



Episode 1,760: Heterodox Leftist Opposes Lockdown and Democratic Establishment

Guest: Mark Crispin Miller

WOODS: I'm so glad to have made your acquaintance. I read your email, and you liked my video very much, and I actually have it linked with a redirect, TomWoods.com/COVIDVideo, the one I've been talking about on the show lately. So that was nice to see. I was just telling you before we started recording that our friend Martin Kulldorff, the infectious disease epidemiologist at Harvard Medical School, also tweeted out my video, so that makes me feel good. It's interesting about him – we'll get to all this later, but I'm virtually certain he's politically a lefty, and he finds it bizarre that he's in this situation where he has to be associated with the right-wing to favor letting people live their lives.

So there's a lot we can talk about, because once I start to look at your background, I thought, okay, yeah, this is an interesting person. Because I'll just say right off the bat, I am completely out of sympathy with the left-wing program such as it is. Completely. But at the same time, I think you're a great guy, so I don't know how to somehow make that all work together. But anyway, let's start off with what happened to you in the classroom, and then we'll go from there onto some other topics.

MILLER: All right, I am keen to talk about what we call the left today. Well, I teach a course on propaganda at NYU, I've taught it for years. And it's a popular course and a very gratifying experience. I approach propaganda not as an academic subject, not as something remote and abstract, as it's often taught, people focusing on the Nazis and the Soviets and maybe they'll talk about World War I, but they kind of leave it there. My view is that if you're going to study propaganda in any meaningful way, you have to contend with it at the time that the course is taking place, study it in real time, as it were. And encourage the students to try to keep their heads in the midst of it and look closely into it and examine those aspects of the story that have been misrepresented or blacked out and assess the truth of what they're hearing and reading and seeing everywhere. And then make an effort to figure out what interests are backing the propaganda drive and the purpose of that drive.

And as I explain to them, always, the beginning of each semester, this is difficult. This is not easy. I mean, real skepticism is very, very challenging. I mean, first of all, just discovering the truth takes work. And let me say parenthetically that even as we speak, with censorship metastasizing all over the internet, it's harder than ever. So it's sort of intellectually hard to be genuinely skeptical, but it's also socially hard and psychologically hard, because you often find yourself realizing that something you've believed for a long time, views you've held faithfully actually didn't end up in your mind by accident. This is a roundabout way of saying that we can always recognize the propaganda that we don't agree with, so if you ask any liberal what's an example of propaganda, they'll say Fox News.

WOODS: Right.

MILLER: But they can't perceive the propaganda that they do agree with, and that's true of everyone wherever they are politically, because propaganda works best when it tells you what you want to hear and when it comes at you as something other than propaganda. And that's why it's pointless to harp on the overt propaganda of the Nazis or in North Korea. Propaganda works best by coming at us as something like news or entertainment or comedy.

And so it's not only intellectually difficult, but it ends up being psychologically challenging and also socially difficult, because I tell them, you will, as you do the reading in this course and you learn certain things about, say, the Kennedy assassination — I mean the first one — or 9/11, or vaccines, you're going to find yourself thinking differently. And you're going to find your roommates, your friends, your family often are rolling their eyes and saying you're a conspiracy theorist. And let me add, that meme is one that we also study in class, the history of how that came to be a thing, which I guess we can talk about in a little bit.

So this semester, now that we're online, which is a whole other can of worms, I said at the beginning of the course we really can't avoid talking about the COVID moment, the COVID crisis, because it has entailed propaganda on an unprecedented scale, really. And I picked as an example the mask mandate in New York and at NYU. And I made very clear, explicit, I said, I am not telling you not to wear a mask. There's a rule here. I observe the rule. And I am simply suggesting that we think about things like this.

For example, I said, there are eight randomized controlled studies — this is the gold standard of scientific research — that had been conducted over the last 15 years or so among healthcare workers, finding that masks are not effective barriers against transmission of respiratory viruses. This is what that body of science says, and I encourage you to read those studies, because you're not going to hear about them in this maelstrom of pro-mask propaganda. I said I also think you should read the more recent studies finding otherwise. You should read those too.

And I gave them guidance on how to try to assess the veracity or reliability of the more recent studies. I mean, there are scientific reviews you can find, see what scientists say about the studies. Are they methodologically sound? I also recommended that looking at the universities where the studies were carried out to see if they have big pharma partnerships or take money from the Gates Foundation. So we talked about all this the first week.

The following week, a student joined the class late. And I think the second time she was there, the conversation about masks resumed, so she'd missed the beginning. And during this discussion when masks came up again, she said not a word. And then a few days later, I learned from my department chair that she had taken to Twitter to demand that NYU fire me. And it wasn't just one tweet; it was a stream of really venomous tweets. She was enraged not only that I'd brought it up, but also that when she called the bias hotline at NYU — you know, I was guilty of some kind of bias.

WOODS: Yeah, bias against stupid people.

MILLER: [laughing] Right. She didn't get any satisfaction. I mean, they rightly said to her we can't charge him with bias for what he's teaching. And so she complained about that. All right,

to my amazement, my department chair tweeted her his thanks. Let me say that her tweet sparked up Twitter storm, a lot of people attacking her, a lot of people attacking me. And among those thanking her was my department chair, who wrote to her: "We as a department have made this a priority and are discussing next steps," which I can only take to mean my termination. I mean, any rational person would read it that way. And I had not heard from any of my colleagues. I didn't know that they had made any decision or taken a position, but it was clear now that they had.

