



## Episode 1,361: Hoaxed: How the Media Demonizes Dissidents and Distorts the News

Guest: Mike Cernovich

**WOODS:** I've watched *Hoaxed* a couple of times already, And I'm already thinking about people who need to see it, people I just know in my own circles, and now with this episode, I hope a lot more will have a chance to see it. It raises a lot of questions, but my initial question I guess to you would be — of course, a lot of people listening right now, we have a hostility toward the media. The bias they have couldn't be more obvious. At this point, they're not even pretending that they don't have it. But some people could say, look, by and large, generally, they get the stories right. They get the names and the dates right. They get most stories more or less correct. It's just some outlying stories that you've put together for *Hoaxed* that, sure, definitely needed to be corrected, but by and large, we can trust them on the big things. Is there anything wrong with that way of thinking?

**CERNOVICH:** There's a number of things wrong with it. One is even if they got the stories right mostly, their failures are utterly catastrophic. It's sort of like saying my investment advisor is right 90% of the time that he invest \$1, and then the only time he's wrong is when he invests my life savings.

**WOODS:** [laughing] Right.

**CERNOVICH:** Well, that's not much of a defense. Now, as to whether they're actually accurate about the little things, oh, I've had people in articles put things that just weren't even true that weren't even insulting to me. For example, there was one article that came out recently that said I host Infowars. And I don't. I like Alex Jones. I'm not throwing shade on it, but it's just not objectively true that I do that. And they're also very dishonest with the label game. Michael Malice and I've talked about that sort of parenthetical death, so if the media thinks they have one thing on you, they'll say, "Michael Cernovich, comma" —

**WOODS:** The one thing.

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** Right.

**CERNOVICH:** But that rule doesn't apply for them. They don't say — for example, Kaitlan Collins of CNN, she was using some very homophobic language in her tweets in the past. They don't say, "Kaitlan Collins, comma, who at one point was tweeting out homophobic slurs, comma, said the following." So there's all these little rules and subtleties and ways that the narrative is manipulated, and that's why at the beginning of *Hoaxed*, we talked about how all

media's narrative, because enough people don't think of it in that way. We think, oh, it's fake news. Well, no, they're not outright fabricating things. So for example, a lot of stories about Trump, they are sourced. The sources are not made up. Now, the sources can be liars. They could be playing the reporters. There could be any number of explanations. Or maybe the reporter won't talk to sources who could contradict the other sources. So it's more about narrative usually than it is about outright fabrication or fake news.

**WOODS:** You know, that thing you say about there's the one quality, and every time you are written about or introduced in that introductory sentence, it's going to be mentioned in some clause, it makes me think about the example of John McCain. Nobody ever said, "John McCain, comma, who promoted war on false pretenses, comma." Now, you would think that would be at least as defining a moment for his career as anything they're saying about you, and would be, you know, a little bit more consequential than anything they're saying about you. And yet, not only was that never said, but he's held up as a statesman that even Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has to go above and beyond — she was saying that he gives us a unique example of public service. So it's not just that the media, they're wrong and they have a bias. I mean, this is borderline cultish.

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah, it's the cult of war, actually, the cult of regime change. Look at how the media attacks Tulsi Gabbard primarily because she's not for regime change, and that's why war and the military industrial complex was a central focal point of *Hoaxed*. A lot of people don't remember the Kuwaiti incubators story, which got us in the first Iraq war. A lot of people don't understand how we got into the Vietnam War and other wars. So you're going to be attacked if you oppose it. So for example, why is Tulsi Gabbard not celebrated as a strong, independent woman, right? Well, because she doesn't believe in regime change. If she believed in regime change, the media would fawn over her.

**WOODS:** Exactly. Now, I want to make sure people — you glided over that example of the Iraqi incubators. I've got so many young listeners who weren't even born at that time, it is astonishing to me. So what happened — and you've got this in *Hoaxed* — was we had this testimony, this tearful testimony by a 15-year-old girl about Iraqi soldiers, in their invasion of Kuwait, going into the hospitals and taking babies out of incubators and throwing them on the floor, which would seem to me to be just an inefficient way for an army to behave when you have other things to do. But that was her testimony. How did it take until 1992 before we found out that she was the daughter of the Kuwaiti ambassador to the United States? Why did nobody — I mean, I ask this I suppose rhetorically. Nobody bothered to look into that?

