



Episode 1,797: Demonized for Wrongthink on Masks and Other Topics, Professor Confronts His Accusers

Guest: Mark Crispin Miller

WOODS: In telling people that you were coming back on at the end of yesterday's episode, I pointed out what you know because I emailed you, that here you are, certainly not a libertarian, and yet you come on this libertarian podcast, and you have the nerve to generate what some people were calling one of the top five episodes I've ever done. I don't know how that happened, but I decided, well, then doggone it, I think the audience needs a little bit more Mark Crispin Miller. So that's what we're doing.

MILLER Right.

WOODS: All right, but today, we're going to talk more specifically about your situation. But of course, your situation is not unique and it is emblematic of larger trends, so there is great value in talking about it not just for what it means for you, but what it means, frankly, for everybody. So let's start off with – we did talk a little bit about what happened in your classroom with regard to your discussion on masks, but then that degenerated into an attack on you from the faculty claiming that you have a track record of intimidating people, whatever it was. Can you just set the stage on that?

MILLER Yeah, as your listeners know, in late September, I was attacked on Twitter by a student infuriated by my having encouraged my propaganda class to look into the scientific studies on the effectiveness of masks as a barrier against respiratory viruses. And what was especially troubling about this attack, which was unprecedented for me – I mean, I've had students disagree in class. I encourage that, but this was very different. What was really troubling about it was that NYU essentially took her side. The chair tweeted his thanks to her. She'd asked that I be fired, and he said, "We as a department have made this a priority and are discussing next steps," which is staggering for a few reasons.

Then the dean of the school and the doctor who advises NYU on its COVID regulations, which are draconian, emailed my other students without putting me on copy, essentially telling them that I had given them dangerous misinformation, and sending links to studies they should read and believe. Studies I had also recommended to the class, because I believe in a comprehensive scrutiny of all available evidence.

And then I was pressured into canceling the propaganda class for next semester in favor of two sections of my film course. I've been teaching the propaganda course for at least 20 years. It's very popular. But the rationale was that the film class has really high enrollments, and it would be good for the department. The only problem with that rationale is that they

are equally crowded classes. They both have 24 students. That's the limit, and then I always let in some waitlisted students.

Anyway, that's what happened. It prompted me to draft this petition with the help of some friends. And that makes the point that you made introducing this show, by noting that this was a petition on behalf of academic freedom and free speech, not just for myself, but for all those professors, journalists, doctors, scientists, activists, whistleblowers, and others, who have been gagged or punished for their dissonance for decades. It really goes back to the Kennedy assassination. And it's been worsening ever since, inexorably worsening, and now is beyond epidemic. Really, there's a crisis now, where we're essentially losing our First Amendment rights.

That was my petition. It simply called on NYU to honor my academic freedom, and it has amassed to date over 20,000 signatures, including the names of some very eminent people in many fields. And it apparently incensed a majority of my department colleagues, who, a month after the attack on Twitter, sent a letter to the dean, demanding that he ordered an expedited review of my conduct, which they claim has been egregious not just because of my, they claimed, discouraging students from wearing masks and intimidating those who were wearing them – which is, like the rest of the letter, sheer fantasy, because I had made very clear in that discussion that I was not telling them not to wear masks –

WOODS: Not to mention, I'm sure the vast majority were. The idea that one faculty member is going to be able to intimidate that many people is a little ridiculous.

MILLER Yeah, the whole letter was written in the same fantastic vein. I'll proceed. So they sent him this letter, which didn't simply deplore what they think I'd said about masks, but went way beyond that to accuse me of not only of forcing my crackpot ideas – which they claim are non-evidence based, right, in a letter that's completely non-evidence based – but that I have been serially abusing students and others for several years. They accuse me of explicit hate speech attacks on students and others in our community, including department staffers, advocating for an unsafe learning environment, intimidation, microaggression. This was staggering to me. And I didn't know that they were even doing this until the dean emailed me to tell me he had ordered the review. I mean, he didn't even consult me, as I would have told him in detail that this letter was a pack of lies or delusions and that it was completely groundless. He went ahead and ordered the review anyway.