Then the dean of the school that I teach in, which is the Steinhardt School, and the doctor who advises NYU on its Chinese-style COVID regulations, I emailed my students without putting me on copy, essentially telling them that I had given them misinformation and basically telling them to read this particular list of studies from the CDC, which their email called "authoritative." I mean, the CDC, of course, until April had endorsed the consensus that I was talking about in class, that masks don't work. Then they switched. Well, now, now they're "authoritative," right? Straight out of Orwell.

Then after that interference or intervention in my class, I was pressed to cancel the propaganda course for next term, on the grounds that my other course – I teach a film course here. Being very popular, if I were to teach two sections of that, instead of that and the propaganda course, it would mean higher enrollments for the department. All right, that's a kind of a sleazy argument, but it's also completely groundless because the two courses are the same size. The same number of students enroll in them. The propaganda course is often waitlisted. So that was a transparent falsehood. That's not the reason they wanted me to cancel it.

And I won't go into detail on the two prior attempts to take me down this year. Suffice it to say that, since I started – I have this listserv News From Underground at MarkCrispinMiller.com. The stuff ends up on Twitter, and I've been working almost full time circulating information about the COVID crisis that people don't know and need to know, stuff that comes from all over the world, scientific studies that are overlooked, etc., and I think my doing that has attracted some hostile attention. NYU is a very vaccine-centric institution, as many universities are. And they drove out a member of the law school faculty, who is now working with Bobby Kennedy's Children's Health Defense, a terrific lawyer, because she is a vaccine safety advocate.

So I think this has come from on high. And there is a petition that I'm sure you can tell your listeners about in defense of academic freedom and free speech. And I'll just end by saying that it is not just a petition in defense of my academic freedom and free speech. It's actually a protest against the rampant censorship faced by professors, scientists, doctors, journalists, and others, on all kinds of subjects, censorship that's been worsening for decades, from the time of the first Kennedy Assassination up through 9/11, then transgender medicine and vaccine safety and all these other issues that you're not really allowed to talk about for various reasons without being vilified, dismissed as a conspiracy theorist or an anti-vaxxer or transphobic or whatever. Now, under the shadow of COVID-19 and this astonishing blitz, this global propaganda blitz, such censorship is more oppressive and dangerous than ever, and that's because propaganda depends on censorship.

WOODS: Well, let me tell everybody listening that I signed the petition, and that I'd like people listening to sign the petition. Stop what you're doing. If you're driving, pull over. Stop what you're doing. And I made it easy to get there by creating a redirect link, so all you have

to type in is TomWoods.com/Miller, and you'll automatically be redirected to the petition page and you just sign your name. Enough's enough here. We have to stand with the people who are being put upon by those who feel offended by dissident points of view. And these are, meanwhile, the same people who consider themselves part of the resistance. If they had any idea what it was like to be Mark Crispin Miller for ten minutes, then they'd know what a real resistance looks like.

And incidentally, let me add one other thing. When I saw how your department chair responded, I wrote to say to you – now, this isn't your word, this is mine. I said you have some kind of creep as a department chair, basically throwing you under the bus. He doesn't even talk to you first? He immediately basically congratulates the student for being a closed-minded nitwit. Part of me thinks, before you become a department chair – that's not true in all cases. But before you become a department chair, there's a procedure you go through: the removal of the spine. But then the other thing I thought was, it's not the removal of the spine. In some cases, it's a personality type. This is the sort of person who just wants to be invited to the cocktail parties, be among the respectable literati, and be able to say to *The New York Times*, "I'm not like that guy over there. Look at him over there. He's awful." I think that's what you've been saddled with, unfortunately. You don't have to comment on that part of it, but I'm just saying, as an outsider, that's what it looks like to me.

MILLER: Well, let me say, I mean, this guy was long a friend of mine. He was actually one of the few of us in this ever larger department who has continued to focus on media studies. Neil Postman ran the department, he hired me in the '90s, and he hired –

WOODS: Wow, I actually know of – well, I don't know if he's reasonably well known, but yeah, I know who he is. That's amazing.

MILLER: Yeah, yeah. And he hired me in part to be a public intellectual. Since his death I guess about 12 years ago or so, the department has become much larger, more academic and more theory-oriented, more social-justice-oriented, and less interested in media studies. And in my chair is one of the few of us who continued to focus on that kind of work. And I think in his case, what's happened is what always happens at NYU, is that when you're chair of a department, you don't actually represent the interests of the faculty to the administration; you represent the interests of the administration to the faculty. I mean, this gets us into a discussion of the corporate university, which is essentially run by its board of trustees, who are the .1%, some of the wealthiest buccaneers on Wall Street and in New York City real estate and in corporate law, some very powerful people in China and in Abu Dhabi. It's really their bailiwick. And they have a certain amount of disdain for the faculty.

So it's ironic that a faculty that regards itself as terribly progressive, oh-so radical, has basically embraced the whole lockdown ideology. And this is not a speculation, it's a fact, that they are offended by my position. This gets us into the whole question of what it means to be on the left today, what the left even is. I've tried to engage with some of them. I'm on a list of progressive faculty and there's a lot of back and forth. And they've been sharing fear propaganda and maintaining themselves in a state of constant panic, absolutely refusing to go back into the classroom, which I was willing to do it. I'm 70. I have chronic Lyme disease. But I've studied this crisis carefully. I lost a friend to this disease months ago, and I almost lost another, a good friend and colleague here. So I'm not cavalier about the risks, but I also don't think that there's any need to close universities and schools.

