



Episode 1,244: The Professor Everybody Shuns

Guest: Michael Rectenwald

WOODS: Oh, I've got so much I want to ask you about here. Now, the way you've organized this memoir is, I think, very sensible. You start off with the controversy you're known for. That draws the reader in. And then you go back in time, and you trace out really the course of your life and how you came to be who you are ideologically and professionally, career choices. All these things are worked out. I mean, it was interesting to read, actually, about your educational background as a young man, and the fact that you didn't want to be an athlete and this made your family kind of crazy. In a way, by the way, although nobody ever gave me a hard time for not being an athlete and for just wanting to be an academic, I do recall many, many Christmas parties in grad school where I would go home, and we'd go over to my dad's side of the family, which was huge, and they just — I mean, God bless them. They just weren't really familiar with graduate school. So what I would get would be — and here I was at a highly prestigious graduate school, and they would say to me, "So, what are you doing, Tom? Are you still in school, or what?"

RECTENWALD: [laughing]

WOODS: You know, like they couldn't — it was like contemptuous. In other words, I'm out here working with my hands; what the heck are you doing all day?

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: But anyway, they don't they don't talk that way to me anymore, but in those days, I used to get that. But anyway, so all these travails of your life. But also, there's a rich discussion in here of different ideologies that we're contending with today, and then wrapping up with kind of coming full circle. So given that you've been on here before — and I'll link to that episode — let's try and just summarize quickly what happened to you at NYU, so then we can get into this this meaty stuff about how you became Michael Rectenwald. So let's start with: why did you start the initially anonymous Twitter account when — you're an NYU professor — what's your status right now with NYU? You actually got a promotion, oddly enough.

RECTENWALD: Yeah, I'm a full professor, and so that's the highest rank. I don't have tenure because there is no tenure in my program. But yeah, I got a promotion in the midst of all this.

WOODS: Right.

RECTENWALD: And it was really unrelated. But why I started the Twitter account was because I was just becoming so alarmed and annoyed by what was going on in terms of social justice taking over the university. And one of the big things that really irked me was in the fall of 2016, NYU established a bias reporting hotline, which I thought was really pernicious. And also there was a lot of speakers being shut down, Milo Yiannopoulos being one of them. And a number of other things, like a lot of talk about safe spaces and trigger warnings and a lot of defenses of those practices, especially trigger warnings. And then a lot of identity politics in the hiring and promotion and other processes that were really, really alarming and annoying and also quite damaging, I think, to the university's credibility and its teaching mission.

So I started tweeting that from an anonymous account; it's called @antipcnypurf. That is still the handle. And I called myself the Deplorable NYU Prof. And you know, there's two parts of a Twitter account; you have the actual literal handle and then the name. My name was Deplorable NYU Prof. The account was replete with a Nietzsche icon. And I just started tweeting things about what I saw happening on campuses, NYU and elsewhere.

And before you know, it, I was contacted by an NYU student newspaper reporter who wanted to make sure I was really an NYU professor, and if so, would I do an interview. And I agreed, but I wasn't sure I was going to go on the record as myself. After the interview was over, I decided to go on the record as myself, because I thought what I said has to be said. And then all hell broke loose. I was put on a paid leave of absence almost immediately. A committee calling themselves the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Group attacked me roundly, and really, that attack by that group on official committee of NYU really set this table for everything that would follow.

WOODS: All right, let me go back up a bit here, though, because when you were called into whatever dean's office, it was —

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: — the dean leans forward and says, "Now look, this doesn't have anything to do with your Twitter account or that interview." And you thought to yourself, *Yeah, I'm sure it's just a coincidence that you called me in.*

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: And then the impression was, given that, *Really, we're just concerned about your mental health, and you probably need to go take a break* — as if they thought *Well, gee, is there one more Stalinist box we haven't yet checked off here at NYU, it's accused him of mental illness?*

RECTENWALD: Right, exactly. Yeah, when I got into the dean's office, he shakes my hands and comes very close to me, about six inches for me, and says, "I just want you to know this discussion has nothing to do with your Twitter account and publicity you're getting." And I said, "Oh" — I was surprised, but I didn't leave it, quite frankly. And then goes, "And if you don't mind, with your permission, I'd like to have the head of Human Resources join us." And

she was waiting just outside the door. I had no idea. I hadn't seen her. And then I said, "Of course." You know, what am I going to say, no? And then that discussion ensued in which they said that people were concerned about me and that some saw my interview and Twitter account as a cry for help.