I asked the Provost what to do, and she said, you should ask to meet with him. So we chatted by Zoom, and he had already ordered it. He said the university lawyers had told him he had no choice, which actually is not true. FIRE, the nonprofit that protects free speech rights for people in universities – the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, FIRE – had then sent the NYU president a terrific letter, going into detail about the legal groundlessness of this process and asking him to intervene and stop it. But he hasn't replied to that letter or acknowledged it.

At any rate, the dean told me the lawyers had said he must do this, and he was doing this. And I asked him to tell me what the review would entail, and he said they would talk to people. And I asked, Well, what people? And he said to faculty and students. I said, well, no faculty have seen me teach.

WOODS: Right.

MILLER I mean, a few have, but they're unavailable or they've left.

WOODS: They're just going to repeat what they've said.

MILLER Well, yes, right. I said no faculty have seen me teach, so I expect you'll to talk to students. And he said yes. It was extremely vague, and was just straight out of Kafka, right? And I asked how long it would take. He said, well, until the end of the semester. And that's actually now. Classes ended last week. And I haven't heard anything from anybody. So I told him that I would ask students, current and former, to write on my behalf to his office, and also asked people who have visited my classes over the years, because I've had many, many visitors come in and have seen me teach. And today they've received about 50 such letters, which I shared with you, and they are pretty eloquent testimony to the fact that the charges of my colleagues' letter are absurd. I mean, they're completely groundless.

Now, let me add that I responded to my colleagues with a point-by-point rebuttal, a cordial point-by-point rebuttal, and asked them to retract their letter and issue an apology. And they ignored that, whereupon I decided to sue them for libel. And I guess that's the headline here. I am suing them for libel. I'm very serious about this, because what they've done is unacceptable. And precisely because it is exemplary of the moment we're living in – this isn't just me – I think they should be held accountable for it. It's time for us to stand up and say no to this kind of thing, which is feeling increasingly dangerous in this formerly free country. But I could not really live with myself if I didn't take this step.

WOODS: Well, what is the specific action or actions by NYU that are the subject of the suit?

MILLER Well, I'm not suing NYU, Tom. I'm suing just those colleagues who signed the letter.

WOODS: Oh, oh, okay.

MILLER Yeah, I mean, I don't think NYU per se has given me any grounds for litigation. I don't yet have a strong grounds –let's say I don't know of any strong grounds for doing it. I do know that 25 of my colleagues signed this letter, which is demonstrably defamatory and demonstrably false and clearly malicious, because they want me to be fired. Their letter opens by saying that, Yeah, I have academic freedom – they always do this ritual nod to academic freedom and say how much they respected. But my academic freedom should be nullified in light of my horrible transgressions. I'm like this Klansmen in the classroom.

And so they I think are definitely subject to and deserving of legal action. I'm not suing the handful of junior faculty who signed the letter, because I reckon they felt they may have felt pressured to sign it, whether they know that or not. So they are not part of this, as far as I'm concerned. But the others, the tenured people and the long-time clinical professors who know me well, some of whom I had thought were friends of mine, two of whom wrote letters of support for me when I was nominated for a Distinguished Teaching Award in 2012. So this really blew my mind, I have to say. I was completely shocked. Some of them weren't surprising to me, but others are. And I should add that some, a minority of my colleagues did not sign the letter, but I have to add that I have not heard from any of them. None of them has reached out to me to say we're sorry about this, or what's your side of the story?

So it's really been quite a ride here. I bitterly regret having to do this. I'm not physically up to it. I have chronic Lyme disease, and I would rather just continue to teach. I love teaching. I've been there for 23 years, and I could blow my own horn. I'm not going to do that. The fact is that I don't deserve this, but I'm not entirely surprised by it, because as I say, I have been an irritant there institutionally.

