



Episode 620: Trump, Buchanan, and the Death of the Political Consultant

Guest: Roger McCaffrey

WOODS: All right, I want to ask you a devil's advocate question right off the bat. This is my best devil's advocate question I've got. It's easy to say, and we'll go into this in a minute, that everything that the political pundits have said about Trump turned out to be wrong. He's not going to run, that he's not going to hit 20%, he's not going to hit 30, he's not going to hit 40, he's not going to hit 50. Or they've said he doesn't like Saint John McCain, so he's going to be out because of that. He's going to be out because of this remark or that remark. Every single thing they said is wrong. Everything they said is wrong. So maybe this shows they're all full of hot air.

My devil's advocate question is this – I can see that point of view, but Trump is such an exception in so many ways. He's independently wealthy; he's extremely well known. The American public got to know him; I got to know him growing up as a kid and then he was on a very, very popular television show. And he's making politically incorrect statements. That's a very, very rare combination. You're not likely to come across another Trump. So even if they were dead wrong about this guy, there aren't that many Trumps coming down the pike, so, you know, can't we give them a Mulligan?

MCCAFFREY: Well first of all, there's a difference between a pundit and a consultant, even though a political consultant/strategist, they often become pundits, but there is a difference – although they're both usually stupid. But no, here's the thing, Trump will be copied for eons. So you're going to have Trump types, a lot of them are going to be synthetic Trumps, if you can fathom that or get your mind around that. But you will have Trump types from now on. We're in the 21st century, so, you know, it's the era of Trump, more so than the era of Reagan, unfortunately, although I like Trump in many ways. I'm not dissing Trump, because I think he could easily win and he speaks for me in most areas.

WOODS: All right, well let's – but look, I don't want to get into a debate on Trump, but when you look at his specific proposals, a lot of them are not very good or not very well articulated, or he wants to make it easier to sue the media, or he wants to kill families of people overseas, or he wants to send ground troops against ISIS or whatever. Before you know it, all the reasons you got excited have all dissipated.

MCCAFFREY: Right, well, you know, look, you know there's room, isn't there, on the campaign trail for hyperbole?

WOODS: (laughing) I guess, if that's what you want to call it.

MCCAFFREY: I mean, this is a democracy. All we have, Tom, since we're not democrats, is one vote.

WOODS: Yeah that's right, that's right.

MCCAFFREY: So what the heck.

WOODS: That's right, all right. So all right, I want to get something of your perspective on this having worked with Pat Buchanan, because everybody is comparing, you know they're comparing Trump either to – well, they really are basically comparing him to Buchanan, because they use the Samuel Francis' analysis of the middle American radicals to explain the Trump constituency, and Pat was really appealing to that demographic.

MCCAFFREY: Exactly, in fact, I had many a meal with Pat and Sam Francis, talking about middle American radicals, although Sam used the slightly different term for a while there. By the way, I worked for Pat, not with Pat. But you know, I mean, we were up close there in late '91 and '92, because I had done the publication, his first publication. I marketed it and later when Gregorsky, his first editor – really Pat was the editor, let's be frank. But you know Frank Gregorsky, Newt Gingrich's former chief of staff, was actually a first editor. He quit eventually, because Pat got too strong for him. Frank liked a different brand of conservatism. So I then became the editor and so forth, so we spent plenty of time there. And I pointed out to him – I take credit for this, that my strength was direct mail. I could see that when we marketed the newsletter that this was a huge success, the first publication from the Right. And I said this has presidential implications. Because you raised money through the mail, in 1992, and by phone.

WOODS: Well, when was Pat writing that newsletter? When did that start?

MCCAFFREY: Well, we started in '89, '90.

WOODS: Okay, so well before the '92 election.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, and by the way it would have become a magazine had he decided not to run for president. But again, the thing was so powerful; I mean, results, the returns were so powerful that you could see this had presidential meaning. Pat and Bill Buckley were the two big names on the Right, period. Reagan of course the biggest, but he had retired by then.

