

>> Peter Robinson: Welcome to Uncommon Knowledge. I'm Peter Robinson, a senior editor of National Review and a columnist for the New York Observer, Richard Brookhiser grew up in Rochester and graduated from Yale. He is the author of nearly a dozen books, including What Would the Founders Do? And most recently, George Washington on Leadership. Rick Brookhiser is also one of the finest pro-stylists in English, an opinion that I shared with Rick Zero [Assumed spelling] and mine, the late William F. Buckley Junior. Segment 1, Why Should We Care. The founders lived in an America with -- in which the population was roughly 1.3% of the population today, in which the principal means of transportation was the horse, in which the big source of energy was the water wheel. Why should we care what the founders would do?

>> Rick Brookhiser: Well, a lot of what they dealt with we're still dealing with. I understand we're in the midst of a presidential election, I've heard that said. Well, they had the first few. They started that system, and we've maintained it for over 200 years. We are in the midst of two wars, depending on how you count them-

>> Peter Robinson: How you slice them.

>>Rick Brookhiser: Right.

>> Peter Robinson: You mean Afghanistan and Iraq?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Afghanistan, Iraq, the War on Terror. Maybe it's one big war, but -- and of course they lived in a world of war. They fought the Revolutionary War, and there were wars before and after that many of them were involved in. And finally, human nature does not change that much, the passions of men remain what they were. They spent a lot of their best thinking about those questions. So a lot that was on their plate is still on ours.

>> Peter Robinson: According to Bob Woodward's [Assumed spelling] book State of Denial, a few years ago when President George W. Bush was feeling especially frustrated with the post-Saddam government in Iraq, he asked, quote "where's the leader. Where's George Washington, where's Thomas Jefferson, where's John Adams, for crying out loud," close quote. Well, where were they? Why did America produce figures such as these when neither Iraq nor any other country I can think of has produced such figures.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Was he saying that about Iraq or about himself?

>> Peter Robinson: You may pursue that if you wish, but let's assume at first that he was saying it about Iraq.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well look, we had -- the United States, the 13 colonies before it was the United States, it was part of the English-speaking world which had been absorbed with political upheaval and the questions that arise from it for 100 years, going back to the English Civil War and this had produced a lot of thinking about society, how society should be run, you know, John Locke was very involved in what became the

Glorious Revolution. He was sort of a spin-meister for, you know, William of Orange when he finally triumphed. So they were growing up in a culture that had done a lot of thinking about this, and also was free enough that it encouraged discussion. And so that was part of their heritage.

>> Peter Robinson: So if you say the population of the United States in the first census of 1790 was about 4 million, roughly the same as the population of Kentucky or Louisiana. That makes these figures look very singular. Adams, Jefferson; you won't find them in Kentucky today. On the other hand, if you say, wait a moment, they were continuous with the English-speaking world, they were in the tradition of Milton and Locke, and Burke would -- right, the Reflections on the Revolution in France. That makes it intelligible some how.

>> Richard Brookhiser: They're not -- [Inaudible] right. They're not all by themselves.

>> Peter Robinson: Right. Segment 2. The Founders and the Constitution. During the administration of George Washington, secretary of the treasury Alexander Hamilton supported legislation to establish a national bank, and that started a fight. And the founders disagreed quite vehemently on the constitutionality of Hamilton's proposal. Very briefly, if you can crunch that one down to 40 seconds or so.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, you had two people who had been at the Constitutional Convention, Hamilton and James Madison.

>> Peter Robinson: Right.

>> Richard Brookhiser: And they were partners in writing the Federalist papers. So this is about as authoritative as it gets. And they disagree on the constitutionality of the national bank. And Hamilton says, you know, look, the Constitution gives the government the power to, you know, to handle commerce and various other things that require a bank. Therefore, it is implied that we can do this unless it's specifically forbidden, which it isn't. Then Madison says, well no, if you reason that way you're going to have the government be able to do almost anything, because you could have the change from A to B, and then B to C, and then so on to Z. So here at the very beginning, the infant is still in the cradle, so to speak, and these two godparents are struggling over it.