I think it's grossly unfair to the students, who pay through the nose to go here – it may be the most expensive university on the planet when you factor in all the hidden fees and so on – and to take that money and then give them an online education as if it were the University of Phoenix strikes me as wrong. And they've been punished in the most draconian way for having six or seven people over to dinner at their apartments. I mean, a number of students are suing them over this. It's crazy. It's like a correctional facility. So I don't really understand what NYU, like many other schools, thinks it's doing. Do they actually think they're going to continue to get people paying all those dollars and slipping so deeply into debt peonage for years, if not forever, to have an experience like that?

So I have tried to engage my colleagues with some information, some data, some studies, to make clear so many – I know you completely get this. I mean, there are so many aspects of the narrative that are completely false. The surge in cases: what do they mean by cases? They're not cases; they're people testing positive. And they're people tested with a test that wasn't even meant by its inventor to be used to diagnose viruses. And asymptomatic cases are not infectious or maybe very mildly so. I mean, one could go on.

There's just so much to point out to people, but my attempts to engage them have all failed, because either they just become abusive, snide, or they say nothing. They lapse into silence. And it's because – and I think this applies to all those whose minds are closed on the subject. It's because they are, first of all, terrorized and therefore inclined to seize on official explanations because it gives them comfort, and also, being academics, they think they know everything already. And as Mark Twain said, it's easier to fool a man than to convince him that he's been fooled, you know?

WOODS: Right, right.

MILLER: You can't tell these people you've actually soaked up a lot of misinformation. I mean, they read *The New York Times*, they listen to NPR, they read *The Atlantic*, they read what's on the BBC website. How could they be misinformed? They're very well informed, you know? Well, this attests to the power of propaganda. I mean, those outlets have all received funding from the Gates Foundation.

WOODS: But the thing is that not only have they absorbed the same ideas of everyone else and not understood how much of it is propaganda, but they even use exactly the same phrases. Like I just gave this as an example, but "The hospitals are overwhelmed." I'm sure there are other ways in the English language to convey that idea, but it's like everyone has to convey it in the same words, and none of them stops to wonder about that. Because as you say, it's hard to spot propaganda that you believe in.

And I know that for a fact, by the way, from my own life, because when I was a college student, I entered college in 1990. I supported the Persian Gulf War. And there was a lot of propaganda that went into supporting that war, and I'm pretty sure, if I'm remembering this right, Noam Chomsky pointed out at the time that basically every major newspaper everywhere in the country editorialized in favor of it. Could it really have been that obvious a home run that everybody – so every respectable outlet went for it, and so I went for it, and it was very hard to get me out of out of that.

But the one thing that started to do it was just hearing the stories of the human suffering that was brought about by that war. And I just thought, I don't know if this is something I can

really endorse. And then when I went to see my European history professor, and I just said, I'm really troubled about this. I feel like I should support this war, but there's a lot of damage being done. And this guy was a left liberal – the sort of person you can't stand, I'm sure – a conventional, left liberal. He told me to go read the cover story in *The New Republic* about the war and that would put my conscience at ease. [laughing] I'm afraid I did that.

MILLER: Oh, God.

WOODS: I know, like the worst advice ever was to read *The New Republic*, but I did it.

MILLER: Right, yeah. Well, it's interesting you mentioned that as an example. I mean, we've all had such experiences as thinking people. I should say, we thinking people have all had that experience, where you thought something is true forever, because it plays to your preconceptions and you want to think it's true, and the tribe you belong to, they all think it's true. Or you think something isn't true, because it seems outlandish to you. It can't possibly have been a fake or a hoax. I mean, we could go on. We could talk about all this for hours and hours. The Gulf War was a propaganda masterpiece, and that's why people like you were smitten by it.

WOODS: And what's interesting, if I may jump in here, is that I was an Ivy League student, so I wasn't an idiot. It wasn't a matter of I had an IQ of 73 and that's why I was easily swayed. So it's not that it necessarily is successful only in targeting people who just aren't bright. There are plenty of people who fall for propaganda who are quite bright. So it's a really fascinating phenomenon to me.

MILLER: Well, that's an extremely important point. In fact, it was Chomsky in his book on the intellectuals in the '60s who made the point that educated people are often more susceptible to propaganda than the uneducated. I mean, that's because so much of it is pitched at educated people. That's the way it's been since the Allied propaganda drive against Germany in World War I, which this is a lot like, only this is much worse. It is smart people who are persuaded or compelled to buy it, hook, line, and sinker. So it's not a matter of a low IQ. I mean, that's what makes it so dispiriting, to hear people who are smart and often who are very progressive journalists – I mean, I could name some names – who do exactly what you're saying.