WOODS: And Pat had worked for Reagan.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, Pat was his chief of communications. Pat was with Reagan at Reykjavik, you know, when Reagan walked out on Gorbachev. Pat was there in the limo writing the Reagan airport speech as they drove to the airport to go back home. I mean, they were just – Pat was with him all the time there for a couple of years.

WOODS: I remember reading it was Pat who ran into the Oval Office and told him that

the space shuttle Challenger had exploded. Generally you were not supposed to run right into the Oval Office, but Reagan thought in this case it was appropriate.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, that's very true. Yeah, Pat did. Anyway, so Pat was the first guy who would ignore the professional political class and get away with it for a while in 1992.

WOODS: Yeah, I want to talk about specifically how he did that, but let's back up for a minute. Did you have any role in or any conversations with him about a decision to run for President in '92?

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, yeah, but that was his – I did not persuade him. All I – my role was to say I think you can raise, you know, anywhere from 5 to 30 million bucks. In other words, anywhere from 10 in today's dollars to 50 million bucks. Yeah, that I said, sure. But I didn't even know Pat had made the decision until – first of all he didn't make the decision until roughly November of '91, and he didn't tell anyone. Bay, who ran his campaign, was still in California. I mean, she had to move, so you can see that he really wasn't sure until November. But in January of '91, I remember talking to him about Bush's approval ratings which were 91%.

WOODS: Yeah, immediately after the liberation of Kuwait it was 91% and he seemed invincible.

MCCAFFREY: Exactly, and I said to Pat, which of course he would have said to me, there's no place for him to go but down.

WOODS: That's a good point.

MCCAFFREY: And you know, I mean, that's so clear. Plus you know, Pat knows politics better than anybody, better than anybody, I would say.

WOODS: Yeah, oh yeah.

MCCAFFREY: And he knew that 91% was heading for 50%, at best. And he also knew Bush. He had a fix on Bush, and I think he felt – he never said this to me; I didn't ever debrief Pat, but I think he felt that Bush would tack to the center. That was his comfort zone. And Pat felt that he could outflank him and maybe beat him. He ran to beat him. He did not like Trump, by the way. Trump ran to win from day one. He wasn't pumping his brand or anything. He figured he could win and so did Pat, and he almost pulled something off in 1996. And as you know, he got, what, 38% against the sitting president in New Hampshire in '92.

WOODS: Yeah, that was really, really high. So he was – but yet I would think almost everybody would have been thinking that Pat is just running to make a point. He's representing frustrated conservatives. You're saying that's not the case.

MCCAFFREY: Definitely not. And I remember the press conference the night before he announced in New Hampshire. That was an amazing press – it was not a press conference; it was a backgrounder for the press. There were no mics allowed. The room was just crammed with reporters of note, and, I mean, it was a mob scene. And

Pat was explaining on background, i.e., off the record, why he was running. And one of them asked him the very question you just asked. And he said, and he explained look I see a “seam,” quote unquote. I see a seam in Bush's numbers, and I see a seam through which I can win. He absolutely ran to win. And I'm sure he figured, I'll go in '96 if I do well in '92 and don't win.

WOODS: Did you work for him only in '92?

MCCAFFREY: Yeah in '92. In fact, I left March 1st, so after New Hampshire, which essentially was the end of the campaign. Although you know he got votes in many other states. So yeah, I did December and January and February, were my months, and that was amazing.

WOODS: So you wrote direct mail that was sent out to a great many people basically saying the sitting U.S. president is a bum – you did that?

MCCAFFREY: Well yeah, I did a couple of pieces, but nobody wrote for Pat until he got a machine going, which really was 1996. But here's the interesting thing, Tom, about the whole consultant class. And Pat always kept his distance from the professional Right. He was friendly with them, but he always kept his distance. And you know, sure enough, they wanted in on his campaign. I was not a member in good standing of the Beltway Right.