WOODS: [laughing] I mean, in a way, it is a cry for help against these very people.

RECTENWALD: Exactly. It's a cry for help against the very forces that I'm now facing. And they sort of made it like it was an ultimatum, an unclear ultimatum, nevertheless. And I've been called — you know, I've been caught a liar for this, and this really irks me beyond belief.

WOODS: Oh, yeah. Let me summarize it for you. Because what they're saying is, *Oh, look that Rectenwald, what a drama queen. We never forced him to go on leave. We just had two extremely highly placed people at the university whom he would be a fool to oppose, who have much more power than he has. And normally every leftist in the world considers power relations in negotiations like this, except I won't consider it in this case.*

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: *And we told him we thought it was a good idea for him to go on leave. It was purely voluntary.* Again, how Stalinist can these people be? Does every word happy mean its opposite that comes out of their mouths?

RECTENWALD: Exactly. It was really, really very, very Kafkaesque or Stalinesque. And, I mean, they said that I lied about this, because a medical leave of absence isn't legally, by necessity, voluntary. But as you said, the power differential was so great, and I was coerced into it. And then of course, all these leftists believed NYU over me, which is very ironic in my mind, because here are people that would oppose massive institutions, and especially what they would call it, the corporate university, which, you know, NYU is the prototype for. And they would always oppose them, but no, not in this case, since I was making comments that they didn't like. It's very interesting, and the left is full of opportunism, today, I think, but that's another story we can get into.

WOODS: Yeah. Oh, there's so much here. All right, let's actually go back now and talk a little bit about your evolution, but really, what I want to do is get into some of the ideas that you came to accept. I mean, you studied under Allen Ginsberg. You knew some pretty influential people back in the day.

RECTENWALD: Yes.

WOODS: And in fact, I believe you say in the book that you attribute to Ginsberg — or at least he's one of the people you think whose ideas ultimately contributed to postmodernism.

RECTENWALD: Oh, yeah.

WOODS: What I want you to do, actually, if we can abstract from your experience for a minute, I'd like you to explain — because you even say in here that Jordan Peterson doesn't quite get postmodernism right. You say that he sometimes calls it neo-Marxism, and it is

anything but that. So I'd like if you can explain for normal people these three things: postmodernism, post-structuralism, and critical theory.

RECTENWALD: Okay, sure. Let's start with critical theory, since chronologically it's the first of the three. Critical theory was founded by three neo-Marxist, okay, or basically by the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, as they're called. So you had Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Herbert Marcuse are the three major players there. And it is a school of criticism that started to see culture as extremely influential and powerful, because, in their minds, the working class had effectively failed the mission of Marxism. And as such, they started to look for other explanations for why that was the case, because, according to Marxist rationality, this should not happen. It should not happen that the working classes actually are sort of attached to the system and that, in fact, especially in the United States, they seem to be very happy. This is, you know, in the '50s and so forth, right? So they looked to culture, and they started seeing culture as this dominating force that was inculcating this propaganda into workers and brainwashing them, etc., etc., etc.

They also initiated a critique of the Enlightenment, of Enlightenment rationality, which, in my mind, is the beginning of the postmodern turn towards this kind of critical and skeptical and anti-rationalist eventuality that is really the beginning of postmodern theory. But they weren't postmodernist, per se; they are neo-Marxists, and they're neo-Marxists because they're no longer looking to the working class as the agent that will overthrow everything. They start looking for different constituencies, and they start to look at identity politics as a possibility in the case of Marcuse. And he's really foundational for the New Left, which starts to cobble together different constituencies as the hope for overthrowing capitalism, because no longer do they see the working class as the agent that's capable or really interested in doing so. And that was really a blow to the whole Marxist enterprise.