>> Peter Robinson: Right. And I'd like to ask you to do exactly the same sort of a 30-second treatment. Washington and Madison also have a constitutional dispute, is that not right?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, they have one -- there is one on--

>> Peter Robinson: You're dubious of Madison's positions --

>> Richard Brookhiser: No, no. There is one on the -- who gets to have a say on treaties -- [Multiple voices speaking]

>> Peter Robinson: Right, that's exactly right.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Whether the House of Representatives has a role.

>> Peter Robinson: Yes.

>> Richard Brookhiser: And the treaty with Britain called Jay's Treaty is -- has come before the Senate, the Senate has approved it by the narrowest of margins. But Madison, who is a Francophile, wants to block it. He thinks he can block it in the House. And he says, well look, this treaty is going to require the spending of money, that's the province of the House, therefore the House has a say. And Washington privately says this is preposterous. His attitude was, look, I was in Philadelphia too, and no one -- you know, at the Constitutional Convention. No one ever said anything of the kind.

>> Peter Robinson: So here we have two instances, the debate over the national bank and this dispute -- the dispute between Washington and Madison is to me especially striking, because Washington presides over every session of the Constitutional Convention, and Madison --

>> Richard Brookhiser: And Madison was also there.

>> Peter Robinson: -- and Madison's also there, and we regard him as the principal drafter of the document.

>> Richard Brookhiser: And they were such tight friends that during that period James Madison was getting his mail at Mount Vernon. He was spending so much time at Mount Vernon people sent their letters to him there.

>> Peter Robinson: Now, listen to Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, quote, "the theory of Originalism gives the Constitution the meaning that its words were understood to bear at the time they were promulgated," close quote. Is it a problem for the Originalism of Mr. Justice Scalia that George Washington and James Madison, and James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, men who are at the Convention, disagreed on what the document meant?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, I think you'd have to have an Originalism that will accommodate those disagreements. I mean, if you're committed to Originalism you do have to understand that you- you have certain original disagreements that maybe have still never been ironed out.

>> Peter Robinson: Right.

>> Richard Brookhiser: And you have to be mindful of that. Now at the same time, there are also things that -- that -- none of the founders contemplated or would have, you know, would have thought of. You know, we speak of Hamilton, I think rightly, as the big government guy among them. And yet he thought that in order for the federal government to pay for roads and canals, which he wanted them to do, there would have to be a Constitutional amendment. So you see, even Hamilton was not willing to take his notion of implied powers to say, well, the federal government does have the power to pay for roads and canals. So he thinks we do need a Constitutional amendment in order to get this. Now this is gone by say the 1830s, you know, when Henry Clay and Daniel Webster are proposing this.

>> Peter Robinson: Well, so then in a certain sense the disputes among the founders, the particularly arresting disputes because they were among men who were present at the Convention. In a certain sense that under guards, Justice Scalia's own treatment of the Constitution, because if you look at the way they reasoned when they were disputing, none of them said, well, that may have been very well and good for six years ago when we ratified the document, but it's a living document, we must adjust it. They were all engaging in quite tight originalist lines of argument really, weren't they?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Originalist --

>> Peter Robinson: Is that fair?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, originalist, but also based on their understandings of the nature of government. I mean, certainly Hamilton was willing to say all governments by nature can and must do certain things. So we have to be guided by that understanding as well as the particular Constitution we've established for ourselves.

>> Peter Robinson: So there's certain premise that is an antecedent to the document.

>> Richard Brookhiser: That's right.

>> Peter Robinson: All right. Okay, now to wrap up this question, you've got the Originalism of Justice Scalia, now listen to Justice Steven Breyer. Quote, "why should courts try to answer difficult questions on the basis of logical deduction from text or precedent alone. Why not ask about the consequences of decision-making on active liberty." The Originalism of Justice Scalia and the consequentialism of Steven Breyer. Where would the founders have -- let's put it in a milder way. Toward which would the founders have inclined?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well they might ask Justice Breyer why do you care about liberty? Where did you get that from?

>> Peter Robinson: Segment 3. The founders and what George Washington called bountiful providence. Let me quote you to yourself, Rick. This is in What Would the Founders Do. Quote, "if the founders did not make America a Christian nation, many of

them thought it should be a religious nation." Now would you explain both clauses of that sentence?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, they did not look – and they all came from particular colonies which became states. And a number of those had religious establishments, and a number of those maintained their religious establishments even after the First Amendment was passed.