WOODS: You don't say.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, well, I was down there for three years. I worked in Washington as a member in good standing, but you know, common sense prevailed and I moved back to New York. But because of my father and my own role – my father was Conservative Book Club Arlington House Publishers. It was the only successful book publisher ever on the Right until Phillips pumped millions into Regnery. So you know, I had standing. Anyway I represented – I could do what the professionals could do but I wasn't a consultant with a capital C.

WOODS: Now, why did they want in on it? Was it partly for the – they sought dollar signs?

MCCAFFREY: Yeah.

WOODS: Was it also because they just couldn't imagine something major going on that they weren't a part of?

MCCAFFREY: Well, both, both, both. There was huge money to be made. And because his direct mail was so good and his future was bright also. And plus, they live to just have meetings and strategize and recreate the great Reagan victory of 1980; you know that's what they're all about. But anyway, the point is regarding his direct mail, his announcement letter, which was a phenomenal success in the mail, he gave it to me. It was an announcement, and I said this should be a letter. First of all, this should be your announcement letter, we should mail this. We'll mail a million pieces of this. Well, all the professionals met at his house. I was there, of course. That was just laughable. And afterwards they all went home, and somehow or other it got back to

Pat that they didn't really like his announcement letter, counseled him sagely that it wouldn't work. And I said, keep every word of this. It was a brilliant letter, a brilliant, brilliant letter, Tom. I can send it to you. I mean it's one for the books. And Trump would be well to look at it. But I added one paragraph to that letter. I cannot — I wish I could claim to have written it. But my role was to say they're full of it, ignore them, they're wrong, this thing's going to work. And man, did it work. Bay, who worked on the Reagan campaign, said that.

WOODS: That's his sister, just for everybody to know.

MCCAFFREY: Sorry, Bay Buchanan ran Pat's campaign, but she also worked on Reagan's in 1980. She said these results are better than the Reagan results. And Reagan won on a landslide in 1980. So what I'm saying is consultants are, as we know, they're full of baloney. You could see that Trump has a handle on consultants, and he doesn't like to throw his money away any more than Bay did in that little campaign, which grew much bigger than we expected.

WOODS: But on the other hand, Roger, in 1996 Pat to some degree signed on Frank Luntz.

MCCAFFREY: I know. Well he signed him on in '92.

WOODS: Oh

MCCAFFREY: Actually he signed him on in '92, I remember seeing. You know, two weeks before Luntz, before I saw him show up in the office, I remember sitting down to dinner at the Hunan Lion at Tyson's Corner. And Bay was there, I think Sam Francis was there, Pat, Shelling, me. There was one other good friend that you and I know who was there too. I don't know if he — he's so humble he might not want to be mentioned.

WOODS: He might not want to be mentioned, but I know who you're talking about.

MCCAFFREY: You know and we were talking about pollsters, and I said — and everybody agreed, including Pat, what do we need pollsters for? Well, two weeks later we had one. And it was pretty much agreed that they were not needed. So what I think happened — I never said to Bay, why'd you hire Frank Luntz, who was a nobody then, by the way. And she explained to me, you know he's not interested in a political career; he just loves this for the — for him it's just an intellectual feast or something.

WOODS: Oh my God, this is like saying Saddam was responsible for 9/11. It's so wrong.

MCCAFFREY: I mean, it just was. Well he's an academic, he's a teacher, I didn't know —

WOODS: He was an adjunct professor at the time. An adjunct professor is somebody who works at a car wash most of the time and teaches a class, you know.

MCCAFFREY: Well, he looked, when I met him — I didn't even meet him by the way; I walked past him — he looked like he had just been in a car wash.

WOODS: I don't even know what that means, but that's great.

MCCAFFREY: Well, I mean it was not an elegant sight.

WOODS: I know what you mean.