**CERNOVICH:** It's too good to check, right? Isn't that the way the saying goes in the news? It's too good of a story to check out. And yeah, the younger people didn't know that; that's why we wanted to show people of all ages that fake news and manipulating the narrative, this isn't a new thing. Everybody has this idea that maybe there was some kind of golden age of a free press. There's always been games and narrative shifting, and the problem is as weapons get better and more expensive, the stakes become a lot higher. That's why most of the fake news is around wars, regime change, why we have to go to wars, and people who are attacked the most by the media are those who stand up against that.

**WOODS:** Take a minute, if you would please, to talk about Cassie Jaye. I've had her on the show, and what happened to her is so interesting, because there's no way you would think you could fit her into the demonization narrative, given her background, given her views. And yet, boy, did they.

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah, so Cassie Jaye I think is kind of the breakout star of *Hoaxed*, and I knew that going in. She's a wonderful, sweet person, had made multiple films, a talented filmmaker. Sort of everything that the feminists would prop up. She's legitimately good. She makes incredible movies. They look great. They have good pacing. And she did a documentary on the men's rights movement in America. Initially she believed a lot of the headlines, which is that MRAs are these bad people —

**WOODS:** And that's men's rights activists, by the way, just for everybody to know.

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah, yeah, the MRAs are men's rights activists, but sometimes I would get called — and I'm not, because I just think MRAs are just a little too kind of weak, because they're crying for legal reform. That said, that is not a very compassionate stance to take. A lot of their issues on male suicide — for example, male suicide is almost four times higher than female suicide, yet you never hear anything about male suicide. There are a number of issues, and that's what Cassie Jaye had discovered. She decided to change the tone of her film from a hit piece on the MRA movement into one that explores there are other issues. Lost all of her funding, lost all of her support. She did a Kickstarter finally to finish the film, was able to finish it, and then the media attacked her, called her a propagandist, said she hated women, said she was a misogynist, everything that they could throw at her. And that's why she was so focal in the movie, is it isn't just — so for example, when I get media hits, I don't expect anybody to cry for me. I'm a big boy, and I'm far from perfect. But it doesn't matter. It isn't about who you are. They don't attack me because I'm strong or because they have a legitimate gripe. They'll go after Cassie Jaye and they'll go after anybody who questions the orthodoxy.

**WOODS:** And in her case, it's — maybe it's because, I don't know, I'm a softy and sentimental in some ways, but I was really so struck by her story of somebody who intended to go look into this men's rights movement, expecting to find monsters and just terrible people as far as the eye can see, and she found that she could find sympathy even for these folks she had in her own mind demonized. And you'd think, what a great moment this is for us to just say, "You know, once in a while our common humanity comes through in a case like this." [laughing] And yet, that is the last thing that occurred to them.

Now, I want to jump out of the film for just a second and think about the kind of response you've gotten and, in a way, the non-response in some quarters. Because it does not surprise me to learn that what we sometimes call official conservatism or conservatism, inc. has more or less it — now, correct me if I'm wrong, but has more or less pretended you're not there. Is that about right?

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah, and that *Hoaxed* isn't there. So *Hoaxed*, not that it should matter, the directors are very Christian guys. So I'll see all these people on social media, not just conservatism, inc., but high-profile conservatives, and they'll say Hollywood is shutting out conservatives, Hollywood hates Christians. And I'm thinking, *Oh, hey, here's this great film that is compelling, beautiful, changes, the narrative, changes the conversation.* Nothing, man. The degree to which I'm being ignored and *Hoaxed* is being ignored is incredible. That said, it's still done very well, been seen in 102 countries right now, a lot of distribution deals and other talks. But it's an interesting way that it's treated. So for example, if somebody writes a book on why Russia and Trump colluded, some conspiracy theory book, every liberal network is fawning over that person. *How can we promote this? How can we get that out?* You make a great film, and conservatives, they're just really nasty. I mean, I don't have any better

way to put it. They want to pretend like it doesn't exist. Very jealous, very petty. Nobody wants to promote even someone like me, who has been very generous over the years and promoted many, many people in many, many projects.