I got in an argument with one whose work I've long admired – this was on Facebook – over masks, and I posted something there about Milwaukee mandating masks, and this was in August, and it was extremely hot there. And it's got I think a majority black population. And black people are more subject to asthma than others; there's higher diabetes rates among black people. And here they are, walking around masked in the summer heat. And I had already studied not only the evidence of their ineffectiveness, but in the growing body of evidence that they're unhealthy. They damage your immune system and they induce hypoxia. They're just bad for you. And I posted this and said, why would they do this? And this guy was enraged, and he came out with a sort of litany of talking points that I had been reading all over the press. He said, well, it's not to protect your sorry butt, he writes, it's to protect other people. How many times have you heard that?

WOODS: Yeah, I can't get over how many people think that by repeating the conventional wisdom that we've all had drummed into our heads 100 times, that constitutes an argument.

MILLER: I know. I know. I know, exactly. So that experience combined with about 50 others just like it has finally convinced me that it's a waste of time to argue with people like that. You just can't do it. I mean, whatever happens to them will happen. It's people whose minds are open. And I have to say, I've found working people to be a lot more sensible about all this. When I see somebody on the staff in my building or some worker out in a store masked up, I will often say, "I hope you don't have to wear that for too long. It's not good for you." And they often say, "Yeah, I know. They make me wear it." So it's under compulsion. But you don't get that kind of resigned, skeptical attitude from my peers. From them, you get a kind of zealotry. You get a fervor. It's like the Red Guards or something. And it's getting worse.

As the actual crisis recedes in the rearview mirror and there is really no evidence of a second wave, the commitment to masking is become more intense, and the mandates become tighter, as lockdowns are now being reimposed with varying degrees of resistance, depending on what country you're talking about. And my worry is that, you may remember Bill Gates, Bill and Melinda appeared in a video in which he was barely able to control his face. He couldn't hide his smile and said that there would be a second wave coming out this fall and that will get people's attention. I don't know if you saw that. And she broke into a broad grin. I mean, it was one of the most grotesque things I've ever seen. It was basically promising us something was going to hit us, and I have no doubt that it will.

I think something will be rolled out, and then you've got all these people whose immunities have been weakened by masking, and you've got all these people who've been — and this is really criminal — told to get flu shots, which they've all done. And I can send you maybe half a dozen studies of how bad an idea, suggesting that that's probably the worst thing you can do, because flu shots seem to induce this sort of viral interference that makes one more susceptible to acute respiratory infection. And there's a study from Bergamo in northern Italy, which was the epicenter of the crisis there, and it turns out that just about everybody who died had received a flu shot. There's a study from the Department of Defense which made the same finding. It came out early in the summer. You're 36% likelier to be infected with an acute respiratory condition if you get a flu shot. And here the government and the media are all pushing people to get them. And this is beyond perverse. This really requires that we ask some tough questions, some uncomfortable questions.

But this is all by way of saying that if and when something strikes and people are weakened and succumb to it, it will all inevitably be ascribed to COVID-19. And then the mask hysteria will intensify, the censorship will worsen, and conversations like this one will become that much more important and yet also difficult.

WOODS: I want to shift a little bit onto a couple of other but in some ways related topics. I don't even really know where to begin. There's a lot of things I want to say. First of all, let's talk for a minute — I really don't care — I know it's going to sound crazy, but I really don't care that much about the Hunter Biden thing. And I know I should, and if the stuff is true, then it shows Joe Biden is corrupt. But I generally just find it more interesting to keep the arguments I make on the level of ideas. The reason I wouldn't vote for Joe Biden has really nothing to do with any of this. Even if he were squeaky clean, I would still not vote for him because he thinks it's a promise rather than a threat that he's going to do whatever Fauci tells him. Well, that alone disqualifies him, even if he had the best son in the world. So this stuff I just don't go for. I know some people do. I really don't.

But what is very interesting to me about it is the instant proclamation that this must be Russian disinformation. And I consider that to be so stupid that it makes me laugh that somebody would be dumb enough to think that. And my impression of this is that that's the kind of thing that is said by people who obviously don't really believe that, but they know there are enough what we like to call midwits out there who will latch onto this phrase and will go around promoting this and just repeat "Russian disinformation, Russian disinformation." The Russian must be laughing their behinds or actually scratching their heads in wonderment at how stupid Americans are. Do you think that this Russian disinformation thing, which I assume you don't believe in – do you think it really is as I described, that the people pushing this themselves know it's just a way to manipulate the public and they don't actually think the Russians planted this story?

MILLER: Well, I think I think that's true in some cases, but at a certain level, it doesn't even matter. The most relevant book that people should all read or reread now is *1984*. I mean, that's the book that really illuminates this moment, much more than anything that Karl Marx ever wrote. Because what's happening now is something that I don't think Marx anticipated, which is kind of a push by a global elite back towards something like a feudal system based on AI and robotics and so on.

And in answer to your point, what's most relevant in Orwell's novel is the concept of doublethink, that you can simultaneously see through something as a lie and yet passionately believe in it at the same time. That's what doublethink is. And so I think that the people who say that, on some level know it's bulls***, and at the same time, they think it's true. So really trying to get them to see through it is sort of pointless, because they already do, but they think it's necessary. And in the case of the *Times* and professors and everybody else in the so-called resistance, it's all based on their hatred of Trump – just as they think that COVID-19 is like the only cause of death, like there was no death before COVID-19 and nobody's dying of anything else.

