



Episode 609: Moderators and Candidates Make Direct Hits on Trump: Lew and Tom Discuss Another Debate

Guest: Lew Rockwell

WOODS: If you don't mind, I want to start off with my antics on Twitter, and then we'll get into the debate (laughing).

ROCKWELL: Yeah, please.

WOODS: Let's see if I can remember them all. I actually sent one out as an issue of my newsletter, which I have been sending out more and more regularly. I just couldn't keep this tweet exchange to myself. So the first one was Max Boot, and you I think had a recent post at *Political Theatre* saying that he might be the most – I don't know what word you used.

ROCKWELL: Repellant.

WOODS: (laughing) Repellant. That's such a Lew Rockwell word. Repellant neocon of all. Well, I had to jump in, because he is in panic mode about a President Trump, because he says President Trump would govern like a strongman. And so I said, oh, you mean quite the opposite of the mild executives who are humbly executing the laws that you have favored over the years, right? And so people liked that tweet. And then later I said, Boot has spent his career calling for an imperial executive, and now he's worried about what somebody might do with that power, somebody he doesn't approve of. And so I just put #karma. (laughing) Maybe you should have thought of that, Max.

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: So Max tried coming back at me, calling me a neoconfederate, which is what he called me 13 years ago, and I just smashed him with the zombie video, and I just reminded him that I answered you years ago in *The American Conservative*, and you pretended that I didn't. So everybody's piling on, so now he doesn't answer me anymore, because it clearly backfired on him. That was the first one.

The second one was Mitt Romney. I had a tweet the other day saying, how out of touch is the – and you and I will comment on this in a minute, but – how out of touch can the GOP be that they would think that a speech by Mitt Romney is what you do to take down Trump, when the opposition of a guy like Romney is exactly the appeal of

Trump. It's almost like Romney's in on it with Trump. I mean, how could he be that tone deaf? But on the other hand, he's Mitt Romney. And Frank Luntz, just this morning – Frank Luntz, just this morning, he's got a tweet out there about his focus groups. Did you see this?

ROCKWELL: Yes, I did see it.

WOODS: Yeah, his focus group was 18 people out of 25 said Kasich, 6 said Cruz, 0 Rubio, and 1 for Trump, and so my tweet was, I see you got the memo, Frank, that Fox is now cold on Rubio, so your randomly selected group should choose Kasich, so well done. And then my second tweet was – he listed the adjectives that his randomly selected group used to describe the debate, and it was, you know, "embarrassing," "childish," this and that, and I said, huh, that's funny, I would use those same words to describe your focus group's foreign policy, which they want more of even though it's made everything worse. So I'm having a blast on Twitter, so everybody listening, follow us on Twitter. Lew is @lewrockwell, and I'm @thomasewoods. What did you think about that Romney thing? Can they be more tone deaf than that?

ROCKWELL: Well, I thought it was hilarious, but what I hear is that Romney is hoping against hope that he can be the nominee.

WOODS: Even now?

ROCKWELL: Oh yeah. That he can come in in some of the late primaries – California, New York, Illinois apparently. And also if Trump is denied a majority on the first ballot, that all of the voters are released, can be pressured, the ringers can reveal their true selves. So, yes, they could nominate Kasich; they could nominate Cruz – unlikely probably. They could nominate Romney. And I think Romney has hopes of that, even though – how many people, how many young people, for example, even know who Romney is? How many people actually have a clear memory of this guy?

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: He really has been gone for a very long time, and he really just disappeared. So now he's Mr. Neocon of course, and he had this long speech that I noticed was getting very little watches on YouTube –

WOODS: Mmm.

ROCKWELL: I didn't check it this morning, but who would want to watch a long speech by Mitt Romney on anything?

WOODS: Yeah, absolutely.