>> Peter Robinson: By establishment, you're speaking in a strict legal sense.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Yes.

>> Peter Robinson: You're not talking about a group of people who had influence, you're talking about a church with legal standing --

>> Richard Brookhiser: Taxes are collected in order to support the clergy of a particular church.

>> Peter Robinson: Okay.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Because states -- the First Amendment was not incorporated for the states until the Civil War amendments -- later. But the United States has many religions in it, even in the late 18th century. They're almost all protestant of one sort or another. I mean, there are a few Catholics and there's even a tinier number of Jews. But, you know, when people are arguing among themselves it's like this kind of protestant versus this other kind, and this could get very acrid. I mean, they hanged each other, you know, not so many decades previously. So there was a sense, both in terms of political theory and also just in terms of pragmatism, that we're on the same boat together and we have to learn how to, you know, split the difference here. And -- and so there behavior, and then the First Amendment when its promulgated and passed, reflects that. Meaning that there will be no national establishment of any -- of any denomination.

>> Peter Robinson: Right.

>> Richard Brookhiser: But in terms of the other half of it, America being a religious nation, let me take Washington as a kind of the central figure. He was, you know, by birth and by practice to some extent an Anglican or an Episcopalian. He had been a church vestryman, he, you know, he had been baptized and married in that church. He does not seem to have been as passionate about it as some of the other founders were in their -- in their religious beliefs. But he does say over and over again in his private and his public pronouncements that providence plays an active role in the whole founding experience. He talks about the astonishing interpositions of providence. That's one phrase during the Revolution. He -- this is language he uses over and over again.

>> Peter Robinson: I was struck in reading Washington on Leadership. Washington took it as a kind of ground of his thinking. His fundamental premise was that much

would be expected of him. He owed duties to his countrymen, to his family, to the people with whom he did business. And that was the kind of providence in which he believed. He -- providence demanded good behavior of him. Now -- [Multiple voices speaking]

>> Peter Robinson: Did you read that, is that a fair reading?

>> Richard Brookhiser: In contrast to someone who thinks he has a star, that will –
[Multiple voices speaking]

>> Peter Robinson: Napoleon.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Yes, yes. Right.

>> Peter Robinson: Okay, now -- well, I have to ask you to be brief, but this is such an important question. I've so wanted to ask you this question. I'm going to ask it anyway. Two views of how we -- and I will overstate both to make the point to frame the question. Two views of how we end up with the First Amendment, the distance between the state and the church. View One. This is a profound intellectual insight arising from the Enlightenment, and this view associates it with Jefferson, who in his letter to the Danbury Baptists writes about a wall of separation between church and state. One, they reason their way to it. Two, David Hackett Fisher [Assumed spelling], an [Inaudible] seed, says wait a moment, the Revolution is a tremendously important moment. But what they're seeking to do in all kinds of ways is ratify arrangements with which they've already had a couple of centuries of experience. So in a certain sense, this refusal to establish a religion ratifies this kind of strange jerry-rigged system that has grown up in the colonies where Boston is Puritan and Connecticut is Congregationalist, and Maryland is Catholic. And they've all learned to live with each other and respect each other, and carve out a certain sphere of private influence for each other's colonies and indeed for each other's thinking. So one is blazing intellectual insight that arises straight from the Enlightenment. The other is a ratification of experience, lived experience.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, maybe the way to reconcile that is that there were different Enlightenments. And you know, some Enlightenments took experience into account. You know, Montesquieu, he was the most often referred to thinker at the Constitutional Convention. Someone has counted. Not me, but --
[Multiple voices speaking]

>>Peter Robinson: Alright. Alright.

>>Richard Brookhiser: -- someone has counted. And then they called him the Celebrated Montesquieu, like that was his first name, you know? Celebrated Montesquieu. And as we know, Montesquieu was very much that kind of a thinker, I mean, a historian as well as a political philosopher. So they don't -- it's not necessarily -- those two views are not necessarily in conflict.

