you were talking about Christie not answering questions. That same article that I read, their assessment was that the two people who genuinely could be relied on to answer the question that was asked were Rand and Jeb, but that the others, it was, you know. The first question that was asked was about Donald Trump not being there, and Cruz spends a full minute thanking the people of Iowa for being so sweet to him, which comes off extremely phony and contrived, given that he was not asked about that.

But anyway, on the Rubio thing, you're right. There was a line where I guess there must have been some cover story – I think they referred to it actually about Rubio being the savior of the GOP. Now, everybody knows what that means. It doesn't mean that Rubio is Jesus Christ, and he is going to be nailed to a cross or anything. I mean, anybody with an IQ above 50 understands that. You're the savior of the Republican Party for various reasons. But he immediately feels it necessary to explain, um, there's only one savior and he's not me. Yeah, but okay, surely you understand that the word "savior" does have other meanings, right? It was just awful. Just awful, awful. But on the other hand, there must be a constituency for pablum like that.

All right, hold on just a minute, though. Let's pause for a quick message, and we'll get back to the pablum.

[Sponsored content]

All right, let me say a couple quick things again about Rand's performance, and then we'll talk about a few of the others. As you say, he had a reasonably good night, and he said some good and sensible things. I want to just focus on areas where he might have done a little bit better.

For instance, on the abortion question, where he was asked, well, do you favor leaving it to the states or do you favor having the federal government get involved, and he basically said both A and B. Mm, okay, I guess that's not necessarily an incoherent answer, but if I were asked that question about, are you saying that a liberal state could allow abortion and that would be okay with you, the answer basically would be yes, on the grounds that murder itself – you're going to say that abortion is murder.

Well, on what level of government do we have laws against murder? Those are state laws. And nobody says you're not serious about murder, because you don't want a constitutional amendment against murder, and you don't want the federal government involved in murder. That doesn't mean you don't take it seriously. Or rape. We don't think rape is serious because we haven't made it a federal crime? That's not how the system works. So to say that I'm not serious about abortion, you'd also have to say that nobody in America is serious about murder or rape, given that those are also state laws. So I mean, that's a factor.

Then the other thing was they said that Rand has criticized Bill Clinton's behavior toward women, and he clarified and said, well, I haven't gone out of my way to do it, but when people have asked me about it, I have talked about that. And the question was, well, it's not Bill who's running; it's Hillary who's running. Can you really hold the crimes, the misdeeds of Bill Clinton against her. And he said, well, I don't blame her for this. And I think that was a bit of a missed opportunity, because, I mean, maybe you don't want to say things you can't absolutely 1,000% prove, but I'm pretty sure the Republican base has the sense that Hillary very much aided and abetted the cover-up of her husband's crimes, right? I mean, shouldn't he have said that?

ROCKWELL: Of course he should have said it, and what he said was she can't go around talking about the status of women or other women's issues because her husband's a bum. Well, that doesn't follow at all. In fact, it might be an impetus. But what he should have done was, you know, maybe he should have read Roger Stone's new book on this very issue. She was the legal enabler of all the attacks on these women, so she was hip-deep in all this stuff. So Stone's point that she's a hypocrite is very effective, and Rand didn't pick up on it, and I thought had a very ineffective answer.

And I thought he actually took a step back on the abortion issue when he said he approves the bill to federalize the whole thing, which he's never done before, and of course it is legitimately a state issue. And of course, with respective view of the whole official pro-life movement, it's just an adjunct of the Republican Party. They drag it out every election and put it away in the garage until the next election, because they never do anything, of course.

And the only guy — if I can mention Ron Paul, the only guy who actually ever had a proposal to do something about it, since the Constitution allows the Congress outside of a very few issues to determine the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the federal courts, he wanted Congress to vote — and this in a day when the Republicans were controlling everything — to take the issue of abortion out of the hands of the federal courts, which would in effect repeal Roe v. Wade and would have left it up to the states. It would have been a huge improvement. Yes, California would still have abortion. New York would still have abortion. But it wouldn't be taking place in Alabama or Nebraska. And also, it's the correct states' rights position, even if you're not anti-abortion. It's the correct position, and I thought Rand, I guess for purposes of Iowa, took a step backwards, and I thought that was unfortunate.

WOODS: All right, let's talk about — I mean, I really don't want to talk about any of these people (laughing), but you know, this is our job, so we're going to do it. Okay, it's true that it's being said that, for some reason, that Jeb had some kind of a good night, but I agree with you completely, that he — to me, he just comes off as a goof. He comes off as a — like a — I don't want to insult 24-year-olds, but it's like a 20-year-old in a 50-year-old man's body. I don't know how else to describe the awkwardness. There's something — I mean, there's another case of there's no there there.

