



## Episode 1,711: Rep. Thomas Massie Against the Fact-Free COVID-19 Hysterics

**Guest: Thomas Massie**

**WOODS:** All right, I've been a fan of yours for a long time. I think you're doing tremendous work. A lot of important things to ask you about here, but I hoped we could start, especially for folks who they know your name, they know you're a good guy on our side, they know something about you and MIT, but that's as far as their knowledge goes. Could you give us like maybe the three-minute Thomas Massie life story?

**MASSIE:** Sure. Okay, I grew up in Appalachia, in the county where I'm living right now, went to public school K through 12. Mom was a nurse, dad was a beer distributor. I took things apart and experimented with stuff. I might have built a few black powder guns or bombs in my childhood. But mostly I built robots. I won at science fairs. I was a geek, even made it to the International Science Fair and won an award from NASA there. My dream was to go to MIT, read about it, never even visited until the first day I showed up to go to class. Just a little side note: my wife is also from the same high school in Appalachia, also went to MIT. She's two years younger than me. So two hillbillies make it to MIT.

We started a company there based on some virtual reality technology that I invented and grew that to 70 people. We kind of got stuck in New England. We really wanted to be back in Kentucky. We have four children. The youngest one just left the house yesterday to go to an early college program. And my wife and I, we did the company for ten years. We came back to Kentucky to raise our kids. We built a house that's off the grid, completely off the grid, and we just wanted to be left alone, frankly.

But then I saw that local government was catching the same disease that the federal government had. They wanted to get involved in our lives. They wanted to zone the county. They wanted to pass a new tax, ostensibly to help with conservation, but they were going to put the tax burden on the backs of the farmers, who are the biggest conservationists the county. I fought that with letters to the editor. That was a slippery slope. I rallied people in 2007 to show up to town meetings. I eventually ran to be the county executive, which, it's a certain kind of hell when a libertarian gets elected and then you have to deal with functions like catching the dogs and getting the trash picked up, because it's really where the rubber meets the road. Found waste, fraud, and abuse, went after it.

Eventually, the congressman for this district decided he wasn't going to run again. I was talked into running for Congress based on my reputation of rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse at the local level. I ran for Congress and won. That was 2012. And I've been there since then. Sort of my plan was to be a more reasonable version of Rand Paul, and I think I ended up more like Ron Paul, instead of being more reasonable than Rand Paul. But what I found

was, I mean, I wanted to be the adult in the room, but what I found were mostly people who weren't adults, who took themselves seriously but didn't take their jobs seriously. And so my approach to Congress has been to take my job seriously, but to try not to take myself too seriously.

**WOODS:** Well, I can't help asking about something that's fresh in the news, and that is Joe Biden's choice of Kamala Harris to be his running mate. What was your reaction to that?

**MASSIE:** Well, I've passed her in the elevator a few times in Congress. I've said hi. I don't know her personally, so I really don't have that much of an informed opinion beyond anybody else who watches the news. I think they were trying to check a lot of boxes — you know, female, African American, to the left, far to the left of Joe Biden on some things, like health care probably, and guns, but also to the right of a lot of liberals I think on arresting you and locking you up for marijuana possession, for instance. So they checked a lot of boxes. I think we need to focus on Joe Biden. He's the guy who's mentally unfit to be president that you're actually going to be voting for.

**WOODS:** I want to ask you about your PRIME Act, where that stands and what it's all about, because that's gotten a lot of attention in our circles and beyond.

**MASSIE:** This is a great example of how you could help the economy, you can help the consumers, you can help the farmers, you can help some people in the middle just by relaxing one little regulation. So what the PRIME Act seeks to do is make it easier for farmers to sell their beef, pork, and lamb directly to consumers using local slaughterhouses. What a lot of folks may not know, but what was unearthed during the onset of COVID is that four companies control 85% of the meat processing in this country.

So if you're a farmer and you want to sell meat to consumer, you have to go through one of these four companies. Now, one of them is owned by the Chinese, one is owned by the Brazilians, and it's a very brittle system, because they've consolidated everything to kind of like an oligopoly. Some farmers have suggested breaking them up using antitrust rules. They're actually under investigation right now by the DOJ.