ROCKWELL: So the guy is of course – I figure, though, that the GOP must have the view that just throw anything at Trump and maybe something will stick. So they're certainly not going to tell Romney not to do this. Maybe they encouraged him to do it,

but I think it's his own ambition, although he's too much of a coward to say what he's actually about. He should be saying that I would like to be president, and I could do a great job, and so forth, but he's not willing to say that. He's being what passes for the Romney version of coy.

WOODS: Cruz apparently the other day said, and I think he said this all along, that if the GOP tries shenanigans at the convention. It is going to turn everybody off, and you're going to have people vacating the place in droves. And I think you would see #neverGOP after that. The Trump people, yeah, they don't want Hillary, but they really, really don't want the GOP to get away with this, and you would just see "neverGOP" all over Twitter.

ROCKWELL: Well, I think that's right, but on the other hand, the GOP elite would much rather see Hillary than Trump.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. Yeah.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, I mean, Bill Kristol and all these people are open about it. Robert Kagan, they all are Hillary backers, because she is a neocon. She's also a very bloodthirsty person. It's why they like her so much. It's recently come out that she was the one who pushed Obama over the edge to massacre people in Libya and cause just horrendous damage. We also now know that she was the one who urged Vince Foster to stop the diddling around in Waco and kill all those people. So she — if we know about these two incidents, who knows what else? This is definitely Lady Macbeth, except she's with a machine gun instead of a dagger.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah, that's exactly right. And you know, you were mentioning the neocons who would prefer Hillary. Max Boot came right out and said that. I think it was in *The New York Times* that he would absolutely vote for Hillary or for Bloomberg (laughing) —

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: Max, you win the prize. You're the first person I've ever heard say he'd vote for Bloomberg of all people. But he said that he would sooner vote for Stalin than for Trump, and you had such a great comment on *Political Theatre*, and I took that and tweeted it and gave you a hat tip, but it was that, well, that's really saying something considering that Stalin killed Trotsky, the neocons' hero. So the fact that he'd be willing to bury the hatchet, so to speak, and support Stalin anyway is really something.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Yeah, very funny. FDR's pal, Stalin, we should say.

WOODS: Yeah, in fact, that's how we should refer to him, FDR's pal, exactly — and Max's pal. Let's say also something about — because it did come up in the debate anyway — actually asking Trump to repudiate or to — what's the word? To renounce or whatever?

ROCKWELL: Renounce, yeah.

WOODS: Any possible support for the Ku Klux Klan. The Ku Klux Klan has about 27 members. 23 of them are FBI informants.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) That's right.

WOODS: Any time they have a parade, it's 12 of them and 500,000 angry people screaming at them. Anybody who's worried about the Ku Klux Klan has got a serious paranoia problem, I mean, probably diagnosable. I mean, the idea that anyone could possibly think that Trump or anybody else on the stage is secretly in cahoots with or sympathetic with the Ku Klux Klan is so – I mean, is mentally deranged. So of course they don't think that.

ROCKWELL: Well, that's the Left, right?

WOODS: Yeah, I know. Some of them probably sincerely do believe it, whereas Fox News, yeah, they're dumb in their own way, but they're clever as foxes, so to speak, in other ways, and clearly this is just an attempt to hurt him by asking – I mean, they did the same to Ron.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, of course it is exactly the same thing. And how many people even know about the KKK? I mean, it's still a bogeyman and rightly so; it was a horrible group, but it's not – it's been a very long time since it did anything evil or anything period probably, except have these Vaudeville shows, which I always wonder what is the FBI interested in when they've got these 12 guys in their Halloween costumes, ridiculous Halloween costumes, marching down the street, as you say, and vast numbers of leftists wanting to kill them and the cops protecting them and so forth. So this was just another big media, big GOP attempt to take down Trump, and I don't think it worked. I think it either backfired or it just had no effect whatsoever, which is very good for those of us concerned about the whole PC craze, so I think it's good that it didn't work, and I think it had certainly no effect – no effect on Ron Paul either.