The problem is that most workers didn't want it, you know? They saw what happened — this is American workers. They saw what was going on in the Soviet Union, and they wanted no part of this. And they just couldn't figure this out. So they ascribed it to the power of culture to brainwash them. And a very influential essay called "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception" is a very key, pivotal text regarding this. That's their critical theorists, and they inaugurated two schools of thought: critical theory and media studies. So media studies from the very beginning is Marxist.

Then you said postmodernism. Postmodernism is a very large umbrella term, under which it contains several theories of postmodern theory. Postmodern theory is now not a consistent, uniform set of beliefs or a systematic approach. Rather, it is a whole slew of sometimes self-contradictory ideas. Post-structuralism is one of them. But postmodern theory is characterized generally by a rejection of what they call master narratives; that is, those types of systematic approaches that explain or pretend to explain all of history, like Marxism, for example. So it starts off as a rejection of Marxism. Secondly, it is it has a focus on language, and this is where deconstruction comes in. And I can talk further about that. And third, it is highly relativistic. It's about relativism, in general. It's against positions that say this is true, this is objective. So it's anti-objectivity and pro-relativity. That's post modernism in a nutshell.

Post-structuralism is a school of thought, or an approach to be more precise, an approach that fits well beneath the postmodern rubric. It is a postmodernist theory. And post-structuralism is — wow, it is the most unbelievably difficult movement or approach to

explain. Just generally, it's against structuralism, which structuralism tried to explain everything in in terms of universals that went across cultures. Post-structuralism claims there are no universals at all. Everything is arbitrary. Everything is peculiar. History has no trends. Everything is merely a peculiar occurrence that's specific to itself. So they speak of things like historicity, which means a historical moment having its own peculiar specificity. It is focused on language. It thinks that language, for example, is utterly arbitrary, and has no relationship to what it signifies. This is a very big point, because it accounts for the skepticism it has about attaining knowledge, in particular, scientific knowledge. Science is very much critiqued, because it's all based on language, and language has no necessary connection to what it refers to. So that's those three in a nutshell.

WOODS: All right, that was a yeoman's effort there, because that was a difficult assignment I gave you. Now let me run by you something somebody in my — I have a private Facebook group — something somebody said about this, because in there, generally there's hostility when you use the term postmodernism.

RECTENWALD: Yeah.

WOODS: But I've got a handful of people who say, *Now, hold on a minute. It's true that there are some nutballs who employ it, but if we take it to mean simply looking critically at so-called meta-narratives, that this can be a healthy attitude.* He says, "For example, we in this group" — in my group — "we're all libertarians. And well, don't you look askance at the meta-narrative by which the state must be the central organizing principle of society? And there are many, many corollaries of that all of which you also disagree with, so you look at the world through an entirely different meta-narrative. And so in a way, you are imbibing the spirit of postmodernism, so there's no reason to throw out the baby with the bathwater." How would you answer that?

RECTENWALD: Ah, well, this is belying the fact that this is a very slippery slope, because what happens is postmodernism leads to an utter fragmentation, such that there are no truth claims that can be made whatsoever, because everybody has their own peculiar positionality and their own truth, and therefore no truth trumps any other truth, and therefore there is no truth. And the other thing is it's a self-refuting statement that there are no credible master narratives or meta-narratives, because postmodernism is a meta narrative [laughing]. It's a meta-narrative that says there are no meta-narratives, you know, so it's self-refuting. But the bigger problem is not that logical self-refutation. The bigger problem is the endless fragmentation of standpoints, such that we can't make claims about anything in the end. There's no truth claims that can be made, which aren't relativized by virtue of being damning next to somebody else's truth point. And this leads to complete, utter fragmentation and eventually what I call epistemological solipsism.

WOODS: You're somebody who wrote widely in journals where people share these sorts of worldviews. So you're not coming at this really from the point of view of an outsider, although today, you more or less think of yourself as an outsider. But you were very much part of this.