And I should add that NYU is heavily committed to the entire vaccine agenda and to the lockdown etiology. They are very, very serious about enforcing this. They've done things like suspend students for having had five people over to dinner last summer. This was before the semester started. I'm not making that up. I mean, some students have sued them over this. And I know another kid who was suspended through the year and will then be placed on academic probation for having had six people over to dinner, and he's not even enrolled this semester. He's taken a gap semester because of the online curriculum, which he doesn't want and he's working for a living. And they have punished him for having that gathering, you know? So NYU is all in for this. And it is possible that my colleagues were somehow encouraged to do this.

Some have even suggested that the student who attacked me was a plant. And I that's not entirely impossible. I mean, I tend to doubt it, but I don't understand how her tweet took off like wildfire – I should say her *tweets*. There were a lot of them – because she only has, I don't know, about 80 followers, but it was all over the place and everybody saw it. And I heard from people I haven't heard from in years who were concerned about what was happening, and I didn't even know what they were talking about, because I was unaware.

At any rate, I think that sort of lays out what's happened. The petition is still up, it's at Change.org. And I am about to put up a GoFundMe page to help me fund this lawsuit, which you know, lawsuits can be very expensive and there'll be a lot of depositions and stuff like that. So I'm definitely going to need help with it.

WOODS: Well, let me point out, before I forget, that I still have an easy redirect link for people to get right over to that Change.org petition. You're at over 20,000 signatures now. It's TomWoods.com/Miller and that gets you right – because the website is Change.org/p/ – you know, it'll take forever. So TomWoods.com/Miller will redirect there. You should definitely sign it, as I have. But while we're talking about this, let me bring up one of the complaints against you, because it has become like a weird third rail in academia, and that's the whole transgender issue, where they're saying – I mean, you can imagine what people are saying about you. But what's the real truth of the matter?

MILLER Well, the truth of the matter is that I regard transgender ideology as problematic. And I see that as something separate from the rights and liberties of transgender persons, with whom I have no problem whatsoever. My colleagues accused me of "mocking and ridiculing transgender individuals" – I mean, that's verbatim – and attacking them. And when they refer to explicit hate speech, that's what they mean. Now, first of all, this is not a subject that I teach, although it has come up in a few classes. And it's something I've written about. I've sent stuff about it to my listserv, and then that ends up on my website.

So their grievance really refers to a few writings that they found online, and I will give you the backstory here. This is actually the third attack on me this year at NYU. And the first was, I was suddenly summoned to the OEO. That's the Office of Equal Opportunity, which is the office of NYU that operates the bias hotline. And they told me that they wanted to question

me about my conduct. And I wrote back and said, What? I was completely baffled by this. I mean, I thought I would be accused of having come on to a student or called somebody the N-word. I couldn't imagine what it might be. And they said, "Your comments on gender identity." I think that's the way they put it. And so I had retain a law firm to get advice. That cost me money that I don't have.

And I finally went in, and they told me that a colleague had sent them three things of mine that had been found online. One was a four-paragraph piece I had sent my listserv – that's News from Underground – which was on my website, MarkCrispinMiller.com, and then two facetious Facebook posts. Not posts, just comments, just comments. Now, this colleague, who has signed the letter, of course, is not a Facebook friend of mine, nor is she on my listserv, so I asked these lawyers how she happened to come across these writings. And they told me another colleague had conveyed them to her. So somebody – I think I know who it is – had sent this stuff to her and then she snitched on me and reported me.

So I was asked, basically the same question you've asked, which is: what's the deal? Do you require your students to join the listserv? I said, no, that's just completely separate from my teaching. Students will ask how to join it if they're interested, but that's it. And then they asked me if I teach transgender theory or ideology or does it come up? And I said no, occasionally it has, and if it does, we discuss it.