MCCAFFREY: And you know, Bay would not have overpaid him, but the idea of hiring a pollster when we had powerful direct mail results and different kinds of mailing lists and even different regions of the country measured, to me was a kind of a waste, really quite a waste. And they actually had two pollsters in 1992. But however they had the money for it. See, the money came flooding in; it broke all records. And that just made the professional political class on the Right in Washington salivate all the more. And they did everything they could to undermine me and anybody else that was authentic.

WOODS: So things were much different then than they are now, is that what you're saying?

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, exactly. The more things change. But anyway, no they'll be around forever, but what Trump is proven is they're not needed at \$20,000 a month, you know? What Trump's campaign has done, among much else, is cut the price of the political consultant in half in future campaigns and that's all to the good.

WOODS: All right, I definitely want to pursue this. Let's pause, though, just for a quick message.

[Sponsored content]

WOODS: Now, is it the case that there's no role at all for political consultants? I mean, most political consultants or maybe all, I know exactly more or less what they're going to say; I know what they're outlook is; I know the kinds of things that the candidate is supposed to say, things he's supposed to avoid, how he's supposed apologize for alleged gaffs. They've got it all written out in a playbook. And that to me seems like I could throw that all in the garbage and not be any the worse for it. But is there any role for these people at all?

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, and you hit it on the head with that point. Where there is no role if you have a candidate with brains, is for the strategist consultant, who tells the candidate what to say, to maximize his vote. Now, if you have half a brain you can figure that out as a candidate, and Trump I hope has killed that species of consultant. As I say, though, Tom, he's at least cut their monthly fee in half, if not 80%. In the future other candidates are going to get the idea that they might be able to do without a strategist consultant who loses half the time anyway. You know Michael Murphy, the guy out in LA you know who used to be in Washington.

The guys with the real money and the real success stories go out to LA and become screenwriters or something, I don't know. Luntz is out there. But you know, they're a waste of money, but you do need a guy who can handle social media. You still need a direct mail guy, because you can still make money in mail. You've got to use physical mailings. So if you see their name in the paper you fire them. That's my attitude. And

Tom, that was the attitude of the old pros. The Vic Golds, who was on — oh he goes back to Barry Goldwater. Vic is still around, although he's not a consultant and never was a consultant. Bill Clark who was the other guy, who — Bill had permission to go into Reagan's office any time he wanted without announcing himself. And you know, Lyn Nofziger and people like that, when they saw their colleagues' names in the paper in campaigns, their attitude was they need to be gone. I suppose a campaign manager is exempted from that. But you don't want it. You want the candidate in the paper, not his strategist, not his speechwriter, and those people need to make as little footprint as possible.

WOODS: And plus there's also the practical fact that nobody cares what the deputy guy in charge of such and such has to say about anything anyway.

MCCAFFREY: Well, except reporters care because they need to get —

WOODS: A quote from somebody, yeah.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, and they need to do it as conveniently as possible.

WOODS: But the voters aren't — the voters don't care. The voters care what Ron Paul thinks; they don't care what Jesse Benton thinks; they don't care what any of these people think. They care what the candidate thinks. So I definitely — anybody who has a mouth problem, yeah that person would be gone. You know, I sometimes sit and think about — not a lot, but when I'm talking to Lew on the phone we sometimes trade advice about unsolicited advice to candidates. You know, he could have said this, he could have said that, wouldn't that have been hilarious? And like for example, Trump it just seems like, even though he has amused and entertained me, he's got a lot of missed opportunities. I mean like when that list of 100 so-called foreign policy experts came out against him and they brought that up in the debate. Oh my gosh, did I have a line for him, you know, that he should have been ready with. These people, these are the people you know, they basically owe us a trillion bucks after all the money we've blown following their advice. I hope they keep writing, I hope they write a letter every single week till November. I'll use it as confetti at the Inaugural Ball. You know, use that.

MCCAFFREY: I know, I agree. And he can borrow a lot of Pat Buchanan's lines from '92 and '96 especially.