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: And as I read your book, I'd like you to maybe spell out a little more clearly for me exactly — it couldn't have been just at one particular moment that you said, "Wait a minute" — I mean, because obviously your case, what happened to you at NYU, and the way people

treated you, that would actually make me stop and think, *Well, gee, everybody who shares my worldview is acting like a Stalinist apparatchik.*

RECTENWALD: Yeah.

WOODS: *Maybe there's something screwy about the worldview.* I'm not even sure I would go that far. I don't know what I would do in that situation. It would be so bewildering to me. But it couldn't have just been everything snowballing. It couldn't have just been that one moment. So I want to know, during your career, were there little moments where you said, "Well, this is kind of screwy," or, "That's kind of oddball?"

RECTENWALD: Oh, yeah, all along. All along. First of all, let me just make one last comment about postmodernism and Marxism. This is very little known, but there's a huge contingent of Marxists that despise postmodern theory, and they totally eschew it and they totally condemn it. I was one of those. So it's not as if I was breaking with everything at once. I had already broken with things like postmodern theory.

WOODS: Well, what is Marxism if not a meta-narrative?

RECTENWALD: Right, exactly. And postmodern theory was born as a philosophical explanation for the failure of Marxism in the 1968 student rebellion in France. This is what's very little known, that in fact, postmodern theory was born as a result — it's the philosophical rebuttal, if you will, to the Marxist explanation for society and social change and historical change.

WOODS: You've got some discussion in here, by the way, of the whole gender and transgender controversy. I'm going to actually leave that out. That you have to go out and buy the book to read. You've got to buy *Springtime for Snowflakes* and read about that, even though I'm sure that's a topic that interviewers would want to talk to you about. But instead, I want to ask you this, you know, kind of a deep question here, which is that: again, you had what turned out to be a horrific experience, not just with the way they dealt with your Twitter account by forcing you out, but then also the subsequent treatment and the shunning and the blocking you on Facebook, you know, like you're back in high school. It's that silly. It's possible — I mean, I think there were probably people in the communist world who, even when their comrades turned on them, were still true believers.

RECTENWALD: Yes, that's right.

WOODS: So I wonder, in your case, you say, look, I was on the left. I've never, ever thought of myself as a libertarian, much less a conservative, but yet, by the end of this book, I have a tantalizing sense that maybe you're one of these rare people who's made a late-in-life ideological transformation. And I just feel like I want to say to you that, if I had been a serious scholarly leftist and then I started looking around seriously at alternative intellectual homes, and I encountered the conservative movement of Rick Santorum and Bill Kristol, I think I'd pluck my eyes out.

RECTENWALD: [laughing]

WOODS: So I hope this has not been remotely a temptation for you, but I'm curious to know about where you would place yourself today.

RECTENWALD: Well, I do place myself as a cultural, social and somewhat economic libertarian. It's the only thing that preserves individual rights, and there are no other kind of rights. I don't believe in group rights, because groups always override individual rights, and therefore nobody has any rights. Really, the only thing that protects individual rights is libertarianism as a social, cultural, and even economic movement. Nothing else comes close. Nothing else can ensure it. And I think that the United States, where we are today, is on the verge of throwing away the best experiment that we've ever had in history for ensuring such rights.

WOODS: Now, listen to what you're saying, Michael Rectenwald. Listen to yourself saying those words. Those are words that would have come out of your mouth over your dead body thirty year ago, right?

RECTENWALD: That's right.

WOODS: So tell me, who are you reading these days?

RECTENWALD: Well, I mean, I've read von Mises. I've been reading Hayek. I've been reading just really broadly into the economic criticism of Marxism, because I did reject it first of all along ideological lines in terms of the political totalitarianism that is inevitable. And then I started to go also then into the critique of the economic system, and I found that also to be completely faulty and also antithetical to what it claims to do. And I talked about that in the book.