WOODS: Right. That's absolutely right. You would think that the occasional marches down the street by the Ku Klux Klan would do more to encourage the idea of road privatization where you could just put a stop to these parades, yet it never seems to have quite that effect unfortunately (laughing).

ROCKWELL: I can remember many, many years ago when the American Nazi Party was in suburban Virginia, and they had, I don't know, 30 or 40 members, and they would go out and have demonstrations, and they were all in spectacularly tailored uniforms, I mean, obviously custom tailored, very beautifully made Nazi uniforms. And I always wondered, where are the guys getting the money for this? Where are these losers – I mean, clearly somebody is funding them who thinks this is a good thing to smear people by having these guys out. So I would say probably the KKK, who knows who's funding the KKK these days besides the FBI?

WOODS: Right, but the people who are in it, if they use their entire life savings couldn't afford that outfit, so that is an interesting point, yeah. Also another point on your blog that I liked, did anybody ever ask Obama in 2008 or 2012 to renounce the Communist Party of the USA, which endorsed him both times?

ROCKWELL: That's right; that's right. And it looks like they're backing Bernie this time. So are they going to ask Bernie? No, of course not.

WOODS: No, no, it wouldn't even come up.

ROCKWELL: All they do is justify the murder of hundreds of millions of people. I mean, nothing to be concerned about there.

WOODS: Yeah, nothing to worry about there. Right, it's 12 people in costumes that everybody hates that we have to worry about. I mean, the communists get away with 100 million murders, and there are almost no movies you could think of that are made about it. Nothing. And most kids know nothing about it. That doesn't concern anybody, that all those crimes are in danger of being forgotten. I wonder why some crimes are more interesting and important to remember than others, Lew.

ROCKWELL: Why is that, Tom?

WOODS: I don't know. In fact, something tells me I'm not supposed to ask that question (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing) One of many you're not supposed to ask.

WOODS: Indeed, indeed. But what's the show for, if not to ask these things? All right, I could see that Fox was really, really pulling out all the stops to go after Trump, but I have to say, they landed some punches last night.

ROCKWELL: Yes, they did.

WOODS: The stuff on the budget where Trump – I mean, he's really going to balance the budget by getting rid of waste, fraud, and abuse? I mean, how dumb does that sound? And then they run the numbers, and the numbers just don't even remotely match up. But of course, that would be true of any candidate. If you were to ask any of them, well, what are you actually going to cut, you know, they'd give you the run around, because there isn't enough discretionary spending to cut, and none of them want to cut anything else. So it would just be, well, we'll grow our way out of it – I mean, whatever. They would figure something out. So they're all probably bad on that, but Trump came out looking bad. And secondly, that thing about the tapes that *The New York Times* has –

ROCKWELL: Whoa, yes.

WOODS: I mean, he's not got a very good thing. What, I'm not going to release a confidential conversation – why, because *The New York Times* were revealing their inmost secrets? I mean, the only person being protected by this is Trump himself, so that came out bad for him. And any time – even though I've actually heard some good things about Trump University, that conversation went on for a long time, and Trump should have tried to change the subject after awhile, instead of saying, oh, it's a minor civil case and we gave some people their money back. As long as that conversation goes on, the whole thing sounds shady.

ROCKWELL: No, and of course Megyn Kelly was the prosecutor. She was the prosecutor, and she had Trump on trial. And in fact, as you mentioned, the whole thing was an ambush, and *Gawker* of all places, the left-wing *Gawker* had an interesting article this morning saying it was the attempted assassination of a presidential frontrunner.

WOODS: Yeah, and for *Gawker* to say that, right.