And that's what propaganda does. It's monomaniacal. It's like one thing only matters. Climate change is the only threat to the environment. And there are so many others, but they don't count. They're eclipsed by that. So Donald Trump has everything that's wrong with America. And until Trump came along, all our presidents were wonderful, and even George W. Bush has been rehabilitated as this sweet guy. They even hailed John Bolton. This guy's a foaming-at-the-mouth warmonger. John McCain, right? This guy, "bomb, bomb, bomb, bomb, bomb Iran." I mean, this guy was really lethal. But because he seemed to be an adversary of Trump's, he got this sort of Stalinesque –

WOODS: Yeah, they can overlook all that. And on social media, you'll see occasionally this photo of the Bushes with the Obamas and the Clintons, and they're all standing together smiling. And then you get people who describe themselves as being on the left who say, "I miss these days." And I just think, okay, you're telling me you miss the days when the American establishment could just sup in happy concord together without being put upon by a populist insurgency. Ah, those days. I don't particularly see what the establishment has done that's been so terrific that I would want to cheer that.

And then the other thing, the McCain thing. I'm going to say something that I guess for my audience won't be too shocking, but maybe for some people. I mean, obviously McCain never saw a war he didn't like, but the war hero thing, because he spent years in a prisoner of war camp, okay, but the thing is, it's not like he was just innocently walking around Hanoi one day

and they just grabbed him. I mean, he was actually doing really awful things to people, and so they tried to stop him from doing that. I mean, I realize that this makes me sound like Jane Fonda, but the fact is that's what happens when you go bomb people. I mean, what do you think is going to happen when you do that?

MILLER: Well, they don't take it well, do they. Right, exactly. It's a kind of a nationalist narcissism on our part that has us blind to that fact.

WOODS: Right, we're allowed to be upset if somebody did that to us, but doggone it, you have no right to be unhappy when all these bombs are dropped on you.

MILLER: Yeah.

WOODS: Can you talk to me now – we've been dancing around it, but let's get right to the heart of it here. I get intensely frustrated with the so-called right wing, because if the right wing is Bob Dole, then what is the point of anything? I mean, Bob Dole is just Bill Clinton, but just 20% less. And they agree on the major things.

MILLER: Right.

WOODS: There's nothing interesting about Bob Dole, the most boring guy in the world. When Bob Dole was the GOP nominee in the '90s, that's when I just stopped following politics. And oh, gosh, especially to watch Fox News during the Iraq War – but I guess it was probably any network, but boy, was it the worst. It was just horrible. You couldn't get any truth out there at all. It's like watching stories about the virus on MSNBC. No matter how hard you try, you're not going to get a fact out of that network. That made me crazy. And so then I occasionally find people who I feel like are pretty good who are on the right, but they're few and far between. Most of them are swamp creatures, or what I prefer – I actually kind of like the David Icke formulation, not that I believe it, but I like lizard people. I think that's a great way to describe them. I call them lizard people.

So I'm sure for you, you're looking around and you say, look, if Hillary Clinton is the left, then there's obviously no meaning to this term. But even beyond that, there are plenty of people who, let's say are Bernie people, who yet are still terrible on the lockdowns. They're terrible at a whole lot of things. There aren't that many people like you and Caitlin Johnstone who will say the Russiagate thing was stupid, of all possible things to attack Trump for. The real problem with Trump is he's too bellicose toward Russia. Of all possible things. You have 27 things you could pick. You pick that? You have to make something up?

MILLER: Yeah, right.

WOODS: So just share your thoughts with me on this.

MILLER: Well, I mean, there's so much to say about this. I don't think we have a left at all. In fact, I think the left today is just the 1950s right 2.0. And by that, I mean they are rabidly Russophobic. They see Russia as the great evil the way that the John Birch Society saw the Soviet Union back in the day. They are completely pro-censorship, much more than the right is. And I mean, I thought the right was pretty censorious, and I should know, because I wrote two books on the Bush administration and a book on the theft of the 2004 election. And I even

did a show, a six-week show in 2004 at the New York Theatre Workshop called *Patriot Act*. And I'm on a right-wing blacklist called Professor Watchlist, which is alphabetized by first names. I mean, it's not that sophisticated.

But the left, so-called left is really deeply into censorship. The student who wanted me fired is a BLM, smash-capitalism, defend-the-police social justice warrior. And my colleagues, who apparently side with her, are the same, and they want anyone who disagrees or questions the official narrative to be silenced.

The left today really detests the working class, as far as I can tell. I mean, they fetishize black people. They'll capitalize the word Black, and they'll sink to their knees when you say BLM, but they don't really care about black people. I mean, if they did, they would be taking an entirely different position on the lockdowns and on things like the government's failure to recommend that people take vitamin D, in which black people tend to be deficient, and that deficiency is linked to COVID infection. I could go on. So you subtract race from the working class and you listen to the way they talk about the working class, really, it's just manifest contempt. They loathe these people. They think they're all Nazi. So that a hatred of the working class was once a kind of right-wing position.

And they're even – and this is kind of an interesting twist – they've even become very anti-feminist. I'm actually a committed feminist. And the left is obsessed with trans rights, trans activism, which includes insisting that biological males be allowed to compete with girls and women in athletics and includes allowing biological males' admittance to women's shelters and women's prisons. That's just wrong. That's something that, okay, so they're talking about the feelings of these trans people being injured. What about the feelings of all those women? That's an anti-feminist position. Not to mention the fact that radical medical intervention in the sexual development of children is not okay. But the left is all for it. The Democratic Party has no problem with that.