WOODS: There is an economist — if you were to promote him, you'd get in even more trouble than you are now — named Hans Hermann Hoppe, and he has a very interesting article on Marxism where he says: I actually think that the primary claims of Marxism are correct. It's just that they've missed, identified who the villains are. So I do believe there's systematic exploitation in society, but I believe it's carried out by the state. He says: and I do believe there are classes in society, but they're defined by the state. It's the state versus everybody else. And then he goes through and he says, that actually, when you put it through this filter, it's not so bad after all. So I may be inclined to actually email that over to you, but that's shocking to me that. I mean, I can't imagine getting to the end of my life and saying, "Oh, doggone it, all right, let me open up *Das Kapital* and start going through it."

RECTENWALD: [laughing]

WOODS: I just can't imagine, after I'd fought my whole life in the other direction, you know?

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: That must be really, really difficult.

RECTENWALD: It was very disorienting at first, I've got to say. It was like I'd come out of Plato's cave, and now I was looking around with glaring sun in my eyes.

WOODS: Yeah.

RECTENWALD: So it was very tough, but I got through it. I just had to muscle my way through, and also, quite frankly, to have faith that I was heading in the right direction. And I did believe that, and I still do.

WOODS: That's tremendous. But on the other hand, you must encounter a lot of people who are anti-leftist who just really have no idea what it is they're opposing. They couldn't tell you what a postmodernist is if their life depended on it. Does that frustrate you at all?

RECTENWALD: Well, yes, it's become too easy to dismiss things that they don't really or have never really investigated, frankly. And I hear this all the time, and it's frustrates me, because some of these people that are dissing postmodern theory don't even know what it is. So I would think that you really have to know what it is before you can reject something like that. But I want to say that also, as a Marxist, though, I was always fiercely independent. So I was always trying to carve out a more libertarian leftist position. And I did run into trouble with that almost all the way, but then it just reached more or less a crescendo. And that's when the tipping point happened.

WOODS: Did you ever read an article that Eugene Genovese wrote back in 1994? It was in a periodical called *Dissent*. I don't know if they still publish it or not.

RECTENWALD: I think they publish, yeah.

WOODS: And it was called "The Question." And the question was: what did you know and when did you know it about the crimes of communism? Now, of course, there are plenty of Marxist who, even at the time, said, "I in no way endorse what's going on in the Soviet Union. This has nothing to do with what I support." But as you well know, there were people — I mean, the Foner family clearly did cheer on the Soviet Union. Try as they may to pretend they didn't, they certainly did.

RECTENWALD: Yeah.

WOODS: So some of them did have to pretend things weren't happening or whatever. So I don't know if you ever read —because there was a big controversy that developed over that. They all jumped on Genovese, because he was saying, *Look, I've been a Marxist for many years, and I feel like all I have to show for myself is piles of corpses, so that is making me kind of go back and say, "Yeah, I guess that maybe none of it was real Marxism."* But geez, man, the consistency of every time that M-word comes up, seems like something screwy here.

RECTENWALD: Yeah, every time. Every time it's experienced — the interesting thing I'd like to point out here is that these kind of texts only became visible to me after I made the turn. They were somehow occluded or obscured from my vision. And there are many such texts that many Marxist do not know about, because they're somehow shielded from them by virtue of the tunnel they're put in intellectually, such that they don't look left or right around these things. There's blinders on, ideological blinders and blinkers that make it almost impossible to see these alternative viewpoints and to see these texts. Because one's whole reading diet is dominated by a certain predilection and a certain end, a telos, and therefore one doesn't find these things. I never had heard of *The Black Book of Communism*, for example, until after I left the movement, and then I read it and I was like, "My God."

WOODS: Yeah.

RECTENWALD: 94 million people, and that's a credible number, of people killed. And it didn't start with Stalin; it started with Lenin, and it started within a year or less after the revolution, of already sending people to the concentration camps, shooting them in the back the head, things like that — or the front. The main thing is that terror was endemic to the whole process from the beginning, always, every time. And I had no idea that even Leninism was always misrepresented in many Marxist texts. Many. And academic Marxism, in fact, sanitizes the whole thing. Somebody like Fredric Jameson, you never even get a clue of what happened under Stalin or Mao if you read Jamison.