ROCKWELL: So they thought it might even be possible from some of their sources that the whole trope about, well, we don't really like Rubio anymore, Rupert Murdoch tweeting out that really if Trump's the frontrunner everybody better unify behind him, all kinds of indications like that were just an attempt to make sure Trump did not drop this debate, that he showed up to be crucified, as I think they put it. So it's one crucifixion I guess they believe in. But anyway, it was successful, and so yeah, they made him look very bad on *The New York Times* tape business. On the budget thing, how come he didn't just say like everybody else says – even Ron Paul had to say this – you can't balance the budget in one year. It has to be over at least several years, but here's the way I'd start. And of course, waste, fraud, and abuse, I mean, that's what the Heritage Foundation always says.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: I mean, that's just the Beltway Republican conservative baloney. So you know, I don't think he – he didn't do well. On the other hand, as usual I like to look at what the Drudge poll has to say, because I think of it as being sort of a snapshot of the entire Republican primary voter base, and they say Trump – these guys in big, big vote, of course – 55% for Trump, 25% for Cruz, 14% for Kasich – hard to believe – 5% for Rubio. In other words, Rubio, it's one place that Drudge would agree with Frank Luntz. Rubio is just a zero. So I think probably he's through, not that he's not going to try to stay in through the Florida primary, but he didn't help himself last night. I think he hasn't helped himself in quite a while, and this was – I guess just the whole thing the last couple of weeks have been a last ditch attempt by some advisors of his to try to bring him back and resuscitate the corpse, and it didn't work.

But how can Kasich, who has to be the most irritating, sanctimonious guy whose entire campaign is "I'm more moral than everybody else; why, people want a hug from me because I can fix all their ills and kiss all their boobos and make them all better." And that's the job of a politician. And then of course he's also going to handle poverty, and

he's got the right tone, and after all, the Pentagon called him in after 9/11 to consult him about what to do, and he was chairman of this committee for 27 years, and therefore give him all power. But apparently, at least some people are liking him more, so I find that slightly mystifying. Cruz I think did pretty well, although if they had a deal ahead of time it was Rubio who had the job of really trying to go after Trump. But nevertheless, Cruz on the *New York Times* tape business was deadly.

WOODS: Yeah, and he just kept demanding an answer until finally Trump just had to say I've given you my answer, and that was the end of it. And you're right, that Rubio must have been given that job, because I remember there was a long stretch where we didn't hear from Cruz, and when Cruz spoke I thought, oh yeah, there's Cruz on the stage. It was – yeah, I mean, he was out of the spotlight, but when he was in it, he used it to very effective – and you know, it's true that Trump supporters seem exceptionally loyal, so I know that Cruz is probably frustrated that – I mean, he is making a reasonable case against Trump, that he doesn't seem to be that well grounded in what he's talking about, and he seems to be all over the place, and he had support for these other candidates in the past, and he's donated to the Clinton Foundation, which makes it hard for him to challenge the Clinton Foundation. I mean, that's not a ridiculously implausible case against Trump, and yet he gets no traction with it whatsoever.

ROCKWELL: Although, you know, having donated to the Clinton Foundation might give you standing to say you people cheated me.

WOODS: That's true.

ROCKWELL: I was told this was going to be helping the poor in Zimbabwe or whatever the claim was, and this all went into your pocket, Hillary.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, yeah –

ROCKWELL: I want my money back –

WOODS: I want my money back, and if you have your checkbook, I'll take it right now (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, you and I should be consultants for people (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: All right, let's see. Oh yeah, on the Kasich front, I was – I mean, because he portrays himself as the reasonable guy who's sort of in the middle and he can bring everybody together and he has all this experience and this and that, it's easy to neglect how extreme he is, at times anyway, on foreign policy, because I took notes

on this. He was basically saying we need full blown war in Syria and Iraq on the ground and in the air.

ROCKWELL: Yes, that's right.

WOODS: And then when we're done with that, we have to be on the ground and in the air in Libya. So he's contemplating three major wars.

ROCKWELL: In the last debate he called for overthrowing the North Korean government and going to war against them.