And then I explained my views on transgender ideology, that transgenderism as a movement, which is funded by some very wealthy people like Warren Buffett and George Soros and others – there's an article by Jennifer Blaylock. She had to write it for *The Federalist*, although she's a left-leaning environmentalist – going through the funding of the trans activism movement, which is separate from, again, the rights and liberties of transgender persons, just as BLM is separate from the rights and liberties, civil rights of African Americans. Those are two different things, just as Israel is something different from the Jewish people. They're not the same, so you can criticize Israel without being anti-Semitic. You can criticize BLM or question it without being racist. And you can question transgender activism, transgender ideology, as some transgender persons have done and are doing and as many feminists do, without being a transphobic person.

And my specific problems with the movement have to do primarily with radical medical intervention and the sexual development of children. I think that's grotesque. It's a violation of informed consent. I mean, I'm on the board of a nonprofit that's all about informed consent. And this is an important issue. And there is a lot of money in this. Hormone treatments, surgeries, and so on. Treatments that are irreversible and that have demonstrably ruin many lives.

I also have a problem with biological males participating in girls' and women's sports and in demanding admission to women's shelters. I understand the misgivings of those females who are bested in those competitions by competitors who have undeniable physical advantages. That's wrong. That's unfair. And I see this as an odd kind of attack on women's rights. The same with the shelters, same with women's prisons, where not only the prisoners, but the guards often don't want biological males who identify as women to be admitted.

At the very least, Tom, this is something that demands discussion. It demands open debate. And I know people in medicine who feel this way. This is not something you just you just accede to and stifle any problems, any medical problems, any clinical problems. You don't

pay any attention to those; you just accept the ideology no matter what its consequences. I think this stuff needs to be discussed without those trying to discuss it be attacked as transphobic, the feminists called TERFs, which is a really hostile term.

My colleagues and many on the left seem to think that all subgroups comprise a big, unhappy family of victims, right? Women, trans people, black people, they lump them all together. And you can't do that, because there are significant tensions between trans activism and women's rights. That's not something you can just gloss over.

So that happened. I was questioned. I answered the questions. They were supposed to take a week to let me know if they were going to proceed or not. And the next day, they told me they were dropping this. Okay, they could clearly see that I am not transphobic. Some pretty clear evidence of this fact is that when I learned last spring that a new member of the department that was going to join us, somebody who is trans and has been hired to teach queer and transgender theory, I immediately wrote to them – that's this person's preferred pronoun – to welcome them to the department, because I thought that they were clearly the best candidate of the three. And I was and am interested in their work. I wrote. I welcomed them. We had a pleasant exchange. I recommended a certain book that I thought was pertinent to her dissertation. And that attests to my attitude. I don't hate any group of people. I'm not a hater. And the lawyers were convinced by this.

And this obviously nettled my colleagues, because they refer to it in their letter that NYU has failed to act against this menace in their midst, which is myself. And that strangely echoes the complaint in the student's tweet stream, because she immediately contacted NYU's bias hotline over my mask remarks, and they rightly told her that they can't charge me with bias over something I taught in class. And she complained bitterly about this in one of her tweets. And it was what prompted her to demand that I simply be fired. And my colleagues sort of echoed that by saying his hate speech came up before and NYU did nothing, so we want this expedited review. And they got the review. It's ongoing.

WOODS: I don't know what to tell you, other than I'm glad you're fighting back, because it's about time somebody does. I'm certainly glad, because I know your personality, that you're not backing down and apologizing, which is what most people do.

MILLER Well, yeah, apologize for what? I mean, I didn't do anything. All I do, and all those letters that I sent you attest to this, all I do is I urge my students to try to be impartial and rigorous in studying the evidence concerning any issue. This is when I teach propaganda. No matter what it is, and no matter how outlandish a possibility may seem, these are the things that are dismissed as conspiracy theory. No matter how outlandish any such theory may seem, unless it's patently absurd – Flat Earth, that kind of thing – you can't dismiss it without at least taking a look to see if there might be something to it.