WOODS: I'd like to know about the status of your academic life these days. I'd like to know about your colleagues, and I'd like to know about your current scholarly and writing interests.

RECTENWALD: Yes, that's great, thank you. I have four years remaining on a five-year contract. The committee that will decide upon my renewal will be drawn from the faculty that shuns me. Almost 100% of them shun me. I have about 100 colleagues, and there's probably two that say hello to me. The rest utterly shun me. People won't even get on an elevator with me. They act as if I have some sort of leprosy that might be contagious, or that I am so vile morally that I can't even be admitted to the same passageways as them. Therefore, my office was moved to the Russian department.

WOODS: [laughing] Oh, man.

RECTENWALD: The ironies are so poetic, it's unbelievable.

WOODS: Oh, yeah. Yeah, yeah.

RECTENWALD: I mean, it's as if I was like a Russian bot and fixed the election or something. I'm in the Russian department in an office that's completely isolated. I have no contacts. No one there, even in the Russian department, they must have been told to: do not speak to this guy.

WOODS: Oh, that is unbelievable. Could you imagine if one of their people were treated like this with one-tenth of the intensity? We would never hear the end of the white privilege and the oppression. We'd never hear the end of it. Never.

RECTENWALD: Right. I am completely quarantined. They put me in this office with metal bookshelves and must have instructed everybody in this department: this guy is anathema. Do not speak to him; do not talk to him; do not say hello. Because I am completely non-personed over there. And I kind of like it in a way, because I don't have to do a lot of nonsense committee work, which is all kind of busywork. Most of the time, nothing comes out of these committees except more committee meetings, meetings on meetings on meetings. You know the drill. And, you know, I like the independence because I don't have to answer to anybody. I mean, it's as if I don't even work for the university. I just teach classes and nobody says anything to me about anything. I'm not told to go to meetings. Nobody's telling me anything. I'm basically completely a free agent in a weird way.

WOODS: Oh, that's great. You don't have to do committee work and stuff. That's great.

RECTENWALD: Not at all.

WOODS: Because who would want you on a committee?

RECTENWALD: That's the problem. I can't do any committee work, because no one will allow me on any of the committees.

WOODS: [laughing] I mean, look, I know I shouldn't laugh at this. I mean, on some level, it must actually be quite difficult to endure this. It's just the sheer malevolence of these people, especially when they're the ones who preen about showing off their superior morality 24 hours a day.

RECTENWALD: Yeah, somebody recently on Facebook, really – not Facebook, I'm sorry, on Amazon. In the comments about my book, somebody hit it right on the head. There was two ways this could have been avoided: one, I never speak out against these issues and I go along with the herd and nobody knows what I really think, or two, they could have just accepted that other people have different views, and they didn't need to condemn me officially and then drive me to the margins of society.

WOODS: Yeah.

RECTENWALD: But no, they had to do it this way. I blame that committee for all of this, that Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Group which, in my mind, is the of course Conformity, Inequity, and Exclusion Group.

WOODS: I had somebody on a couple years ago, April Kelly-Woessner. She's at Elizabethtown College, and she's done work arguing that the millennials, she says, are the most intolerant generation of all, and that this seems to be paradoxical because aren't they the ones who are so openminded to all different types of groups? But she says toleration really is not about how do you feel and act toward people you already like and agree with.

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: The real test of toleration is: how do you treat people you disagree with? And yeah, you can find some nasty people on all sides, but I find in general in my life, it's just much, much worse coming from the left. Incredible nastiness toward people – so their treatment of you, you're somebody they don't agree with, and you are absolutely like an unperson.

RECTENWALD: Unpersoned, entirely. I've said this before: I feel like Julian Assange, in a way. I'm sort of quarantined away in an embassy, almost, you know? I am allowed to leave, but you know, I really have to be careful, because I mean, I walk down the street; literally if they see me, they'll cross the street to get off the sidewalk that I'm on. It's really unbelievable.