WOODS: And see Pat was brilliant at that. I mean Trump is good at the sledgehammer, you know, "Hey, you're kind of fat," kind of remark. But Pat had these clever, absolutely cut-you-to-the-quick kind of lines.

MCCAFFREY: Yes. And he wrote them for candidates too. I mean that's what he did for Nixon. And that's what he did, he did it for Agnew. You know they put him on Agnew's plane with Vic Gold, by the way, in the 1972 campaign, which was a very hot campaign. Even though Nixon won it in a landslide. Pat was writing these lines. And a smart candidate looks at ten of them and picks two of them. And I guess Trump probably has now a writer on staff but he doesn't use him much.

WOODS: No he doesn't. And his speeches are very stream of consciousness,

meandering sorts of things. But yet it connects with people, because I think they feel like anybody who gives me a polished speech is probably going to screw me.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah.

WOODS: It seems to be their attitude.

MCCAFFREY: And how wrong is that?

WOODS: Yeah, I mean, so far it seems to be running at 100 percent accurate.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah.

WOODS: I have no control group that I can – I can't look at people who speak badly and get elected, because there really aren't that many of them. They're all teleprompter, super-polished sorts of people. They're not all exciting speakers, but they're all extremely proper. Mike Dukakis could not speak very excitingly or neither could George H. W. Bush, but they could stick to a script.

MCCAFFREY: Right. Well, what I would do – or should we get into Trump and what consultants he should use – or are we?

WOODS: No sure – yes, I mean. I'm curious to know what you think he needs.

MCCAFFREY: Well, what he really – he does need a writer for a few lines a week. And I don't want to see the guy's name in the paper or he's gone. And you saw him with Roger Stone, who's got – by the way he's highly credentialed. But I think Trump wanted to be the only guy whose name was in the paper. And okay, he needs that, what he desperately needs is he needs to – he needs high tech; he needs IT guys very badly, because this election, if it's close which it probably will be – I'm assuming Trump is the nominee. It's going to go down to ten or twenty precincts, or it could, in the United States, and you need somebody who knows those precincts cold. So those are the guys he needs.

And remember Google and all these creeps out on the west coast are helping Hilary. They're helping her now, they're going to be helping her in the future. And they have the upper hand. Republican Party is not just way behind on IT stuff and they were wrongly credited in 2008 with being ahead. They're not ahead on anything, by the way. But you know, that's what we're up against if you're rooting – let's say if you're rooting against Hilary. Those are the consultants he really needs. And you know, you won't see their names in the paper but those guys are desperately needed. Or this campaign will not prevail.

WOODS: Now I myself, as I say – I mean there are things that Trump has said that I'm glad he's said. But then as soon as he says them he makes me cringe with the next thing that he says. So the part of my life where I endorse candidates or I get involved in campaigns, that chapter of my life is closed almost certainly forever. But I still am interested to follow it, which is why I enjoy conversations like this; I'm interested to follow it.

But let's predict – because you have observed this stuff for a while and you've worked

closely with Pat and so on for a long time, and you – I mean, anybody who just gets to talk to Pat for a long time, that's a tremendous advantage. I want to know, if he really is the nominee up against Hilary Clinton, there is a part of me that feels like she crushes him in a Goldwater-style landslide, LBJ-style landslide, because she has all the Democratic Party interest groups in lockstep, and because he has said at least one thing that enrages a lot of people.

There's another part of me that feels like American elections are not decided in the faculty lounges of U.S. law schools. They're decided by regular, ordinary Americans, a lot of whom apparently feel like what he's saying really resonates with them and he is actually making inroads into the black community and even among Hispanics who people say, oh, why would Hispanics vote for Trump? What possible reason would Hispanics who were settled here and established have for wanting a flood of more Hispanics to come in? They don't necessarily want that. So of course it makes sense for them to vote for Trump, and there are plenty of them who are going to do that. So which one of those two analyses do you think is closer to the truth?