And listen, Tom, like everybody else, many times I've been presented with some narrative, some scenario and I bristled. I have been kind of repulsed and thought that's ridiculous, it can't be true. And then I've looked into it and found to my shock and embarrassment that I was wrong. I mean, that's what it means to have an open mind. And it doesn't matter where you are in the political spectrum. Whether you're left, right, you have to stop thinking tribally about these things and be willing to admit that notions you've held tightly as articles of faith maybe your whole life were actually furniture that was placed in your mind by propagandists, you see.

I mean, here's a good example, leaping off from the subject of my plight at NYU here, is the election. I mean, I was a leading figure in the election integrity movement from 2005, when my book on the theft of the 2004 election came out. And at that time, the movement, the election integrity movement was hollering everywhere and trying our damndest to spread the word about the abundant and specific evidence of theft in that election. And back then, Republicans, to a man, I recited the same script, which was there's no evidence of fraud, this is conspiracy theory, blah, blah, blah. And not just the Republicans, but *The New York Times* and all the so-called liberal media and the left press, let me add.

That was a mighty propaganda chorus of denial, and it was extremely difficult to get anywhere with an urgent issue, because if we have a corrupt voting system, as this country does and has for decades, we're not a democracy and we're in serious danger. For years, I and they continued to work together to try to spread the word about this. We followed other elections that had been demonstrably stolen or at least that were fishy. And most of them benefited the Republicans, so at that time, it seemed that the Democrats were on the losing end of that sort of war, but strangely said nothing about it and gave us no help or encouragement. And I have a lot to say about that, if you're interested. I mean, I did discuss it with John Kerry, which was quite something.

Now, I find in this election that the evidence – or let's put it this way: the signs of theft are more abundant and more persuasive even than they were 16 years ago. And that's saying something, because there were so many such signs back then. This time, the signs seem to be innumerable, and it's evidence of all kinds. And to my amazement, I find that many, if not most of the leading figures in that very movement – these are former allies of mine. These are people with whom, in many cases, I was close friends, whose work I championed, people from whom I got funding, people whom I got published, and some of them have essays in a book I edited called *Loser Take All* in 2008, and I know them well – and they now sound exactly like the Republicans sounded 16 years ago. They're saying the same thing:

There's no evidence. Trump is a liar. Therefore, none of this evidence makes any sense. It doesn't add up. It's a fraud. It's a hoax. He's trying to steal the election. He's destroying democracy, blah, blah, blah.

This takes my breath away, you know? Here they have an opportunity to take advantage of, for the first time, really widespread, mass disbelief in the outcome of an election and on solid grounds. They could take advantage of that groundswell, which we never saw when it was Gore and then Kerry. Democrats are much wimpier, I mean at the grassroots level. Certainly the party was hopeless. But there wasn't the kind of fierce resistance and loud demands for proper investigation that we're seeing now. So I can only say I applaud those who are making those demands, because this is not a minor thing.

And I'm not by any stretch of the imagination a Trump supporter. I don't trust him as far as I could throw him. It's not about that. It's about the necessity of honoring the will of the electorate. And my old comrades in that movement are not the ones to make the call as to whether or not the outcome was legit. It's not up to them. We need to know, right?

So this is an example of the kind of tribalism I'm talking about. This isn't everybody in the movement. There are a significant number of us who are trying to hold this election to the same standard we have the others. And at the same time, I want to add that the people on the right who are deploring this apparent theft for Biden-Harris have got to snap out of their

amnesiac trance thinking this has never happened before. It has happened repeatedly; it's just happening to their side now. That's the only difference.

And let me add to this idea that Venezuela is part of some foreign commie plot – people have mentioned Iran. They've mentioned China. This is as ridiculous as Russiagate. Elections have been stolen in this country by domestic players for decades, really since before 2000 when things got much worse, because the Help America Vote Act essentially mandated, sort of indirectly mandated the use of electronic voting systems all over the country, which is what we now have, and it's one of the reasons why our voting system is so disgraceful.