WOODS: Yeah, it is unbelievable, and one of these days when I'm – I get to New York quite a few times per year. I think you've earned a free lunch. You've earned lunch on me.

RECTENWALD: Oh, great. I would like to take you into one of my classes or so. I think that would be fun.

WOODS: Yeah, that would be interesting. And plus, I'd like to walk through campus and see what happens.

RECTENWALD: That would be curious. You will see that I'm not exaggerating. It's probably worse than what I'm saying.

WOODS: Wow.

RECTENWALD: I don't know what these people say about me behind my back. I know what they said about me on email, and it was despicable, what they said. Unbelievable. And I felt like writing back to the head of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Group and saying, "Is this the kind of civility that you were referring to, that I should have abided by?" These people called me everything in the book. I mean, unbelievable. You know, I was basically called a Nazi. I was called alt-right, misogynist, Satan. I was called Satan. I was called "short pants, white boy." I was called "fragile white male." I mean, these are all — I was being pelted with racist and sexist epithets, even as they said I was the racist and sexist.

WOODS: But the idea that they would call you fragile. Not one of these people has the emotional wherewithal to withstand what you've been put through, and you're the fragile one?

RECTENWALD: Right, isn't that hilarious?

WOODS: Yeah, unbelievable. Let's see. Obviously we want to get people following you on Twitter. I'm going to link to both of those accounts, because you have to account. So is one of them more professional than the other one and one's more fun?

RECTENWALD: Yeah, I save the Dr. Rectenwald one for my students, mostly.

WOODS: Okay.

RECTENWALD: The other the other one is @antipcnyuprof, one word.

WOODS: Okay, so if you're driving around and that's too much to remember, I'll link to that at TomWoods.com/1244 for the episode today. And then your website, which I'm trying to — it's MichaelRectenwald.com.

RECTENWALD: That's right. It's MichaelRectenwald.com, no dots, and then there's another website for the book itself: SpringtimeForSnowflakes.com.

WOODS: Oh, okay. I did not have that one. All right, SpringtimeForSnowflakes.com.

RECTENWALD: There you will find a lot of the media coverage, samples of my other interviews, and also other writing on social justice and PC authoritarianism.

WOODS: Excellent. All right, well, the only thing that surprises me about this situation — I'm not surprised at how you were treated or how any of it shook out, but I am surprised that you're not more of an internet celebrity, given what's happened to you. And if you'd like to become one, I know the formula if you'd like [laughing]. With a story like that, I can make you one.

RECTENWALD: Oh, I would like that. I mean, I don't understand. They've either accepted I haven't really been a — I'm more of a writer than I am a speaker. I think that my writing is just much better than what I do in oratory. So I haven't really done the YouTube channel bit, although I'm being told I've got to do it.

WOODS: Yeah.

RECTENWALD: I mean, I love writing. I mean, I'm a writer. If you want to read — I think this last book is a piece of literature. I'm not boasting, but I think it's a literary work. And that's just what I like doing better. So if I haven't become an internet celebrity, it's largely because writing is my thing.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. That's true. I mean, I see that, and the thing is I love writing myself, and then I realized I make a three-minute YouTube video, and it gets, you know, tens of thousands of views almost immediately.

RECTENWALD: Yeah.

WOODS: And I think: but what about that blog post I slaved over? Don't you ever read that?

RECTENWALD: Right.

WOODS: But anyway, all right, we're going to — geez, there are so many places to refer people, but all the stuff will be linked at TomWoods.com/1244. You definitely want to check out the book *Springtime for Snowflakes: Social Justice and Its Postmodern Parentage* by Michael Rectenwald of NYU. Thanks, Michael. I hope you continue on this path that you're on, which is — we're all cheering you around the country. I know it's hard to perceive that when you're surrounded by enemies, but you have more friends than you have enemies. They're just more scattered.

RECTENWALD: I've felt that, and I really appreciate it very much.

WOODS: All right, thanks again.

RECTENWALD: Thank you, Tom.