**WOODS:** Yeah, and you find that in cases like this, those people won't reciprocate. You never hear from them. It's always one way. Now, when I first watched it — I was going to watch it anyway, but it was Michael Malice wrote to me and said, "By the way, I saw *Hoaxed*, and it is superb. It absolutely must be seen." And I told you through DM that Michael Malice has been voted the number-one guest on *The Tom Woods Show*. So that now means that all you folks are required to watch *Hoaxed* unless you're lying to me about how you feel about Michael Malice. But the way the right wing, so-called — again, so-called right-wing media initially dealt with that Covington Catholic High School episode, where they were tripping over each other to make sure the left knew that we are ready to throw these people under the bus if that's what it takes to satisfy you — the left never does that. The left never thinks, *Oh, we better a piece conservative sensibilities here and rush to get out front of this narrative*. Never. Never. Never. And then the right wonders why it's losing.

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah, the left has all the cultural power, and conservatives, they don't want to admit it, their very supplicating, beta roll in the relationship, and they beg and plead and really want to be accepted by the left. Meanwhile, they bash the left. It's all to me quite hilarious for a number of reasons. One is that I understand sort of the power dynamics of it all, so I see all these conservatives, *We're the real men, and these liberals, they're weak, unlike us real conservative men. Yeah, we're going to restore family and masculinity into the country*. And then the next minute, they're doing anything they can to bend over and cry and beg and bow down to left. So to me, that's funny.

Secondly, is I've done well for myself, so I don't need them even. It's more of a neutral observation, which is, *Hey, we've been seeing 102 countries. We're in talks with every distribution company right now/ People are really excited about the film. But hey, wouldn't it be nice if, when somebody came up with something good that had a way to make an impact, if you shared it, reviewed it, posted a link?* There are people that that they DM me every day — verified accounts, I won't name names — for me to retweet their stuff. *Hoaxed* comes out, and what, they don't have an account, apparently. They want to pretend that it doesn't really exist, even people that I've really boosted. So some of that seems a little petty, and there's always a little male ego, little pettiness to it, so I'm not proclaiming to be above all of that.

But the much bigger point really, because the film's done well, is this is just not effective. If you really want to make a difference, you should be promoting everyone else, just like Malice promotes people. I promote Malice. Malice was that my DC event. Malice is promoting your stuff. That's what you actually do if you give a damn and you care.

**WOODS:** Right. Now, Malice has a book coming out in a couple of months, and I intend to use my show to just — you know, I might have him on for a full week. Every single day, we'll talk about a new aspect of his book. I've never done that for any author in now close to 1,400 episodes, and that would be intended to highlight the significance of what he's done, because I think he should be promoted. So you and I are definitely speaking the same language in that regard.

Now, let me state what might seem obvious to some people, which is maybe the reason that the people on the right don't want to promote *Hoaxed* is they don't want to promote you, so that they feel like you, for one reason or other because of things you've said or done in the past, that you are — I mean, they don't mind being retweeted by you. They don't mind siphoning off some of your audience. But they don't want to be associated with somebody who is perceived in the media as an extremist.

**CERNOVICH:** There's that angle, which I'm willing to entertain, but I don't see them promoting anybody else either, though, right? I don't see Ben Shapiro — I don't want to put specific people on names, but if you follow prominent so-called conservative accounts, I don't see them going out of their way to promote anybody other than people in *The New York Times*. I don't see them promoting your brand-new, up-and-coming people. I don't see them promoting Malice, who doesn't have any kind of baggage, right? Even people who are just legitimately good and interesting and provocative, but don't have any kind of, *Ooh, he did something bad or said something bad*, those people aren't getting boosted either. So like Rich Lowry, the *National Review* guys, none of them are promoting new, up-and-coming people. So it isn't just about me and, oh, they're so afraid of me. And by the way, some of these people who, again, I'm not naming, when I wrote or did videos about their stuff, they were fine with three tweeting my commentary on their stuff, too. So there's a little more to it than that, and I think largely it's, if you're a conservative, you view it as crabs in a bucket or a scarcity mindset, where there's so little cultural cache to go along, that oh, well, there's not room for another filmmaker. Even though I'm not really conservative, there's not room for another filmmaker, because there's only room for one conservative filmmaker or two conservative filmmakers. It's much more of the negative mindset, scarcity mindset angle than the "look how scary Cernovich is" angle.

**WOODS:** I do want to get back into the content here; I just can't help thinking about these sorts of issues. They love Dinesh D'Souza. Now, what do you think it is about Dinesh D'Souza that makes him acceptable and wonderful? I mean, he really sticks to the script, or he'll say things that are just — I don't know, I think his analysis of Obama is just not really getting the point, and it just gets people off on unhelpful tangents. But man, they love that guy.