WOODS: Yeah, which is complete lunacy and makes no sense. And again, I want to tell people – well, the show notes page is TomWoods.com/609, and what I'm going to include on there is – I think I've done this before, but we did an episode on North Korea after they had another missile launch not too long ago, explaining what the correct response to this would be, and my guest, Michael Malice, said I'm going to give a completely Rothbardian analysis of what's going on and what our response should be. So listen to that. You will find it very informative. I will link to it at TomWoods.com/609. It's very, very much worth listening to. So Kasich, in case you were thinking, well, here's a relatively even keeled temperament, it goes to show this whole temperament nonsense is totally overblown, because Kasich has prided himself on being kind of a bore, and yet he's got three wars up his sleeve (laughing), so what does that tell you?

ROCKWELL: Also, I saw Gloria Borger on CNN the other day defending Kasich, and he's the only Republican that talks about poverty and how the government should be curing poverty. And of course it's true. He's just as bad on the welfare state and related issues. He's also Mr. Common Core, and last night he was saying, no, no, let the localities do things and let the states do it. So he's – I would say Kasich is a very bad guy right across the board. But you're right, is it the boring personality? I don't know, the constant talking about on what a moral high plane he operates. What is it? I don't know, but he does seem to get away with being a crazed warmonger and a crazed welfare statist, just a crazed government guy, and also of course, as Trump once mentioned, went to work for Lehman Brothers right before they went bust as a general partner. And this guy's very connected, very bad.

And of course Cruz's wife is the vice president of Goldman Sachs, and he got all sorts of loans from Goldman Sachs, so he's a Goldman Sachs guy too. This is exactly of course what the bankers would like. You'd like to have an election between Hillary, the Goldman Sachs lady, and some Republican who's a Goldman Sachs guy. You know, that way they can't lose and representing the whole of Wall Street and the whole financial empire that has grown so fat and happy off the government while stepping on the throat of the American people.

WOODS: Lew, I know you feel the way I do, that we both miss Ron Paul in these debates, but in particular I was curious to see or I wish we could have seen how he would have handled the Snowden question, because they're all terrible on Snowden.

ROCKWELL: Terrible. Well, I think he's correctly called Snowden a hero, that he absolutely should not be prosecuted and that he ought to get a medal, because by revealing the crimes that the government is committing against the people, you know, he did us a lot of good. And as if anybody who is worried about – in the foreign clime – worried about the U.S. government killing them in one of its wars, the idea that they're going to just be using their cell phone to make plans, they know not to do that.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: But Americans didn't know it. Americans didn't realize that they were being subjected to this kind of surveillance in the budding American police state, and Snowden – I also liked, Snowden had a comment the other day that he thought the election was coming down to Trump versus Goldman Sachs.

WOODS: Wow, that's very interesting.

ROCKWELL: Yeah.

WOODS: Well, I think it was Cruz who said that one way we knew that Snowden was really a no-goodnik was how he behaved after he started releasing the information. He fled to Russia! He fled to other countries! What does that tell you? Well, what does it tell you, actually?

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: That you don't want to be thrown in some cage or executed by the crazed lunatics that you've just exposed.

ROCKWELL: That's right, of course (laughing).

WOODS: I just didn't understand that line of argument at all. What is he driving at? Of course he leaves the country.

ROCKWELL: Well, that was Cruz when he was pretending to be a little bit libertarianish leaning, and of course that's long gone out the window. He's back in full neocon mode.

WOODS: And you know, it's true that he did land some punches on Trump, but when he was saying things like – when Trump was talking over him, he was saying things like, "Count to 10, Donald," he came across as, I found, extremely effeminate, and he just sounded weak and silly and scripted and rehearsed.

ROCKWELL: Yeah.

WOODS: That didn't work at all. "Count to 10??"

ROCKWELL: No, I think that's right. I think he is himself a repellent figure and not at all the anti-establishment guy he's portrayed himself as, and was I guess a very smart move given his total establishment, George W. Bush, Goldman Sachs background. When he got into the Senate he attacked Mitch McConnell so he would be seen as — and of course Mitch McConnell is doubly repellent — and he attacked Mitch McConnell so he would be seen to be an anti-elite, anti-establishment guy. That was his tactic, and I guess it's worked for a lot of people.