MCCAFFREY: Whoa, he's going to get tons of – I don't understand your, how's this for a candidate – I don't understand your question. I think he's going to get a lot of minority votes, meaning he'll get 10% of the black vote.

WOODS: I think he'll get higher. I think he'll get higher.

MCCAFFREY: Well okay, 15 to 20. If he gets that I think he'll win the election. And I think he'll probably get a quarter, not more than a quarter of the Hispanic vote, so if that answers your question, that's my take on Trump. Because he's going to be, by the time this thing ends, six, seven months from now, the press will have done its work. The other thing is who's he going to pick as his running mate. That's very important.

WOODS: Yeah, because it seems like – it would not surprise me at all if he picked a basically establishment person. I would be shocked if he picked somebody outside of the establishment.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah I think you're right; I think you're right. But you know, but how do we define –

WOODS: Because in other words, once he gets the nomination, then I think he feels like he's enough part of the system that he can tone himself down a little bit.

MCCAFFREY: Right. Well, to illustrate that point, I remember asking Pat Buchanan in '96 – this is one that didn't make it to the Tim Stanley book, like a lot of things didn't make it. But that's the book on the Buchanan campaigns, and it's worth having if you're a Pat fan, you want to read it, but it's not definitive. There's a lot missing. And one thing is I said to Pat, who would you pick as your running mate, because he had beaten Dole in New Hampshire. And he had every chance to win the nomination if things had clicked and if he had more money in South Carolina. But who would you have picked as your running mate? He said, ahh, probably somebody like Kent. You've got to unite the party.

WOODS: Gosh, well, see there's Pat's political mind basically. You've got to unite the

party.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, and I think if Pat would do such a thing, such a terrible thing – well, I mean you do if you want to win. And after all, that's what Trump wants to do. He might have to go establishment. But it's got to be somebody that he hasn't called a pipsqueak or a jerk.

WOODS: You know it's going to be hard to find.

MCCAFFREY: Where the hell are you going to find that?

WOODS: And that nominee is going to be faced with a barrage of questions everywhere he goes. Hey did you hear what you running mate said today? You know you're on the top of the ticket. How do you feel about all the names he's calling everybody? It's going to be a full-time job just to handle all those questions.

MCCAFFREY: Tom, you're right. But I mean, are we going to get into names, or do you not want to do that?

WOODS: I am so pro-names I can't even begin to say, so go ahead.

MCCAFFREY: Well if I were in Trump's shoes, I would consider – I'm just again trying to put myself in his shoes. Huckabee? Jeff Sessions, the senator from Alabama. I'm not making value judgments, Tom, I'm just saying.

WOODS: Yeah as a political – right. My listeners are smart enough to know what you're doing, so don't worry.

MCCAFFREY: Good. And Steve King, the congressman from Iowa.

WOODS: Oh, geez.

MCCAFFREY: Well, you know, I mean, look –

WOODS: I understand why, I'm just saying.

MCCAFFREY: Because you cannot go – if you go outside the box – if you go too inside the box you're going to get a guy who's going to spend his entire three months explaining why Trump really didn't mean to sound as radical as he sounded on such and such. You know what I'm saying?

WOODS: Yeah.

MCCAFFREY: You can't bring – you cannot get the governor of Maryland as your running mate or something and then expect him to be able to handle trick questions. So you've got to pick someone who's on your team and yet who has establishment credentials. Such is my reading of it. I really don't know who he's going to pick. There's always Terry Brandsted, governor of Iowa.

WOODS: Oh no, he's – geez, this is getting worse every minute we talk. We've got to

switch; let's switch. Let's talk about Pat Buchanan again. I can't take current events any more. I want to ask you this: I've heard this theory about Alan Keyes, that my understanding is that Alan Keyes and Bill Kristol were college roommates. They've known each other a long time.

MCCAFFREY: That's accurate, that's totally accurate.