>> Peter Robinson: All right. Segment 4, republic or empire. Thomas Jefferson in 1823, quote -- he's an old man. He's had plenty of time to reflect on this. "Our first and fundamental maximum must be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe," closed quote. Today the United States has the biggest armed forces in the world by a large multiple. We have an enormous military presence in Europe. We're -- we're entangled in their broils. Also in Asia, more recently in the Middle East. Would the founders have approved of the current state of affairs or would they have been appalled?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well let's take Jefferson. Shortly before he said that quote, he's writing to his pal James Madison, who's just been inaugurated as president, followed in the office. And he says, you know, we can get Cuba and Canada -- he says Canada will be a mere matter of marching. And then he says then we will have such an empire for liberty -- empire for liberty -- as the world has never seen. So you know, maybe he didn't want to get broiled in Europe, and there were lots of reasons not to in his life time.

>> Peter Robinson: He didn't mind snookering Napoleon, though, to add the Louisiana Purchase.

>> Richard Brookhiser: No, but that was over here. You know, and that was in his back yard, and he grabbed for that when the chance came up. And he -- and that wasn't all. He thought we'd get Canada and Cuba, which we never have got. I mean, we had Cuba for a few years and then we let it become independent, and we were never able to take Canada. You know, we tried. We tried a couple of times. So you know, even he had that -- had that ambition. Washington certainly uses the phrase this rising empire over and over. I mean, he uses it at that dramatic moment at the end of the revolution when he's appealing to the almost mutinous officers in Newburgh. He says do not deluge this rising empire in blood. I mean, he sees a great future for America, which is not only great morally and great politically, but great in terms of its size and power.

>> Peter Robinson: How was he using the word empire? Did he mean it the way we use it, when we talk about the Austro-Hungarian empire, which is a collection of quite different peoples held together under a system of government, but also a force. Or did he mean it something more analogous to what we now think of as having been the British empire, which is a system of language and thought and a kind of culture.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well I think he means a political entity of empyreal extent and power. I think that's -- that's the basic meaning there. And obviously, it can't have a monarch, because that's --

>> Peter Robinson: We've done that.

>> Richard Brookhiser: -- we've done that, and he refused, you know, sort of a bumptious offer that came his way from one of his officers. So we're not going to have a king. There will be no emperor. But for this to be a great -- for this to be a super-power, that is something he hoped -- hoped would happen.

>> Peter Robinson: No problem. Dirty trick but I can't resist. Invasion of Iraq. Specific question, would they have approved?

>> Richard Brookhiser: If they thought there was a threat to us, and Iraq being uninvaded, well yes. I mean, you know, Jefferson fought a war with Islamic countries in North Africa. And he -- and he actually broke the policy of the Washington and the Adams administration which was to pay them off to leave us alone. They went the negotiation route. And for good reason. I mean, not to bad reason. But --

>> Peter Robinson: The cheapest way out of the problem.

>> Richard Brookhiser: The cheapest way out of the problem. They're running a protection racket. You know, we pay them, and they won't raid our shippings and enslave our people that they capture. But Jefferson becomes president, he's been dealing with this question since he was minister to France. He's been dealing with it a long, long time. And you know, we sometimes think of Jefferson as a Pacific man. But you know, he says, I've had enough of this. Enough is enough. And he sends a fleet over to the Mediterranean, and then it goes on. I mean, he uses force, then he negotiates, and then the treaty he negotiates doesn't hold up. So then Madison has to send a second fleet over in the Madison administration, and then finally the problem ends. But there's a problem that goes on through the first four administrations, and it went on even before the Constitution. It's a long-running problem.

>> Peter Robinson: Okay now, President Bush, President George W. Bush, has offered two rationals for the war in Iraq. One was that the regime of Saddam Hussein represented a threat -- direct threat -- to our own security. The other is that we need to spread Democracy to be true to our own mission. Listen to Bush's second Inaugural Address. From the day of our founding we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this Earth has rights -- from the day of our founding, by the way -- has rights and dignity and matchless value because they bear the image of the maker of heaven and Earth. Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our nation. Now it is the urgent requirement of our nation's security. There we go back to the rational that we have to do it for our own protection, and the calling of our time. And there the rational that we must because we're Americans. You've addressed the first rational. They would have whacked Iraq if they thought it represented a threat to this republic. What about the second?