I've got a different solution. My solution is just allow the little guys to stay in business, because these big guys have encouraged the adoption of more and more draconian regulations by the USDA and their size-prejudicial regulations. And if we would just let the small guys compete, then farmers could use local processors — sometimes they're called abattoirs — to sell the what they grow to their neighbors. And the farmer would actually get more money for the animal they sell. The consumer would get better quality with more accountability and actually safer, because the meat's not being commingled with 100 other animals, and it's a win all around, and all you have to do is reduce one regulation.

Right now, the difference between a USDA-certified facility that can sell meat in grocery stores and anywhere they want and one that's not "USDA-certified" is a checklist of things that the factory has to have and a full-time USDA employee. My bill, the PRIME Act, which stands for Processor Revival Interstate Meat Exemption, says that if you're not going to cross state lines with the meat, you can use a local processor, who by the way, is inspected by the local health department, is subject to surprise inspections by the USDA, but doesn't have a full-time USDA inspector on staff. You can use that local processor and sell meat in a grocery store or directly to a consumer as long as you stay inside of your state boundaries. So it's

actually very constitutional, that I really don't see a nexus for the federal government, i.e. the USDA, if you are conducting commerce that doesn't cross state lines.

**WOODS:** Is this the kind of initiative that attracts support from beyond just the, let's say, traditional conservative or libertarian community? Or because it has Thomas Massie's name on it, does that make it toxic for some people because they absolutely can't support you or any of that silliness?

**MASSIE:** Well, here's the interesting thing. CNN called me the most hated man in Washington DC on March 27th, because I insisted that people show up for work and vote on the \$2 trillion bailout bill, but I've picked up dozens of co-sponsors since that day for this bill. I now have 54 sponsors in the House and 9 in the Senate. I've got four different party affiliations on this bill. I've got Democrats, I've got Republicans, I've got a Libertarian, and an Independent all sponsoring this bill. So this bill has broad appeal across all ideologies, because it's actually a very green notion that you could sell the foods you grow locally, and that you don't have to transport it thousands of miles. And also, it's a very libertarian notion that you should be able to decide what you and your family eat and where you get that food. So it crosses a lot of boundaries. Food does that. When you're enjoying food, most people don't care about the political persuasion of their chef or their farmer. And usually, the chefs are liberal and the farmers are conservative, so we somehow make it work.

**WOODS:** I know that the issue on most people's minds, of course, is the virus and lockdowns and what's likely to happen, but before we get to that, Eric Brakey, who I know you know, who's a former state senator from Maine, actually asked me to ask — he says, "Make sure you ask him about the story about the time when he personally replaced the water heater at the local prison." What is this?

**MASSIE:** [laughing] So when I was the county executive, backing up to my three-minute life story there, I came in and people knew I didn't want to spend any money. I mean, I had led tax revolts as a citizen, so they knew I wasn't going to raise taxes. Well, the jailer came to me and said — by the way, small diversion: Kentucky is the only state out of 50 that elects the county jailer. And it's a very libertarian notion that the person who's responsible for putting people in cages has to be accountable to the voters once every four years.

Anyways, the jailer came to me and he said, "The hot water heater went out in the jail. We need to replace it." And I said, "So what's the big deal? Just get a hot water heater." He said, "It's \$12,000." And I said, "What?" I said, "I'll put it in." So I go over and I look at the hot water heater, and I immediately recognize this is not one you buy at Lowe's. It's more like a boiler than a hot water heater. 199,000 BTUs, though, it's right under the boiler limit. It's something you might find in a hotel. It's got a computer on it. Even ten years ago, it had a computer on it, and an inch and a half of some plywood.

So I said, "Well, we can't buy this at Lowe's. Let me go on eBay." Well, I found one new in the box for \$5,500, hot water heater for the jail. And I called a special meeting. I didn't use executive emergency orders, okay. I called a special meeting. I noticed it 24 hours in advance. The local newspaper came. And I got permission from the local legislature — it's called the fiscal court or the commissioners — I got their permission to buy it now. So as soon as the meeting was over, I bought the hot water heater, had it delivered, new in the box. I got three inmates to help me unload it off the truck because we didn't have a forklift. And then the three inmates took the old one out. I went in the closet, and I said, "I just need one

inmate in the hot water heater closet with me to put this thing in." And within four hours, we had this thing installed.