So I don't really know what they mean by *left*. It's all about identity politics. It's all based on tribes and censorship and pronouns and taking down statues. It's not about stopping war. It's not about fighting for workers' rights. It's not about resisting corporate power. It's not about opposing Big Pharma. And here we have a left that has now basically defined itself through its hatred of Donald Trump and Trump's supporters. That's what the left is. It is anti-Trump. I don't know what's going to happen to them when he's gone. They're going to be very depressed. They're going to miss their sort of defining principle that's Donald Trump. They hate him so much. And they think that he is threatening us with fascism. They compare him to Hitler, okay? I even know people who have studied the Holocaust and written books about it who think that Trump is Hitler, which is beyond preposterous for many reasons.

But what's most insidious about this misperception is that they're pointing at Trump and like the Proud Boys as posing some sort of fascist threat when we have an outright totalitarianism rolling out around the world right before our eyes. We're talking about health passports. We're talking about constant contact tracing. We're talking about mandatory vaccination programs. We're talking about ever-worsening censorship. This is what totalitarianism looks like, and it's happening, and they're all supporting it.

So that the left-right divide, you're absolutely right to point out that it's been meaningless for a long time, because the two parties are, as Upton Sinclair said decades ago, two wings on a single bird of prey. And it's been this way forever, and it's worse now. I mean, there were

some progressives in the Democratic Party, like Paul Wellstone. Well, we know what happened to him. There was Dennis Kucinich, there was Cynthia McKinney. They were unseated through election theft, and it wasn't the Russians who did it, right? And the Democratic Party said nothing about it. They probably were involved in it.

So yeah, it's a sideshow. The whole thing's a sideshow. We should be talking about, like the trillion dollars that was stolen, basically, under the auspices of the CARES Act with COVID as a pretext. We should be talking about the obscene increase in the wealth of the world's top billionaires, how much richer Bezos and Gates and others are now than they were even ten months ago. We should be talking about that. We should be talking about the plan to roll out a cashless economy. We should be talking about the Great Reset, which is not a conspiracy theory. I mean, it's explicit. There's websites, there's a book. The plan is to take away our lives and everything that makes them joyful forever and transform the world into this high-tech dystopia that's only going to keep this super-rich class in power and wealth forever at our expense. That's what we should be talking about. We should not be talking about the election.

Now, let me say that the right has in its favor the fact that among them are some libertarians who are willing to question the lockdown narrative. It is the libertarians who are opposing lockdown. They're the ones who appreciate the importance of freedom. The left doesn't care at all. The left is enamored of the super state, and they want Dr. Fauci to tell us how to live and what to do. They'll follow his orders. They're the good Germans of today. The libertarian right is not going to go for that. So it's long been those sort of eccentric figures who questioned the intelligence agencies and the FBI and so on as secret police. They're the constitutional purists. So I would say that, all things being equal, there are more figures on the right who are reasonable and have the right idea than there on the so-called left, which I mean, I can't find any variety or diversity within their ranks. I mean, they all seem to be on the same page, absolutely. And that's very troubling.

WOODS: Well, I presume you're familiar at this point with the so-called, I think we've mentioned it, the Great Barrington declaration, because two of the three scientists who were the chief architects of that I think are politically on the left. I don't think Bhattacharya is because he's at Hoover, so I assume certain things about that. But Kulldorff and Gupta — when Sunetra Gupta was asked about this, because of course the American Institute for Economic Research, which it's under their auspices that the declaration was released, she was asked, Well, wait a minute, I mean, is this just some big libertarian plot? And she said, my politics are very far from libertarian.

And Kulldorff, who is trying to be nonpolitical, very much to his credit — we should try to be nonpolitical on this — nevertheless, he's dropped hints, and he did an interesting interview in *Jacobin Magazine* that he is on the left. But it's just for some reason, the American left in particular — now, on the other hand, I'm sure there are plenty of pro-lockdown Europeans, but there's something I don't know particularly perverse about the American left, it seems to me —

MILLER: Oh, definitely.

WOODS: Like I could move to Sweden, and yeah, there would be things about the left wing in Sweden that would probably bother me, but I feel like I could probably just live my life and

not be badgered 24 hours a day and lectured to about things I didn't do. I think I could live a fairly peaceful life there.

MILLER: Well, it's probably likelier than your being able to do it here. The American left – and this applies to some extent to left movements abroad, but particularly here, the left has been systematically and incrementally depoliticized through very clever moves by the CIA and its adjuncts, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. This has been going on for decades. They have managed to move the left away from economic analysis and a concern with class, which is what makes leftism meaningful at all, it seems to me, towards a more race, gender, identitarian orientation. This is certainly the case with the campus left, and it all has to do with the kinds of grants and research – I should say the kind of research that those big foundations have funded for decades.

If you dig into the history of the Black Panther Party, for example, you find that the intelligence communities were encouraging and cultivating black separatist movements in opposition to the Panthers. This is a history that has yet to be written up in one coherent volume, but there are pieces of it that have been established already here and there. And it's a story that needs to be told, because I don't believe that the left was defaced or disfigured or, let's say, perverted just by accident. How it came to be not about economic justice and an end to war and so on, and came instead to be about intersectionality and white fragility and all that stuff, that didn't just happen. That was engineered with great success, it seems to me.