ROCKWELL: You know, usually when you encounter somebody who's sort of the manor born like that, the one thing they do have is a certain amount of gravitas. He doesn't have it. Despite his breeding, despite his upbringing, despite his riches and so forth, he just doesn't have self-confidence. So he used to look like Baby Huey; now he doesn't anymore, but he acts like Baby Huey, and he's just not —

But I must say, my favorite moment was his *humma humma humma* moment last night when he was asked about his support of Puerto Rico becoming a state. So he didn't want to answer that question; he had some long disposition about self-determination. Although Americans don't get any self-determination about whether Puerto Rico should become a state or either if it should continue as a welfare-supported commonwealth.

They were conquered of course by the U.S., and they should be freed. But he didn't want to answer it. He was very uncomfortable. He did admit that he'd been a supporter of the Gang of Eight bill on immigration but blamed it on the fact that Rubio asked him to. Well, that doesn't explain it, Jeb. You still supported this kind of stuff.

WOODS: Yeah, that I thought was terrible.

ROCKWELL: Mr. Open Borders.

WOODS: Terrible answer, yeah.

ROCKWELL: And also he was entirely politically correct. He was a social leftist, exactly like the members of his class, these social left oligarchs who run the Republican Party through their big donations — and run the Democratic Party too, of course. But I thought he was not effective. As you say, he's goofy.

WOODS: And you know, it's also — we'll talk about Cruz now. As we know, Cruz is a pretty good speaker and he's a pretty good debater, and he's really in his element in an environment like this, but last night it came off much too much like nobody understands me and it's all very simple, but all my fellow candidates and everybody in the media is just too doltish to understand that actually, even though I look like I've been all over the map, I've actually been, you know — you have to be some kind of a cartographer to figure it out, but I have actually been consistent the whole time. It sounded like a politician, and that is the kind of talking that basically puts people off.

And every time I would hear Bush or Kasich talk about their record of accomplishment and so on, just everything they say sounds so canned and so much like a politician. It's like they haven't learned anything from the success that Trump has had. He's had that success — you know, I'm very unhappy about a lot of the things he's said. That's irrelevant. The point is, how has he done it. What's the style that he's adopted? It's not to talk or sound like those people at all. Not to memorize anything. Just to be off the cuff, spontaneous, and say things, and it's like they just don't have the ability to do that.

ROCKWELL: Well, and as Roger Stone pointed out, Trump is an off-the-cuff kind of guy. He doesn't — you know, the rest of these people have hours and hours and hours of mock debates and briefings and their brain packed with — and Rubio of course, his performance is entirely scripted, and so there's just this massive, massive preparation. Trump just goes in and goes off the cuff and says what he thinks and what he thinks will appeal to people obviously. I must say I liked Justin Raimondo's description of his own position as being anti-anti-Trump, sort of a Rothbardian —

WOODS: Ah, that's interesting, yeah.

ROCKWELL: And he can't stand all the anti-Trump people. So I'm sympathetic to Justin. And Trump of course was the presence in the room, no matter — and really his

leaving that debate, very, very smart political move I would say. Just made the whole thing an undercard, and I think everybody treated it like that. It was not significant.

And you know, there was one point when Cruz was complaining that they'd been mean to them, and Chris Wallace said, well, this is a debate, sir. And I would like to have seen Cruz come back and say, yeah, but you know, you guys aren't supposed to be part of the debate. You're supposed to be moderating. You're not supposed to be attack dogs. They should bring back the League of Women Voters or something to run debates. Yes, they should be attacked, but it should be one candidate on the other. They should be able to speak their views, and you're supposed to be able to get to know a little about them. It should not be the Megyn Kelly show.

I must say Megyn had a complete makeover physically and not in any other sense, so she didn't have her cyberpunk Barbie look. It was much more distinguished looking, having a new hairdo, more sort of respectable clothes and so forth. And she looked great, but again, why are they the stars? Why are these three birds the stars? And speaking of the moderators, did I mishear it, but did Bret Baier, when he was introducing Rand at the very beginning, refer to him as Senator Ron Paul of Kentucky?

WOODS: Oh, I don't remember that. What I — he might have said that —

ROCKWELL: I may have misheard that. And he was thinking I guess that the first question he was going to ask was about Ron Paul.

WOODS: Oh, right, right, right. Yeah, no, I didn't notice that. I did notice his — it was hard to hear because of all the cheering, but Rand got a big cheer, and so he said something like, well, Kentucky is apparently next to Iowa, to try to account for how Rand was getting all those big cheers.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, well, they had a lot of the kids there, and they were very vociferous.