Now, this gets to an interesting point. I go back outside. There's the old hot water heater. And I told the inmates to strip anything of value off the old one. You know, there might be parts or something we could recycle. Well, half these guys were in jail for stripping copper or something —

**WOODS:** [laughing] Oh, geez.

**MASSIE:** So anyway, they got really excited. This was something they knew how to do. And so they went to work like locusts on this hot water heater and stripped everything off of it and came to me with some milk crates full of parts. And they said, "We've got all the valuable things off the hot water heater." and I went over and I said, "No, you missed the most valuable thing." And so they looked at it again, and they came back and said, "No, we stripped it of everything of value." I said, "You see the lime green inspection sticker when it was installed?" And they said, "Yeah." I said, "Very gently peel that off of that hot water heater and put it on the new one."

**WOODS:** [laughing] Yeah.

**MASSIE:** My credibility in the jail went up among the inmates. They said, "Judge, you could go to jail for this." I said, "I'll have a hot shower, though, won't I?"

**WOODS:** Very good. All right, very good. Eric Brakey gives good advice. I'm glad I did ask about that. All right, I want to talk now about what's on everybody's minds. Here we are in August. It's a little bit past 15 days to flatten the curve at this point.

**MASSIE:** [laughing]

**WOODS:** I guess Scott Atlas was just brought on as an advisor of some sort on the issue of the virus. And I like him, and I'm glad to hear that he's from Stanford. He's been a sober voice on this. He's not a hysteric. The main problem I've seen with Trump involves the personnel he chooses. I mean, yes, I'll cheer that he gets rid of John Bolton, but he wouldn't have had to get rid of John Bolton if he hadn't brought on John Bolton. So there are a lot of mystifying decisions. And I guess my question would be: what would a Thomas Massie coronavirus task force look like? I mean, it would be the kind of task force I'm sure Trump would prefer, and yet he won't assemble.

**MASSIE:** Oh, yes, I would love — I haven't thought about that. I've thought about what would a coronavirus response bill look like if Thomas Massie wrote it.

**WOODS:** Oh, we'll get to that. Yeah, that's a good one.

**MASSIE:** So you should have not just one person — by the way, I had a chance to ask Dr. Fauci a question in one of our conference calls. We have these private meetings. And Tom McClintock asked him a very similar question, but the question centered around science and criteria. What's the criteria for opening our economy back up? Like anytime you shut anything down, you need to know what's the trigger to open it back up.

And also one of the other questions, and I think McClintock asked this — and this was very revealing, and this is when Dr. Fauci lost all credibility with me. Tom McClintock, he's a representative from California, asked him — let me see. I don't want to misquote him, but it was basically: what are the negative health effects of poverty? In other words, we are going to impoverish a lot of people. And then more broadly, what are the negative health effects of just shutting down our economy? And Dr. Fauci said, "Well, we know there are negative effects, but we haven't quantified them." And I'm thinking, if you can't quantify the negative externalities of what you're undertaking, where do you get the justification for undertaking it?

So that is sort of the background to say that I would get more voices in the room. I don't think I would let one person get up and just dominate things. It's true that the governors have killed their own economies, but they're doing it with the imprimatur of Birx and Fauci. Fauci's going on TV and Birx is flying and doing press conferences in every state, patting the governors on the back every time they shut down their economies. I wouldn't let the bureaucrats — and they are bureaucrats, okay? They may have medical degrees, but they're bureaucrats. Maybe you want to call them technocrats. They exist in government regardless of who's in power, regardless of what you do at the ballot box. Dr. Fauci is going to be that guy. Liz Cheney says he's one of her best friends. He's friends with Hillary Clinton. He is your consummate bureaucrat. And I would get some voices who've actually practiced medicine, Tom. I would bring the doctors in that I'm talking to here in Kentucky, that tell me how they're treating patients and what they make of this, not somebody who's been stuck there inside the Beltway for so long.

**WOODS:** Well, you raise the key question here, which really is: what is the end game of all this? We look over at Europe, and we've been lectured to about how great Europe is because they follow the rules and all that. And they're having spikes all over the place now in Spain and a lot of other places, and then Japan's having a bunch — they're all going to be fine, because at this point, probably it's moving through less vulnerable people, so I'm not panicked about this, but they are. New Zealand is shutting down for several days because of one family. Is this just our lives forever? What would be — and by the way, these are countries we were lectured about, because look, they locked down hard, and we Americans are too stupid and backward and individualistic to listen to what our leaders tell us. But they're still having spikes of cases too. So when Fauci said a couple of months ago that what he was looking for were no new deaths and no new cases, I thought, surely he can't actually believe that. But now I think that may be what they're looking for.