>> Richard Brookhiser: There you would have seen some disagreement. I mean, Governor Morris, who is in some ways my favorite founder, and he's not --

>> Peter Robinson: And the title of your book about Governor Morris is?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Gentleman Revolutionary.

>> Peter Robinson: Gentleman Revolutionary.

>> Richard Brookhiser: The rake who wrote the Constitution.

>> Peter Robinson: All right, add that to your pile of Rick Brookhiser books.

>> Richard Brookhiser: And he was -- he was a cynic. And he was an experienced cynic because he lived for almost eight or nine years in Europe, and part of that time he was a businessman in France and then he was our minister to France during the French Revolution. And he was at the first meeting of the three estates when Louis XVI got this all going, and then he leaves when Robespierre has been toppled. So he sees that old swatch of history. And his attitude toward the French was that they were like a vicious horse in a cart, and they needed the whip and the spur to tame them. So could France ever have free institutions? Not really, maybe a little freer, but they're just not like us folks.

>> Peter Robinson: Right.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Okay, so that's one view. I think there were other founders who would say, well yes, even France can have freedom.

>> Peter Robinson: Jefferson, particularly.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, Jefferson -- thought they were going to have it right away. But I think even some of those who were very skeptical about the French Revolution would have said, well, this is a bad way to go about it, and this is not going to work. But they wouldn't say the French can never have it. They would say, look you've got to, you know, try again. And you know, all the men -- we like to laugh at how many different French regimes there have been, but the two longest ones were the third and the fifth republic.

>> Peter Robinson: Third is?

>> Richard Brookhiser: From 1871 -- no, the third republic, 1871 to 1940. And then the fifth is '58 to now.

>> Peter Robinson: Right. So they have actually -- after a delay of almost a century, even the French found democracy. All right. So there have been a range of views about human nature and about the extendibility of democracy in American ideals.

>> Richard Brookhiser: About the extendibility of democracy maybe less about human nature, because they did -- they did refer to the laws of nature and nature as God, and not having universal application.

>> Peter Robinson: All right. Segment 5. The founders and politics. Rick Brookhiser in What Would the Founders Do? Quote, "sick of attack ads, spinning, mindless partisanship. The founders hated it as much as you do. They also invented it." Explain.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Look, if they came back now, you know, if they were looking at the 2008 election and we briefed them on 2002, 2004, think they'd say this is better. You know, the tone is just -- it's just better. It's just kind of nicer and it's not as mean as it was when we were around. I mean, when people -- it kills me when people moan and groan about how awful and ugly it is. And it is awful and ugly, it really is. But I say read the political literature of the 1790s. I mean, it was just berserk. It really was.

>> Peter Robinson: Talk about going negative.

>> Richard Brookhiser: And part of that -- part of that is its all brand new.

>> Peter Robinson: Right.

>> Richard Brookhiser: And you don't know the first time that if your enemies come in that they will be willing to leave.

>> Peter Robinson: Right.

>> Richard Brookhiser: You know, your theory may say, well yes they will. But you haven't done it yet. So -- so when the first two-party system emerges after the Constitution is in place and this is the Federalist party of Washington, Hamilton, John Adams. And then there is the Republican party of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, which is now the Democratic party --

>> Peter Robinson: And they've divvied themselves into these two parties in practice before the end of Washington's second term, is that right?

>> Richard Brookhiser: Yes, yes. It already happens --
[Multiple voices speaking]

>> Peter Robinson: -- just like that.

>> Richard Brookhiser: It -- it's a few years and then they're off. And part of it is foreign policy and part of it is domestic policy. But -- but they had these disagreements. And you know, and they really don't know, I mean the Federalists think, you know, if these people come in they'll just want to bust up the whole government. And Hamilton writes that, you know, the stakes in this election -- I think he's talking about 1796 -- is laws, property, and of course heads. You know, he just tosses off that reference to guillotines and the French Revolution, just like, tosses that off. And then you know, Jefferson believes that Hamilton is a monarch. Which he isn't, but Jefferson really believes this, that Hamilton, you know, he's only putting up with the Constitution for the time being, he really wants it to be a monarchy. So there's this -- you know, there's this kind of --

>> Peter Robinson: They really only had two models to choose from, in effect. Britain or France. They didn't have their own model. It was too fresh.