WOODS: Well, they really don't like him, though, Lew. I mean, the senators, they really don't like him.

ROCKWELL: Well, apparently, despite what the governor of Texas says, nobody has ever loved him. People at Harvard, his roommates have written articles about how horrendous it was to be his roommate, and you know, he's a smart guy who wants everybody to know it and just apparently just a nasty guy, if I can quote Trump, and all his life, so whether he was working in the Solicitor General's office, in Texas in the George W. Bush administration, or in school, all the various things he does he has been universally disliked. So I think that's accurate, but there are a lot of repellent people in the Senate. If you wanted to go along to get along, they'd be clapping you on the back and saying, hey, how you doing, Ted — if you were doing what they wanted. So it makes it easier for them of course to hate him, because he is so hateable.

WOODS: You know, Trump could very easily have come back on that. He could have deflected attention from that *New York Times* tape thing by saying, you know, that's funny, Ted, because reports are saying that when you were talking to New York donors, you assured them that you didn't really mean what you said about gay marriage, that you said that just to shut up the rubes in Iowa, but that you're not going to do anything about gay marriage, so why don't you — those tapes have already been released, type of thing.

ROCKWELL: (laughing) Well, Trump didn't do anywhere near as well as he ought to have done, what can I say?

WOODS: Yeah, I'm not getting paid enough (laughing).

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: Ah, geez. All right, what did I miss here? I mean, they did talk foreign policy a little bit and you can't negotiate with terrorists and stuff, but what else did I miss?

ROCKWELL: I must say Trump did say wouldn't it be nice if we could get along with other countries.

WOODS: Oh, that's right. Yeah, that was good.

ROCKWELL: Wouldn't it be nice if we could just not have all these wars? So I thought, well, good for him. That's the one good thing he said last night.

WOODS: Yeah, exactly, because they were all angry at him because he didn't want to launch a war on Putin or something, and then he —

ROCKWELL: No, and then of course, as the *Gawker* pointed out, Fox runs an anti-Trump commercial —

WOODS: (laughing) Oh, yeah.

ROCKWELL: — about a Putin-Trump ticket, and essentially Megyn Kelly's question to Kasich was, wasn't that a great ad.

WOODS: (laughing)

ROCKWELL: I mean — so just a sample of what Fox was doing, the evil Fox, and I hope if there's another Fox debate, I hope Trump will boycott it and have an anti-Murdoch fundraiser or something like that.

WOODS: Afterward I saw him interviewed by Bill O'Reilly, and he said that he felt like the debate was fair, but maybe, I don't know, if he has time to look at it again or think about it, he might think differently. But you're right about what he said there, that — because the others are all, we've got to bang, bang, bang —

ROCKWELL: Kill 'em all, kill 'em.

WOODS: They don't recognize the threat that Putin poses and whatever, you know, we have to arm the Ukrainians and this and that, and Trump —

ROCKWELL: Another trope of Kasich, by the way: "arm the Ukrainians."

WOODS: Yeah, that was Kasich, yeah. And meanwhile you have Trump saying, look, we have so many problems here that we could probably stand to spend a trillion on those rather than a trillion on trying to cook up some war constantly all the time; it's ridiculous. Okay, I would rather the people just get the money back, but I mean, that was Ron's line too, that it would be better — obviously if I had to choose, it would be better to spend the money here in the U.S. on productive things than on some ridiculous war cooked up by the neocons. So even on a bad night, he got that point out, which again, for all the people saying, oh my goodness, if you have any analysis of Trump whatsoever you're obviously a Trump supporter or this or that. I mean, my gosh, am I tired of hearing that. But this is the only person who says anything like that and the only person who's likely to say it in either party. The only person. That is something valuable. I'm glad it's being said.