**MASSIE:** Well, when they said 15 days to flatten the curve, and understanding what they meant was that they're not going to reduce the number of people who catch it, they're just going to change the timing on the people who catch it, right? Because they didn't want to overwhelm our healthcare infrastructure. Well, as soon as they did that, I woke up the next morning and did the math. And I told my wife, she woke up, and I sat there with some graph paper and I said, You know what? This is going all the way through this summer. This is a big fat lie. Even if you don't flatten the curve, at the doubling rate we have for enough people to get herd immunity, it would be in the middle of the summer. And if they succeed in flattening the curve, we're into next fall. And you could prove it with math. But here you had the government lying to you. And it was it was mathematically provable, that they were lying.

And so you really can't trust them. I don't trust them. I think we're going to have to get to herd immunity, naturally, frankly. By the way, I got the antibody test about a week ago, I got

the results a week ago. I have the antibodies for the coronavirus. So I'm one of those people that's getting us on the way to herd immunity. Now, people say, did you catch it and didn't know you had it? I'm also one of those people who thinks they had it in January, before it was even identified in the United States. I had symptoms for four days. I was miserable, fever, fatigue, sore throat, and I think that's when I had it. Now, there's no way to prove that now, but I believe that a lot more people have been exposed to this than the government cares to admit to. I believe in New York City it wasn't any policy — they probably steepened the curve, frankly. But I think most of the people who were going to get it or could get it have gotten it now in New York City, if you look at their curve.

And the question is, under what conditions are you going to open things back up? I think the secret that the government is keeping from you is that they plan to keep us shut down until there's some kind of vaccine. And then whether it's compulsory at the federal level or the state level, or maybe they persuade your employer through another PPP program that you won't qualify for unless you make your employees get the vaccine, I think that's their plan. Somebody convince me that's not their plan, because there's no logical ending to this other than that, if I try to get inside of their head and think about what they're thinking. And by the way, I am 100% against any kind of mandatory or even coerced vaccinations, especially with the types of vaccinations they're talking about using, like with the RNA vaccinations.

**WOODS:** I think it was a Democratic congressman from Oregon who asked Dr. Fauci some obviously leading questions, like how long does it ordinarily take for a vaccine like this to be developed? What's the average amount of time? And Fauci resisted a little bit, and finally, he said seven years. And then they went on and on. And this congressman who was a Democrat was basically saying it's unreasonable for people to be just sitting around waiting for a vaccine and not living their lives. And Fauci said, "I absolutely agree with you." But I get the feeling that Fauci absolutely agrees with whoever the last influential person who interrogated him was, so it was a very strange interaction. And isn't it also been interesting to see the way the Tenth Amendment played into this? Because on the one hand, Trump saying he's going to just open up the country led to all these Tenth-Amendment-based objections from Democratic governors; however, there's no Tenth-Amendment objection when people say he should shut down the country by fiat.

**MASSIE:** Yeah, they want more of a dictatorial response, the left does. And by the way, just talking about the Constitution — which the left and these Democratic governors have just newly found, this thing called the Constitution and they're espousing the Tenth Amendment — the problem I have in Kentucky with our governor's behavior as it relates to the Constitution is that the Constitution guarantees every state a republican form of government. The Founding Fathers didn't want a bunch of states, half of which were led by monarchs or dictators. And so by republican form of government, they didn't mean even Republicans versus Democrats; they meant that there would be these three branches, and there would at least be a legislature of representatives elected by the people. And our legislature has been totally left out of everything the governor has done here in Kentucky. And I think it's a very similar situation in other states. So the way I back into this, in terms of why I should have anything to say about it at all, is that the governors in some states are denying their constituents, their citizens, a republican form of government. They're just ruling by edict.

**WOODS:** I had not considered that approach. So given that that's a political way of addressing it, let's take a minute and think about the economics of this, because you were saying that

you had thought about what your coronavirus relief bill might look like and how it compares to what has been voted on in the past weeks and months. What would it look like?

**MASSIE:** Well, let me give — and I might not be the best one to argue this, but let me give you the argument that some of my conservative and constitutional friends in Congress have given for why it was right to vote to bail out all of these businesses and to give people money. They say that what's happened is a taking, that the government has taken the livelihood of so many people, that according to the Fifth Amendment, when you take something, you have to compensate people for it. And so that's their argument for how you can vote for this and feel good about the Constitution.