>> Richard Brookhiser: They didn't know that they had it. I mean, they really did, and they really were working on it, but here, I mean here it's a little country, here these two super-powers with their gravitational fields -- everything is new. This world war is raging, and you know, that just makes you feel uncertain and insecure, and the response to that is almost lunacy.

>> Peter Robinson: To present-day politics. Henry Adams, great-grandson of John Adams, actually to present-day politics by way of the late 19th century. Henry Adams, great-grandson of John Adams. By the way, your book on the Adams dynasty is called --

>> Richard Brookhiser: America's First Dynasty.

>> Peter Robinson: America's First Dynasty. Add that to the bed-side stack. All right. Henry Adams writing on the presidential politics of the late 19th century, quote, "the progress of evolution" -- I love this one -- "the progress of evolution from President Washington to President Grant is alone evidence enough to upset Darwin. Okay, Washington to Grant, Grant to Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. Repudiate the argument that that's an unbroken decline.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well, look --

>> Peter Robinson: If you will.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Let's just start with Henry Adams, whom I love, but you do want to ring his neck, you know, half the time. And partly, he's upset that it's -- it's not Henry Adams, it's Grant in the White House. You know, who are these Grants coming into the family inheritance. You know, and Grant's presidency is being revived upwards, even as we speak. And for a variety of reasons.

>> Peter Robinson: And he had broken Lee, which was not an inconsiderable task.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Well no, his military genius ought to be unchallengeable, and people are finally figuring out that he was at least an okay president, not in the cellar where he's been for a while. But you know, part of it is, again, that it's not just the leaders who are in the picture here, it's also everybody else. So if we don't, you know, if we don't like the class of leaders we have, the fault is not only theirs. I mean, we put them there, we really do. They are not there because they are the nephew of the Duke of so-and-so, you know. They're there because they got elected, and they got elected because we and our friends decided to do that. So we have a responsibility -- we always have a responsibility. And if we're really that unhappy with it, then we ought to do some reflection about ourselves. The other thing is people do respond to crisis and challenges. I mean, you know, Abraham Lincoln was kind of a slick railroad lawyer from Illinois, and most people think he did pretty well. Franklin Roosevelt was from a sort of a broken down Hudson River aristocracy, minor sprig of the Roosevelt clan. Many people think you know, he did all right. So you know, and there may even be people who look back on George W. Bush and his response to 911 and you know, revise their opinions of that.

>> Peter Robinson: Okay Rick, final couple of questions, alas. And now instead of talking about George Washington or writing about George Washington, as you do brilliantly and enjoyably in *George Washington on Leadership* -- you are George Washington and I am let's say Lafayette, someone in who Washington confided. So let me name three names and ask you to give me -- ask you, General Washington, to give me a candid sentence or two on each. George W. Bush.

>> Richard Brookhiser: You must never take your hands off the wheel.

>> Peter Robinson: John McCain.

>> Richard Brookhiser: We share the same flaw, which is temper. And you're older than I ever got, so I could never make it go away and neither will you. But what we do is we learn to step back from it and make decisions on the basis of our rationality, not our temper.

>> Peter Robinson: Barack Obama.

>> Richard Brookhiser: You have great communication skills, which were different than mine. Play to those advantages, you know. Never throw them away. But communication is not the only thing you will need. You will also have to back it up with a consistent record of your deeds.

>> Peter Robinson: Last question, General Washington. We presume you're now 300 and-some years old, and still a registered voter. In November, for whom do you intend to vote?

>> Richard Brookhiser: John Adams said of me shortly after I died that Washington possessed the gift of silence.
[Laughter]

>> Peter Robinson: Richard Brookhiser, author of many wonderful books, including *What Would the Founders Do?* And still more recently, *George Washington on Leadership*. Thank you very much.

>> Richard Brookhiser: Thank you.

>> Peter Robinson: I'm Peter Robinson at the Hoover Institution, for *Uncommon Knowledge*, thanks for joining us.