Back in the '70s when the Church Committee was looking into CIA abuses, the guy who had just taken over the CIA during that unprecedented crisis in public relations for them, was George H.W. Bush. He was made CIA Director, and I think his main task – and he only ran it for a year or so – was to steer the CIA through that storm and help them weather it. And he negotiated with Frank Church over what areas the CIA did not really want the committee to look into. And since the committee got all of its documents and everything they had from the CIA and the FBI, they sort of had to listen to what the CIA wanted.

There were two areas that Bush prevailed on them to ignore. One was the CIA's influence on the media, and the other was the CIA's influence on academia, or I should say its presence in academia. The Church Committee report has some pages on CIA media involvement. They're okay. They're a little general. But there's nothing in the report about the CIA's academic presence. And I think it's probably been decisive, you know, many, many schools. And so this is an undercurrent of modern American history that's I think been under-studied, but it's one that would help us see why the left has gone so far astray, and the Democratic Party with it.

WOODS: As we wrap up, let me ask: what would you recommend my folks read on the general subject of propaganda? Should they read the Bernays book? I think you wrote the introduction to an edition of that.

MILLER: Yeah, the paperback edition of Edward Bernays' classic *Propaganda* is a good place to start, because I have a long introduction to it that places that book in its historical context and also points out where it's misleading. And if they're serious about it, they should also get hold of a book that was published the same year, 1928, called *Falsehood in Wartime* by a British Member of Parliament named Arthur Ponsonby.

WOODS: I have that on my shelf right now, as a matter of fact.

MILLER: Right. You read those two together, it's very illuminating. It's such a huge subject otherwise, that I guess the other book I would strongly recommend is called *Conspiracy Theory in America* by Lance DeHaven-Smith. That's a hyphenated name. And this is a book by a professor of public policy at Florida Atlantic University. I think he's retired now. I asked him to write this book. For a series I was editing at the University of Texas Press. This is a must-read, because it explains how it came to happen that the phrase *conspiracy theory* and *conspiracy theorist* became such a widely used, pejorative terms, because *conspiracy theory* wasn't really much used by us journalists until 1967, and *conspiracy theorist* was never used. It was the CIA that actually weaponized the term in '67.

There's a memo 1035-960, which people can find online, that lays out why they did – I mean, you can read the memo. Their purpose of weaponizing the term was to discredit books that were questioning the Warren Report on JFK Dallas. And these books were selling handsomely, and the CIA was concerned about that. So they urged their station chiefs worldwide to use their media connections to generate hostile reviews and articles so that people would distrust these critiques. And that was a staggeringly successful propaganda drive.

It never stopped, as the phrase *conspiracy theory* continued to be used through the Bobby and King assassinations and the October surprise in 1980 and Iran contra and 9/11 and up to today. Now everybody uses it. We all use it. We all say, "Oh, that's a conspiracy theory," or we say – this I hear people say a lot – "Well, I'm not a conspiracy theorist, but..." right? Then they'll say something perfectly rational. I mean, there's something really important about having a healthy distrust of elite intentions. I mean, that's as American as apple pie. That's the Declaration of Independence, one long conspiracy theory.

WOODS: Well, let me jump in on this, because just two weeks ago, I spent a weekend in Jekyll Island, Georgia. Now, I think most people on the left if – again, I'm sorry to use that – you know what I mean: people who think of they're on the left. If you talk to them about the Federal Reserve, they think there's something wrong with you. You're obviously crazy.

So in other words, what these people want us to believe, contrary to what they claim to believe about every other institution, is that a bunch of the wealthiest, most influential bankers met under assumed names in this remote area to draw up legislation for the common good. [laughing] So I'm supposed to believe that that's what was going? If it were anything else, if it were, let's say, Walmart's CEO and Target, and they all gathered together and they emerged with some legislation about big box retail stores, would we automatically assume that was for the public good? No, of course not.

But here, it's like this is part of the American establishment, so therefore, you are a "conspiracy theorist" even to think about it. Now, of course, calling me a conspiracy theorist is not actually an argument. I actually have arguments. I can say, look, this does not actually benefit the average person, nor was it designed to. And I can demonstrate that with facts. But if I'm just going to be dismissed with that term, then that allows them to skip the trouble of having to have an argument with me.

MILLER: Well, exactly. They're not interested in arguments. And there's this whole fact checking industry now that's basically subsidized by the likes of the Gates Foundation and Big Pharma. That's what it is. That's what it does. And if you read how they fact check claims that are, in fact, true and accurate, is that they rely on that phrase or variants of that phrase, like fake news or junk science or something like that, and ridicule, right? Ridicule and appeals to

authority. That's the whole argument. They don't have an argument. They don't have any counter evidence. They don't address the actual facts of the matter. What they do is they give people a handy way – they give them something that they can fling at you and say, "See, look at this. That's conspiracy theory." It's an admission of defeat.

And actually, to be called a conspiracy theorist is increasingly becoming kind of a badge of honor, as far as I'm concerned, because the evidence of what we're calling conspiracy theory in so many cases is so copious and explicit and incontestable, that to dismiss it as conspiracy theory, that's a sign that you're not using your mind at all. You're some kind of a coincidence theorist, or I don't know what you'd call them. But the fact is that it wasn't until the '60s that the American people ceased to trust their own instincts about elite power and executive authority and now feel that there's something shameful about harboring these suspicions. There's something wrong with me if I flirt with conspiracy theory.