ROCKWELL: No, it's why there were — was it 60 or 70 neocon alleged foreign policy experts, all guys up to their waists in blood and have made a lot of money off the blood, advisors to Bush and etc., saying Donald Trump must not be president, he's not serious, he's whatever.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: Why do the Max Boots hate him so much? Why do the Bill Kristols and all these alleged foreign policy experts hate his guts so much? Because this is what they're afraid of. They don't care about anything else; they care about the warfare state, the empire going on, and they see Trump – you know, it's an unbelievable outrage to talk about, gee, maybe some of this money should be spent in the United States. This is not allowed. This should be illegal to say this. And this is why they flip out. So I thought it was a very good – of course Romney is a part of this gang.

WOODS: Yep.

ROCKWELL: And they want war, war, war, war. Romney was the one who in 2012 was saying that Putin was America's number one enemy and has to be taken down or taken care of or assassinated or whatever was his line at the moment. So I think, you know, that was the, I thought the one sort of happy line in the debate. I thought the rest of it was I must say pretty unpleasant. But I looked at the clock and I saw it was only 47 minutes into it, and I thought, holy smokes, if I weren't talking to Tom tomorrow –

WOODS: (laughing)

ROCKWELL: – I would be clicking this off and reading a book.

WOODS: I know. I know. There's a real opportunity cost to doing this show: all the knowledge you could have gained by doing something productive. But you know, again, Trump was not – he did not handle that thing very well about the experts coming out. I would have had a blast with that question. I would have said, oh, let's see. I would have said people who are responsible for the state of the world today think I would be a bad choice. These are people who out of shame should have resigned long ago or been fired, and the fact that they're against me should be all the endorsement everybody needs, so get out and vote Trump, is what I would have said, absolutely. I would have said, I am so glad you people wrote that letter, because it exposes that people who have done nothing but harm to this country and people around the world – *nothing* but harm. They have *nothing* to show for themselves at all, except trillions of dollars blown. They're against me? Great. I want you to be against me. In fact, I want you to keep writing letters every week till the election.

ROCKWELL: (laughing)

WOODS: Ahh.

ROCKWELL: Open letters – Chris Matthews made a point, that this is a typical neocon thing, the open letter.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah.

ROCKWELL: So yeah, keep up the open letters (laughing).

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah, exactly. It's crazy. All right, anything else? Do you feel like we hit it pretty well here?

ROCKWELL: I think so, yeah.

WOODS: I mean, I don't want to say anything about his remark about the size of his hands (laughing).

ROCKWELL: No, no.

WOODS: (laughing) I couldn't believe that was said on television, but anyway – I still felt like it was entertaining, though, because they were – they're so late in the game and the other candidates consider it so urgent to defeat him that it was really – there were no kid gloves at all. And so for the viewer, that did make it, you know.

ROCKWELL: That's true.

WOODS: Yeah.

ROCKWELL: Far more interesting than the typical boring debate, even though, when did a network hosting a debate become the prosecutor? I mean, when did that happen? Aren't these – this wasn't the way it was in the old days, starting with Kennedy and Nixon. The networks have sort of taken power, especially Fox, and see themselves as the arbiters.

WOODS: Right, in a traditional debate you let the contestants go after each other.

ROCKWELL: Yeah, yeah, I mean, that's the whole point of it, not what Megyn Kelly thinks, not what Chris Wallace thinks. Somebody reminded me this morning, Chris Wallace, the guy who hated Ron Paul so much that he wouldn't mention his name as doing so well in the Iowa Straw Poll. Wouldn't even mention his name, just full of hate, Chris Wallace. So these are very nasty people, maybe even nastier than Ted Cruz. And why they're in charge – of course, this is the RNC allowing this, the RNC setting this up, and I look forward to Trump making Roger Stone chairman of the RNC.

WOODS: (laughing) I know, exactly. That would be fun. Okay, Lew, thanks a lot. Looking forward to the next one.

ROCKWELL: Thank you, Tom.