My problem is the taking was at the state level, and the giving is at the federal level. And frankly, the only reason we're involved in things like unemployment right now and not the states is because we're the only level of government that can print and borrow money we don't have. They can't do that at the state level. But the taking argument I think falls flat, because you set up a moral hazard. Now when we give all this money to the industries and to the people and when we augment the unemployment, we're covering up the evil that the governors are doing to their constituents. In fact, we are encouraging them to do it. If you remember Ron DeSantis, he was a holdout. He was like Kristi Noem until the day after we passed the \$2 trillion bill. And at that point, it just didn't make any sense. The financial incentives were all wrong.

So what would my bill do? Well, let me make an admission here on your show that some people may not know. I voted for the first coronavirus bill in Congress. There was an \$8 billion bill, and I had to hold my nose because there was even money in there for foreign aid. But the bulk of the bill attacked the virus. And it wasn't a bailout bill; it was to try and get our heads around how this virus spreads, what could be some of the cures, those sorts of things. How do you stop the spread, how do we accelerate the testing? I say that bill attacked the virus, and every subsequent bill has attacked the taxpayer. If we wanted, in my opinion, to treat this as a foreign invader to our country, that would be my analogy. It would be like we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. As I read history, we didn't do a stimulus package when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor; we declared war.

And I would declare war on the virus. The government right now funds tens of thousands of PhDs, like people with doctorate degrees who collect a government paycheck, whether it's at Sandia National Labs or NIST or Huntsville, NASA. I think the bulk of those people should be working on this problem. If this is big enough to shut down our economy and invoke the biggest spending package in the history of mankind, the biggest debt in the history of mankind, then it's probably big enough to tell those PhDs, whether they are physicists or chemists or microbiologists: you work on this problem. Let's do a Manhattan-type Project against this problem, and let's get answers to these questions that I see debated on Twitter, which, these are answers we should have already.

For instance, how long did the antibodies last? I've tested positive for the antibody. So the question is, how long will that last, because that really dictates what the policy is going to be and how we get back out of this hole. Also, if you've developed antibodies in response to another coronavirus, do those convey immunity against this coronavirus? The more you read about how the test is done, the more you think that they probably would, since the antibodies attack the spikes on the virus. Then the whole question of masks. Let's do a scientific test on masks. Let's take a sample population that wears masks and one that doesn't, and in practice,

in reality, do they slow the spread? I think the only way we're going to get out of this is through herd immunity. And I've sort of conceded that maybe people putting these masks on and off and fiddling with these masks, they may get us to herd immunity quicker than not wearing the masks.

**WOODS:** Yeah, it's quite possible. It's quite possible. You mentioned Kristi Noem, on her Twitter account, not her personal one, but the one as governor of South Dakota, she's actually been politically brilliant here. I generally find that people on our side, they let opportunities pass them by. But she has a resilient one-minute video, urging people to move to South Dakota. And she's talking about how you can live your life, you can run your business. And I don't think it's any coincidence that there's nobody wearing a mask in the entire video. Now, I don't know the science behind masks. Maybe they do work. What I do know is that people have almost a religious devotion to them, and now we see a major spike in the Philippines, the most mask-compliant country in the world. It can't be the miracle cure people think it is.

But my point of bringing up Kristi Noem is I think most Republicans on this have been pretty darn useless. And part of that could well be that the public has been so panicked, irrationally, about the virus, that nobody feels like they have the ability to break through that, no matter how many statistics or sensible things to say they have. So you have natural, let's say, cowardice on the one hand, and then the fact that even if you were brave, you're up against the entire media establishment pounding away at people every day, claiming that this is more dangerous than it is. Where do you start?

**MASSIE:** I call March 27 the singularity, because the universe collapsed on me for demanding that people show up to pass a \$2 trillion bill.

**WOODS:** Oh, yeah.

**MASSIE:** Like, I know what that's like.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**MASSIE:** Fox, every network, Fox or MSNBC was saying I was single-handedly going to put the country into the next depression. The hyperbole was out of control. My colleagues were saying that I was going to get other colleagues killed and that the blood would be on my hands. And I tried everywhere in the world to get somebody else to do that, to stand up and ask for the roll call and ask for quorum, and I couldn't get a single person to do it because they were scared. They were terrified, not just of the virus and the way it had been hyped up by the media, but of their constituents.