And that's kind of thing that enables the most horrendous crimes against humanity to take place. I think McLuhan said, it's the big lies are protected, or the he major – I'm going to botch this, but it's something like the most horrendous crimes are protected by public incredulity. In other words, you can't believe that they would do this, and you don't want to believe that they would do this. And since propaganda works best by telling you what you want to hear, the non-argument that it's a conspiracy theory really appeals to people who don't want to think that the Federal Reserve is what it actually is, or for that matter, that the CDC is actually what it is and that the World Health Organization is actually what it is. I mean, these are deeply corrupt institutions with major ties to Big Pharma. They're not about the public health; they're about something else.

WOODS: Well, one of the things that really made me think, for the first time, gee, maybe the creeps in the American establishment might not actually be motivated entirely by my welfare was when I saw the – I mean, yes, I know this took me a long time to come to this realization, but in particular, it was the Iraq War of 2003. I do not believe that they were honestly misled by the intelligence, blah, blah, blah. All the excuses they make now, they're all pathetic, so I don't buy any of them. I think they knew that there was nothing to it, and they knew that what they were doing was, of course, going to lead to horrendous, avoidable loss of life, not to mention the dislocation of millions of people. I mean, refugees like crazy. They knew this, and they did it anyway. Now, if they're capable of that – some of the things that – again, I don't go for necessarily – maybe you and I will disagree on some things, and I won't agree that maybe in this case, the elites did this event. But my point is, after that, I can't put it past them, because half the things that the elites are accused of doing by so-called conspiracy theorists are far more benign than what they did in Iraq. And if they did that, I don't see how you can put anything past them.

MILLER: Well, I agree. I mean, yes. I take no pleasure in the view that their intentions are often malign. But once you study the Kennedy assassination in depth, you have a hard time putting a positive spin on their machinations. And once you've studied what they've done abroad to countries all over the world, not just Iraq – I mean, that was a grotesque crime against humanity. But look what they did to Libya. Look what they did in Ukraine. I mean, they installed a junta that was comprised of technocrats and outspoken neo-Nazis, which was dismissed as Russian propaganda, that claim, until even *The New York Times* had to grudgingly admit that actually there was a significant neo-Nazi presence in that junta, and that the troops fighting in East Ukraine were basically neo-Nazi battalions. You just had to read interviews with them in the press abroad to find that out.

So all this suggests a pattern of malfeasance, let's call it, that we have to come to terms with if we're going to get through this and reclaim something of America and our democracy. We have to come to terms with it. It is very dark, but if that's where the facts take us, I don't see that we have any choice, you know?

WOODS: Well, let me urge people to check out your website, MarkCrispinMiller.com. I'll link to that at TomWoods.com/1760. And don't forget also to sign the petition, that's TomWoods.com/Miller. I'll also link to that, as well, at TomWoods.com/1760. Is there anything else you think we should promote before we wrap up for today?

MILLER: I'll just mention this series I edited called *The Forbidden Bookshelf*, which is published by Open Road Media. And this is an eBook series of important works that have slipped out of print, most of which were variously killed at birth. The most important thing for us to do is to discover the truth and reclaim real history, which means to find the information that has been hidden from us, taken away, suppressed in various ways. And that's happening now at a dizzying pace. So these books about the DuPonts, and the American government's import of Nazis after World War II, the Phoenix program in Vietnam, the CIA's Phoenix program. There's 27 titles.

The series overall did not make sufficient profit to justify their continuing it. I could probably lengthen that list to hundreds of titles that have been killed, but the 27 that we've done are all very important books, well worth reading. And as I was working on the series, I would find more books. People would send me more titles to read, and it was a whole alternative history of the United States that makes Howard Zinn's book look tame. So there's a real need for a series like that, and we made a good start on it, and I think your listeners would probably very much enjoy looking at the titles and reading any of them that they choose.

WOODS: Well I'll link, as I see how to find this — there's an Amazon page, but there's also an article you did at the History News Network, so I'll link to that also at TomWoods.com/1760, about the *Forbidden Bookshelf*. So there's so much Mark Crispin Miller material and recommended material on this page, you could really spend a good chunk of your life digging into it, and I don't think it would be a bad use of your time. And speaking of uses of your time, I appreciate you taking all this time with me today, and I'm glad to have gotten to know you. I appreciate what you're doing.

MILLER: Well, right back atcha. Your talk was so powerful and so moving and so important. I shared it immediately with my list. And I tell you, the reviews were glowing, so it's very good to get to know you too.

WOODS: Wonderful. Well, normal people everywhere need to come together at a time like this. The last thing I'll say is another one of these propaganda phrases is "We're all in this together." Now, look, I am not in anything together with Hillary Clinton and Mitt Romney. I'm just not. And I'm also not in this together — a lot of the working class people are not in it together with people who, as Scott Atlas says, stay home, working from their laptop, sipping lattes all day.

MILLER: I know, I love that.

WOODS: The people who truly are in it together are people like you and me, who for whatever our other differences, are fighting against the lizard people. We're the ones who are in it together, and I'm glad we are. I'm really getting to know who the good guys in the world are from where they come down on this. So anyway, thank you so much for your time again today. I appreciate it.

MILLER: Thank you, Tom. It's been terrific.