**CERNOVICH:** So with the Dinesh, Dinesh is one — so first of all, I'll own, I've been very abrasive over the years, so I understand that. But with Dinesh, he's a very likable guy. The reason his films definitely get more attention than *Hoaxed* is because he serves up a product that very much confirms your point of view about the world. *Democrats, they're the real racists; we're actually the good guys. Trump's going to save America; everybody else is bad.* It's a very simple white-hat-versus-black-hat style of film, and that's going to resonate especially with a Boomer audience. And me, I've always been comfortable with a role of an antihero or a role of somebody who is a little morally ambiguous. Am I a good guy, or am I a bad guy doing the right thing, or does it matter? Can you even know? *Hoaxed* is very much in that vein, is who are the good guys, who's the bad guys, how would anybody even know who it is? So it's a complicated, complex subject, and it's definitely going to be more interesting — even though a lot of Boomers have watched, it's more interesting to a Gen X, Gen Y, millennial crowd.

And because conservative media tends to be very old, that's another reason it hasn't got the play — the median viewer of Fox News I think is 70 years old, something really, really absurd. Young people aren't flocking to conservatism for the most part, and that's another reason conservatives might just think, *Well, the film is kind of a cultural mismatch. He is not telling*

*Boomers that Donald Trump is the greatest president in American history. He's not telling Boomers that they're just the greatest generation that ever lived and everybody else are the real racists and that there's no complicated issues.* And my position on a lot of these issues is there are some structural barriers in place that can and should be talked about. That's lost on a conservative audience. They want that very kind of hokey, corny, generic slop, which I'm not saying Dinesh's film is, because someone's going to try to clip that and create drama or whatever. But generally speaking, Boomers don't want to have their values challenged or their worldview challenged.

**WOODS:** I want to say a quick thing about Mike Cernovich, the man, because you mentioned that you're doing pretty well for yourself, you don't need these people. And that's kind of the message that has been a subtext of my show, which is that it helps to have so-called "F you" money, which is what Scott Adams often says. And Scott Adams is also featured in *Hoaxed*, by the way. But you also have a very, very good business sense. You write really good marketing copy, and I try to get better at that all the time. But yet, on those grounds, I do want to point out what may be lacking in *Hoaxed*, which is, when I get to the end of a long-form sales page, there's some call to action: buy this product. Or I'm on a squeeze page; there's a call to action: sign up for my email list. What is the call to action in *Hoaxed*?

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah, I love it. That's actually an issue that we talked about. We were going to put a call to action, which is: watch or go to Cerno Films or go to *Hoaxed* Movie. And we ended up, the call to action is more metaphorical, but there is a call to action. The call to action is to get out of whatever place they have you in and get free and step out into the light.

**WOODS:** Now, I get that, and I thought that final segment really, it gives you the chills if you're if you're really listening and paying attention. Because what it put me in mind of was this Covington Catholic thing, which took place after you had finished work on *Hoaxed*, but it made me think: we got to the truth of that because, thank heavens, it turns out the bad guys recorded it and thereby exonerated the kids in that story. But how many times then in the past could the media have been getting away with smear jobs on people that were completely unfounded, and those people pathetically tried to defend themselves and nobody believed them?

**CERNOVICH:** Yeah, that's why the media, they hate social media so much, and I wish we could have gotten into that more in *Hoaxed* movie, and that's why we might be doing a *Hoaxed* series. Social media is the ultimate check on the media, on the news media. That's why they hate it. They want it censored. Without social media, the Covington kids are ruined. That's it. They're racist. They're Nazi boys. That's all. Life over. Enjoy whatever life you're going to live, but you're done. With social media, right away people were able to say, "Wait a minute. There's other camera angles. This camera angle shows that Nathan Phillips actually walked up to them, and people on social media saying, "Well, hey, I'm a veteran. I'm going to request his DD 214." Oh, it turns out he wasn't really in Vietnam. Oh, and somebody else on social media says, "Well, I'm going to watch this old YouTube videos." They watch us on YouTube videos and say, "Oh, he did claim he was in Vietnam. Stolen valor." The media hates it. They are a search-and-destroy team. They search and destroy anyone who questions the narrative, whatever that narrative may be. And then they move on to their next target. Social media has so much power now.