So I was in a heated primary race at the time, and we were trying to keep Trump from endorsing my opponent, because I'd broken with him on, for instance, the Iran vote. The day before I got my primary opponent, the President called me and warned me I would get a primary if I voted for the Iran vote saying that he can't go to war without a declaration from Congress. Well, so that was the whole strategy. Well, here I had the president call me up that day, and he was — I mean, I haven't really talked about this in the media, but someday I'll write a book and talk about that phone conversation. It wasn't kind to me. So here you've got the most powerful man in the country, in the world, upset with you, saying he's going to make sure you lose your election. He's tweeting saying that I should be thrown out of the GOP.



**WOODS:** [laughing] I shouldn't laugh, but I just can't imagine what that was like.

**MASSIE:** Oh, and I was being offered all sorts of things — by my friends, so I'm not going to call them out and tell you the things that I was offered — if I wouldn't do that. But when that was all over, and it's still not over, but three weeks later, we decided to go into the field and poll, do some polling, because I was in the middle of a pitched battle. By the way, Liz Cheney sent money to and endorsed my opponent, as did some other national organizations that were coming after me and some other congressmen.

So we had to poll this. And my political consultants were telling me that this was a very popular bill that I had opposed, even among Republicans. And I said, well, then let's find out how popular it is. And I said, but I want to call it a bailout to half of the constituents and I want to call it a stimulus to the other half, because let's see if there's a better way to message this. Among Republican primary voters in Kentucky, three weeks after the bill passed, 83% had a favorable view of it if you called it a stimulus, and 79% — these are so-called conservatives had a favorable view of it, if you called it a bailout.

**WOODS:** Oh, wow.

**MASSIE:** You couldn't even change the opinion based on the poll question, which a lot of times people ask the question to try and get a certain answer. So we asked it both ways, and what we found out was four out of five Republicans approved this bill. So when you look at my colleagues and say, you know, were they cowards? In some sense, they were just representing the will of the people. And this is the conundrum you have as one of the gears in this great republic, when you have to vote on something, the question that you have to wrestle with is: do I vote the way I think I should vote, or do I would vote the way my constituents would have me vote today?

**WOODS:** But the thing is, I'm thinking about maybe not people at the federal level; I'm thinking about Republicans at the state level. Where are the Republicans speaking out for the forgotten man, the one whose business is destroyed because of irrational state decisions, people whose lives are ruined, whose dreams are indefinitely postponed? These people have been shamed into silence. They can't even speak up to just talk about the pain they've endured, because they'll be shamed and called a grandma killer. Where are the Republicans representing those people? That's what I mean.

**MASSIE:** Well, I can tell you in Kentucky, there are a couple outspoken state legislators and that's it. And we have 138; there's 100 in the House and 38 in the Senate. I mean, some of them will grumble about what the governor here has done, but there's one, Savannah Maddox, who's really taken a stand. And the funny thing is, everybody just looks at her in awe, as if they know that they should be doing it, I think, but they're not as vocal as she is, because they see the same thing that I see in my polling, which is you are really going upstream even among Republicans to come out against this. I mean, the 80% number is real. I paid for the poll myself.

But back to the age-old question: do you vote your conscience, or do you vote the way your constituents want you to vote that day? I think your job is to be somewhat of a flywheel and say, what will my constituents want in two years? Not what do they want today because the media is trying to tell them this is necessary, but after it's all said and done, what is the best thing for them? What will they actually want? Or if I could spend 15 minutes in a room with 20

people who oppose me on this issue who can vote for me, could I convince them that the vote that I took was actually the right vote, or at least half of them? That's sort of the litmus test that I have in my own mind when I take these votes, where it might seem like you're at odds with your constituency.

**WOODS:** Well, my gut tells me that right now you have people who think lockdowns work and this is all necessary to protect people, but as you say, two years from now when we'll have a lot more data and we'll be able to run graphs of the experiences of different states, plot them on the same chart, the numbers, and you won't be able to distinguish one state from another in terms of which one — You tell me, of these squiggly lines, which ones are states that locked down and which ones that didn't? At that point, it has to be the case that you turn to people and say this was for nothing. The virus did what it was going to do, regardless of what we did. Look at the look at the numbers. You had all these things done to you, despite the attempts of dissenting voices to protect you. You had these things done to you by power-mad people who were implementing a policy that's never been implemented anywhere for any virus. But maybe I'm just too optimistic in the good sense of the American public.