WOODS: Okay, all right, and that Keyes was polling way, way in the basement in '96. He was just not even registering, but he was taking a crucial few percent that would have gone to Buchanan if Keyes hadn't been in the race. There was no point in Keyes staying in the race unless you think to yourself, well let's see, he's friends with Bill Kristol. Bill Kristol would die a million deaths before he would allow Pat Buchanan to become president. He's in there entirely to thwart Buchanan.

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, plus Keyes is never hurt for -

WOODS: Ego? Attention seeking? What are you looking for here?

MCCAFFREY: Yeah, let's put it that way. There's no self-esteem problem there.

WOODS: That's right.

MCCAFFREY: And so yeah, I'm sure they encouraged Keyes to – in fact Keyes cost Pat Iowa in '96.

WOODS: You really – you think that's the case?

MCCAFFREY: Yeah.

WOODS: Wow.

MCCAFFREY: And that's, you know, Pat - listen, if Pat had won the nomination in '96, he'd have beat Clinton, because Perot could not have run.

WOODS: Oh, but wouldn't they have hit Pat over and over again with racism and anti-Semitism and over and over and all the stuff that we all predict is going to happen? That's toxic stuff.

MCCAFFREY: It is, but they're doing it to Trump minus the anti-Semitism.

WOODS: But the difference is after 20 more tiresome years of this, I think people finally have the guts to stand up and say none of these terms mean anything to us, because 99.9% of the time they are being used unjustly and because we don't even know what these words really mean anyway, so forget it.

MCCAFFREY: Right, well, there's a lot to that. I do remember saying to Pat in probably it was '95, you know, if you get close the next time, if you win New Hampshire there's going to be a huge press conference. Every leader of the party is going to be there, and they're going to condemn you. And he thought for about three seconds, and he said, that's exactly what I want.

WOODS: (laughing) That is such a great answer.

MCCAFFREY: So you know, you can — there is such a thing as ju-jitsu in politics too. Now, whether that kind of thing gets you elected president, that's debatable. But Trump clearly is proving that you can handle a certain amount of crescendo from the — the question is how loud is this crescendo going to get over the next six months from the Trump point of view, you know?

WOODS: Yeah, and it will morally intimidate people in to not voting for him, because you know that all right-thinking people don't vote for racists and whatever, whatever. So you know — I just, I'm sorry, I just can't get out of my mind the idea of a Buchanan-Kemp ticket. Because in that case I would have been more interested in seeing a debate between the two guys on the ticket than I would have been between the Republican and the Democrat. I want to see Pat and Kemp go at each other.

MCCAFFREY: Which they did, they did it on *Larry King* on CNN, and roughly in '93, '94 they actually had a debate right there with Larry King in the middle of it so to speak.

WOODS: Oh, how about that? I would not want to debate Pat, even if I knew that I was 1,000% in the right and I had all the facts on my side, I still wouldn't want to debate Pat.

MCCAFFREY: Right, yeah. Well, it was not a good debate in the sense that Kemp was totally obnoxious, and by the way, I don't think Pat would have picked Kemp. He said somebody like Kemp. As with George Bush in 1988 — and I know somebody who was deliberating with "Bush 41" as a candidate — you know, a lot of people did not like Kemp. And he was on the short list for Bush 41. But Bush 41 didn't like him, and there was no way he was going to be picked. And I don't think Pat was going to pick Kemp, but he would have selected somebody like Kemp and there were certainly enough guys like that.

WOODS: All right, I think we're going to - well, I think we'll leave it there. I don't know what to link to for the show notes for today, TomWoods.com/620. I don't know what to link to; maybe there's some Buchanan thing we can link to, I don't know, we'll dig something up, something that's interesting, we'll put it up there. And I mean, I just enjoy having a freewheeling discussion with Roger McCaffrey, and if we record it, even better. You know, historians 200 years from now can tune in and listen, get some insights about what was going on in early 21st century America. Well thanks, Roger, for your time. We'll have to do this again soon.

MCCAFFREY: Any time, Tom. Lot of fun.