WOODS: Oh yeah, yeah, yeah, they made their presence felt. Now, Monday is of course the Iowa caucuses, and there are people who say that, in the caucuses, of course, it's different from a primary. Your ground game does really matter. The get-out-the-vote effort does really matter, and Trump has been light on stuff like that, and he's not been absent in that department, but lighter than the other candidates on it, and that this could give Cruz a bit of an edge. Now, I don't discount that, but I wonder if that edge is a bit exaggerated. Do you care to share any predictions about Monday night?

ROCKWELL: Well, I think that Trump is going to win, but I don't think he's going to win massively. I think Cruz will do better than the indications in the debate last night, and I think it'll be — you know, this is hardly a radical prediction, but I think it'll be Trump, Cruz, Rubio. But if Trump wins Iowa, it's probably all over for the other candidates, because he's going to go on to win New Hampshire where he's way ahead, South Carolina where he's way ahead, and he'll be off to the races. If Cruz wins — and I don't

think, by the way, that Trump has to win Iowa in order to do well in the nominating process.

WOODS: No.

ROCKWELL: Cruz has to win Iowa. See, this is Cruz's state where he's put all his money and his effort and his time. And there's one thing that might be unfortunate for Trump, however: the predictions of a snowstorm on the night of the caucuses. So I think it's probably true that Trump requires a good turnout. If there's a reduced turnout, then it's probably just for Cruz, so you know, this is an ancient political problem as far as those who want a big turnout, those who want a smaller turnout. So we'll just have to see. But if I were in Las Vegas and making a bet, I would bet on Trump taking Iowa and running the table.

WOODS: All right, so if it starts to look that way, maybe Trump never participates in another debate. Maybe we've seen him debate for the last time. Is that possible? What reason would he have to do it?

ROCKWELL: Well, you know, that's true. It doesn't help the frontrunner to be in a debate. That's why Hillary is so desperate to get Bernie in another debate before the caucuses in Iowa and many more debates after she was of course very anti-debate when she was the leader. This is just politics. But I don't know; at some point it seems to me the Republicans are going to say we're not going to put up with the media being the star of this, and we're going to do this differently.

And they never should have had, of course, the Commission on Presidential Debates, which is designed to suppress any third party people after Ross Perot. And bring back the League of Women Voters. I mean, maybe there's no such organization anymore. Maybe it's the League of People Voters or something, but it needs to be that kind of non-partisan, even a slightly liberal group. It can't be the Megyn Kellies of the world, the Chris Wallaces of the world, the Bret Baiers of the world. The guys want everything to be about themselves, and that's fine on their own talk shows, but it's not fine in something like this.

WOODS: I agree.

ROCKWELL: Also Fox is [inaudible] ideologically a humongous problem. They're just as statist as all the other networks. More warmongers, nastier. I don't know how many people have seen that Trump retweeted about Prince Al-Waleed of Saudi Arabia being a co-owner of Fox News. He has to be the dorkiest looking Arab prince in world history. I mean, this is a very unimpressive looking guy. But how many of the Fox viewers know that a Saudi Arabian prince co-owns Fox News? I mean, it's an interesting point, never discussed. So we just have to see.

But I think Fox has been taken down a notch, which they desperately deserve. And I still will never forgive Roger Ailes and all those guys for getting rid of Judge Napolitano's show, *Freedom Watch*, the greatest show ever to be on television, non-

fiction show ever to be on television. And I must say I don't like any of the people at Fox. It's good to see them taken down a notch. May they be taken down many more notches.

WOODS: Indeed, indeed. And on that note, we will conclude another one of these episodes. The show notes page will be TomWoods.com/582. I guess we'll just have to see — I mean, I'd love to —

ROCKWELL: What's your prediction, Tom?

WOODS: I know, it's easy for me to — I mean, I — it is true that the wild card is the extent to which the traditional political ground game, so-called, is put into play in Iowa. And also, we don't yet know, other than the Drudge poll, any poll numbers in the wake of the debate and Trump's decision to have his own event. But I think Trump having that event, having it be for veterans, then the Duck Dynasty endorsement, the Sarah Palin endorsement, the sticking it to the media, I think it boosts him. So I actually think — my prediction is that he'll win Iowa fairly comfortably. Not in a blowout, but I don't think it'll be close enough to call it really close either. So that's basically my thinking. I mean, I assume Cruz comes in second. So we'll see. It's going to happen soon enough, and ugh, it just seems like no matter what you do, you're always in the middle of some kind of election in this country (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: All right, Lew, thanks for doing this, especially when you're out of town and you've got to talk on a landline phone. You've been a really great sport, and we really appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

ROCKWELL: Tom, it's an honor to be on your show, as always.