**MASSIE:** Some of it's the government doing it to you, and some of it's just your neighbors shaming you.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**MASSIE:** They don't even need the intermediary of a government. Maybe the imprimatur of a Fauci is all they need to scream at you if you don't have your mask on. Meanwhile, they don't know your health condition. Maybe you're somebody who has antibodies, that you're already over it. And then people who are wearing masks are trying to be polite. Most people, most polite people do not like confrontation, so they put the mask on. And maybe not because they believe it works, but just to avoid the confrontation. And then that emboldens the people who want to tell everybody else how to live. And I hope this doesn't all end up at mandatory vaccinations of dubious efficacy and safety.

**WOODS:** Well, listen, I'm going to let you go after to one final question that is completely unrelated to any of this, but I had a couple people kind of implying I'd be a terrible interviewer if I didn't ask them about their pet issue. So I'm going to do it. Why not? And that's electric cars. What do you think about the technology, like where it stands, where it's going? What is your comment? I mean, I don't want you to necessarily have to comment about a particular company, let's say, if you don't want to, but what about electric cars right now?

**MASSIE:** Great question. I actually think it's bigger than that. I think batteries are the future. And it's public knowledge, and so it's nothing for me to disclose it, but the only public stock that I own is Tesla stock. But not because I own their car, and I think — and by the way, they do make a great car. But it's not because of that; it's because I think batteries are going to change the way we live in the future. Even if you don't own a car, they'll change how the electricity in your house works. And I say that as somebody who took apart a wrecked Model S Tesla battery, rewired it, and it's been running my house for almost three years now. These things have a great future.

Electric cars, I can tell you the good, bad, and the ugly. I've owned mine for eight years now, a Tesla. I was one of the first adopters. It's not a good car to go cross country in. If I want to get to Washington, DC, I typically ask to borrow my wife's Expedition, because otherwise I'll

have to stop two or three times and charge the Tesla, and it will add an hour and a half to a seven-hour car ride. But that's really, frankly, the only dimension in which they are inferior to an internal combustion engine. In every other regard, they're better. You don't have to go to a gas station. The fuel is cheaper, not counting the amortization of the battery. But there's going to be breakthroughs there. The cars are faster, they're quieter. I'm a big fan of electric cars. I was on the solar car team in 1990 at MIT when we drove a solar car from Florida to Michigan, and I caught the bug then, and I've still got the bug.

**WOODS:** All right, well, I'm glad I did ask. If people want to follow you and/or support you online, what's the best way for them to do that?

**MASSIE:** Well, if they want to know what I'm doing politically, they can go to @RepThomasMassie. It's the same handle on Facebook as it is on Twitter, just plain @ThomasMassie on Parler. If they want to support me, they can go to ThomasMassie.com. And if you can't remember any of this, just search for #SassywithMassies, and you can find some of my finer moments on Twitter with that hashtag.

**WOODS:** Well, I will also link to those places at TomWoods.com/1711, which is our show notes page for today. I know you are crazy, because I can't imagine the life of a US Congressman. It seems like you're running for reelection again three months after you just got elected. It must be exhausting. So I am speaking for all my listeners. We're very grateful that you took the time to talk to us today. Thank you.

**MASSIE:** Well, I am honored to be on your show. I've been waiting for you to invite me. I didn't want to be so presumptuous as to invite myself. It took like eight years for me — next time, I'm just going to invite myself, because —

**WOODS:** I don't want to bother people. That's my flaw. I don't want to bother people.

**MASSIE:** I'm a big fan of yours, have been ever since we met in Cincinnati when we talked to the young college students there and I heard your speech and I was inspired. And it was actually somewhat intimidating to come on your show, because I have so much respect for you.

**WOODS:** I appreciate that very much. But for heaven's sake, you were saying earlier that you were thinking you'd be the more reasonable Rand Paul and you turned into Ron Paul? Yeah, I would say having Trump call you and saying I'm going to ruin you, and you still standing your ground, I would say you are a worthy successor to Ron Paul in that regard. So you have nothing to be afraid of from anybody. And I'll say something else. I can't wait to read that book when it comes out some day.

**MASSIE:** [laughing] Okay, well, I've got to make sure I'm out of Congress before I write it.

**WOODS:** That's right.

**MASSIE:** I'm not pulling any punches.

**WOODS:** That's right. Okay, well, we'll look forward to that. But in the meantime, we need you in Congress doing the things you've been doing. So thanks so much again. We appreciate it.

**MASSIE:** Thanks, Tom.