In fact, I think the best treatment of the article of the Covington kids, which was unintentionally beneficial to me, was in *The Washington Post*, and the headline was "The media try to keep up with the Covingtongate story while social media fought back." And the tone of the article was, *Hey, we're hardworking reporters at The Washington Post. We were reporting on the Covington thing, but then people like Cernovich were calling us fake news and doing all these video responses to show us that we're wrong.* And somehow I was the villain in it, but only if you're in their worldview. Anybody outside of their worldview would be like, *Oh, wait a minute, so Cernovich showed why it was a hoax.* But if you're the media, you're thinking, *We're just reporting on what's happening here and not doing anything wrong. This is what reporters do.*

Because this is the line — here's a line to throw away. So if people want to understand reporting really deeply or how reporters think, reporters say we're only reporting on what's happening, which as you and I know, is BS. They can choose what stories to cover. They can choose how to cover it. You have a show. You can choose who to have on as guests. You can't just say, "Well, I'm only reporting on what's happening." No, you're not. You're choosing guests, and you're choosing what to cover. There's a thousand things you could cover on a given day. It's just BS. That's the throwaway line, though, that the media had. There's no reason in the world Covingtongate should have been in *The New York Times* or *The Washington Post*. Even if those kids had been jerks, even if it were true, there's no reason the world that's worthy of what should be prestige publications. So this whole line, *We're just reporting on what's happening*, is such BS, but that's what they always say.

**WOODS:** And I thought there were people — did you happen to see how S.E. Cupp, who is one of my least favorite people in the world. In fact, the first time I saw S.E. Cupp on TV was the first and only time that I saw somebody on TV I thought was so stupid, I had to go to my phone and say, "Who the hell is this person? I just have to know." Did you see the clip where — this cloying, schoolmarmy response just went on and on and on, where she's making up a story about these kids. She wouldn't have done this about anybody else, any other group of people. It would never even have occurred to her. To see the so-called right wing do this just makes me crazy. It's why I'm glad I'm away from and not part of so-called conservatism, inc. You know what summarizes conservatism, inc. for me, is going to CPAC back in 2011, I guess. And I remember thinking to myself: nobody likes Mitt Romney. I mean, maybe they feel like, you know, he's somebody and he's a guy in a suit and he's better than nothing, but nobody really loves him. And certainly no young person loves him.

**CERNOVICH:** Right.

**WOODS:** And I saw all these nerdy, dork kids with their little bowties, standing around monitors so that they could get catch a glimpse of Romney's speech, because they had to man their tables. And I just thought, I can't believe I'm even observing this. The whole movement makes me crazy. But then I look at the progressive left these days, and I think, well, not much to choose, is there [laughing]?

**CERNOVICH:** Well, you bring up another point too, which is: here's how the left shapes the narrative about conservatives. They put on the weakest talent, and they go, *Oh, here's the conservatives.*

**WOODS:** Oh, you're right.

**CERNOVICH:** They don't put on people like Malice, people like you. I went on Fox News one night, and I just shredded every talking point that the media smear machine attacked me, twisted satire claim that my satire was real, even though I was literally just repeating words in another article and changing a couple words. And they had to kick me off TV there, because people like me, I just shred the left's talking points. People like Malice, people like you, there are people who are great, and those people will never be put up as "the right." The people you put up as the so-called right, as conservatives are bunch of nitwits or midwits, where they're not complete idiots, but they're just not that smart. They really can't hang.

I'll give you another example. Joel Pollak went on CNN — he works at Breitbart. He's one of the smartest guys. He's probably one of the few people who could beat me in a debate — well, it depends on the subject. If the truth were on my side, that's a different thing. He goes on CNN, shreds the whole panel. He's an Orthodox Jewish guy. What are you going to do? You can't call him an anti-Semite. He just shreds them. That's why you don't see Joel Pollak — you should see him on TV. If we had a real media and we had real news and it wasn't dishonest, every day Joel Pollak would be on TV as either a Trump surrogate or as somebody who's pro-right, but you won't have him on because then if people watch it, they'd go, *Wow, these people are actually more intelligent.*

You don't see the right calling for deplatforming the left, because we truly believe — maybe we're wrong and we don't have the best ideas, but if you look at how we actually behave, we believe we do. I'll debate these people. They're the ones who go, *Oh, we've got to shut down the conversation. We have to ban people. We have to no-platform people.* And that's also true of conservative, inc. Ben Shapiro doesn't debate adults. Ben Shapiro debates 19-year-old confused, often mentally unstable college kids about very low-grade conversations, like two or three genders. He doesn't get into the weeds about why he supports regime change and why he supported the Iraq war and how is conservative government consistent with a large military industrial complex, which is basically a form of socialism because all these government contracts are going to big corporations. They'll never debate an actual adult on that.

So this is again another way that they control the narrative. The media will marginalize you — they'll do one of two things. They'll put you on the cone of outrage, which is what they tried to do to Tucker Carlson, or they'll put you in the cone of silence and just pretend like Joel Pollak doesn't exist or pretend like *Hoaxed* movie isn't out there. The liberal media, by the way — here's how I know my *Hoaxed* is great. And I can say it's great, because the directors deserve 95% of the credit — is Jordan Peterson's in the film. Hawk Newsome's in the film. Ryan Holiday's in the film. A lot of lefties were in the film. I thought for sure the media would say, "Hey, Jordan Peterson, I can't believe you were in the film. Didn't you know Cernovich is a bad guy? Disavow." The media doesn't even want to attack people in the film, because it's so great, they don't want it getting any attention at all, so there's been no outrage pieces or no calls for anybody who was in the film to disavow that decision.

**WOODS:** Wow. Well, yes, there are two different ways they could go. But this second way, that's clearly a deliberate decision they made in this case, because as you say, you could have imagined them going the other way. Let me throw you a little softball here. You said that Cassie Jaye in some ways is the star. Leaving that aside, what's your favorite part? You watch this film, and there's a bit on it where you just say, "This is just beautiful. I couldn't possibly improve on this?"



**CERNOVICH:** The footage of CNN people talking about Tomahawk missiles being like a fireworks display and how beautiful it is. Every time it gets laughs in the crowds, every time I watch it, I laugh. And it's a perfect miss — the director, it was just a beautiful, beautiful sequence, where we're talking about war machine death and destruction, but it's almost comedic, because you look at the farcical nature of the media, where they don't think, "Oh, these missiles they're going to go up and they're going to blow up people. Maybe some children on the way to school are going to die. This is a very serious thing." Instead, the coverage is saying, "Look at how beautiful these missiles are. It's like a fireworks display," and they're all sitting in awe of that. That scene every time gets me laughing. It's definitely my favorite scene.

**WOODS:** Let me ask you, if you don't describe yourself as a conservative, how do you describe yourself?

**CERNOVICH:** Economic populist. My view of the world — this is where, you know, yang is picking up a lot of steam, though it might be based in nihilism is, I think it's an outrage that you can't file bankruptcy for student loan debt. You can for any other kind of debt. If I leverage up a company and I fail, it's in the Constitution that we can have bankruptcy, and you ought to be able to have that failure. You buy a house, you can't make it, you get foreclosed on, you move on with your life. Student loan debt is lifetime indenturedhood. You're in servitude for the rest of your life, and it's the only kind of debt that you can't restructure and you can't file bankruptcy from. So my platform would be based on median income. Okay, you're a young man, you're a young woman listening; you want to have a family. I want you to be able to afford to have a family. That doesn't mean two BMWs and a huge house with a pool or whatever. But if you want to have a family, we ought to look to set up our system in such a way that, as Benjamin Franklin talked about, affordable family formation. Is it affordable for two people of reasonable talent, not even exceptional people, to start a family? No, it's not. It just isn't possible these days, because a lot of the incentive structures.

So me, the only issues I care — and that's also why the culture wars and identity politics is largely to keep people divided. I care about economic issues. What are we doing for the median worker? What are we doing for people who, they can't learn to code? They just don't have the IQ to learn how to code, right? What are we doing for those people, and how do you create a great country and a great life for all of them? Universal basic income is, it's funny that this is coming up now, because there was a big profile on me done in Politico right after Trump won, and although I'm not alt-right, it was called "The Alt-Right Goes to Washington." And in the interview, they go, *Oh, Cernovich has talked about how he's in favor of the universal basic income* — which is not the whole story. I'm not saying I am. But I've been talking about these ideas for years. What are we going to do with automation? What do we do with 8 million truck drivers who are out of work? What are we going to do when people just can't work hard?

But here's what I think when I go to Costco. I walk out and I just see, okay, here's some guy or some gal working there, checking your receipt as you leave the door, checking your membership cards, and they're making, you know, 12, 15 bucks an hour. There's no big exit for that person. They're not going to sell their company one day for millions. This is sort of their life, and they're nice people, and I'm not denigrating that kind of work at all. But I think: how can I create a society that gives people like that a decent life, even an

opportunity to have a good life? Not how can I give more money to a military industrial complex, more money to Wall Street, more money to the super rich?

**WOODS:** All right, here's I guess one of the final things I want to ask you. I think maybe ten years ago or maybe even less, we looked at the Internet and we said, man, this thing is the most liberating development ever for so many reasons. Now, I wouldn't say — it's obviously not lost that care entirely. But we've now seen that it's possible for the people who want to silence us to strike back. And the Internet is not quite the free play of ideas that we thought it might be. But so on the one hand, it does seem to be the case that some people are going to have more difficulty than we anticipated getting the word out about what they believe, and we see more and more of this. But at the same time, we also live in a world in which you are able to make a documentary like *Hoaxed*, and you're able to do this — I mean, you have a company, but you're not 20th Century Fox, and yet you're still able to produce something that looks like it was made by 20th Century Fox. How do you think this all balances out? What are the pluses and minuses, and where do we stand with all this?

**CERNOVICH:** Well, it's going to get worse. More people are going to be silenced, and they're even going after now Ben Shapiro. Kara Swisher, who is a very prominent tech reporter, was kind of lobbying YouTube's CEO to ban Ben Shapiro. Because nobody's safe, really. And the irony of Ben Shapiro thing is he plays it so safe and everything but the whole transgender issue, but on the transgender thing, I'm just like, leave these people alone. Who cares, right, for the most part, unless it's — you know, the drag queens reading to children might be a bit much, but I just don't really care. But that's becoming a wedge issue. That's becoming hate speech. There is going to be more and more self-censorship, where people are being more careful. *Should I say this? Should I not say this?* That's going to lead probably to a really bad backlash, and it won't be pretty.

But in terms of individual content creators, a lot of things that people do, they're doing incorrectly. So people who are — I follow these guys like Flaccus and all these really young up-and-comers, and they're great at creating value; they're not good at capturing value. If you're a content — I hate the word "content creator," but whatever. If you make films, movies, write books, you need to read a book on marketing. You need to read a book by Dan Kennedy. You need to know what a long-form sales letter is. You need to read a book by Frank Kern. You need to read a book by Jeff Walker, and you have to run what you do individually, even if it isn't a huge business, you have to run it as a business. And okay, there is a call to action. So for me, every time you read a Cernovich article, you know at the very end, there's going to be a, "PS, you should go buy something from me." And if you like me, that shouldn't bother you because you would want me to be able to actually make a living, and if you read me often enough, you know, *Okay, at the very end just, I'll scroll past that.* It's going to be some kind of, you know, PS thing. But that does actually convert. I've done it both ways. So I know it's done both ways, so people need to have a call to action. So if people like you, like all of us, like people listening who maybe want to start a podcast, need to learn some of that old-school marketing methodology.

**WOODS:** I couldn't be happier that you said that, because I'm constantly pushing that on the show, that, first of all, if people are doing something valuable like producing a documentary, I'm thrilled about that. But it doesn't do any good if people don't know about it. And if you don't know how to promote it and yourself — and I see a lot of academics out there who are very sympathetic to the ideas I hold, and they write books that are read by a handful of people, because they don't have an email list, they don't know how to promote themselves,

they don't know how to use free tools that are sitting there. And it seems like people like us who were, at least in the public eye, outnumbered, we can't afford to be clueless about stuff like this or think of marketing as something kind of shady and underhanded that only terrible people are involved in. No, no, no, no. Come on. If you take yourself seriously. You've got to know that stuff. You've got to read those people you just mentioned. What's the website so people can go watch and buy *Hoaxed*?

**CERNOVICH:** HoaxedMovie.com, go watch the trailer. If you like it, buy the film. It's five or ten bucks, less than a latte.

**WOODS:** Exactly, and a lot longer lasting, and you're going to want to show it to your friends. So I will link to that also at TomWoods.com/ 1361, the show notes page for today. Mike Cernovich, thanks for your time.

**CERNOVICH:** My pleasure, Tom. It was great talking to you.