And so the right needs to face the fact that some of their heroes were not actually elected. And the left needs to face the fact that, much as they like the outcome, this time, that doesn't make it legitimate. And this all speaks to the urgent need for something like, dare I say it, solidarity among the American people. And I mean, this seems like a lost cause, I realize, but if Americans continue to be at each other's throats like this, they will be extremely vulnerable to the worst repression.

WOODS: In this moment we're living through now with shutdowns everywhere, and now we have all the data you could ask for – we have all the charts. I can compare this place and that place, and this one was very shut down and this one wasn't, and they have the same result. And we all kind of know that it doesn't really do anything, which is why our leaders just ignore it when it suits their purposes – but here we have the perfect time when people of all backgrounds could come together to agree that the so-called public health establishment, in league with our political rulers, have done a disastrous job, have destroyed so many people's lives. We should be arm-in-arm, standing up against this. And instead, somehow, they've managed to take the divisions that they have sown in the public. They've sown these divisions over the course of especially the past several years, and made it so that people whose own lives are being ruined are cheering what's going on? And that, of course, blocks any such solidarity. I mean, I love the Woods/Miller solidarity. I just wish it could be replicated on a large scale.

MILLER Right. No, I agree completely. I want to say parenthetically that I am tending more and more libertarian with every passing week.

WOODS: I can understand why. I haven't been a proselytizer with you. I respect the work you do, and I'm not trying to convert – well, okay, I am trying to cover people. But you know what I mean? Indirectly, I'm not an obnoxious jerk about it. But doggone it, when you look at – I mean, in a way, it reminds me of the Michael Rectenwald situation, because he was treated very badly by a great many people at NYU. And it made him – I mean, I could understand how something like that wouldn't really make you reexamine first principles. You'd just say I'm surrounded by a bunch of jerks.

But then the question has to arise: why? Why are these people jerks? Is there something in common? What makes them be jerks? Oh, my gosh, are there – in terms of the political right and Conservatism, Inc., they're almost all jerks too. These people. I mean, the idea that I would want to hang around with Mike Huckabee and people around him or Rick Santorum, I'd rather slit my wrists. But there's something about the academic left that is just so unforgiving and wants to erase people, not just show that you're wrong. They're not going to bother to show that you're wrong. You're not entitled to an opinion. I mean, that's got to at some point make you wonder: maybe there's something wrong with the whole damn thing?

MILLER Well, there is something deeply wrong with the academic left, which I don't really recognize as left. I mean, if we're going to get down to specifics here, I mean, I am antiwar. I know you can certainly be libertarian and antiwar, as Ron and Rand Paul are. I believe in cutting back on corporate power. It is excessive. The corporate demiurge is just much too close to the state and that's the definition of fascism. I believe in empowering the working class and protecting their advances since the New Deal, which have been attacked and rescinded since the Reagan years. And I believe in protecting the environment. I certainly believe passionately in civil rights. I could go on and on. That strikes me as a left perspective, and that's mine.

And I guess it's a left-libertarian perspective, because I am completely opposed to censorship of all kinds. I think the First Amendment is sacrosanct. I also believe now much more consciously than I used to in religious freedom. And I now understand the case for the Second Amendment too. And I share that position with George Orwell. Not many people know this, but in the late '30s, as there was some growing fear that the Nazis might invade England, he wrote a column for one of the British dailies in which he passionately affirmed the right to bear arms and said something – I'm going to butcher this – something like that gun on the wall of a worker's flat or a farmer's cottage is a symbol of freedom, right? I understand that. I see that now. I don't think only the cops should have automatic weapons and only the National Guard. So I am I guess a left-libertarian.

But I also believe in the family. I believe in informed consent for children. I believe parents should have an important say in whether their kid gets vaccinated or undergoes gender transition and medical procedures. And there are concerted attacks on that right now. That reminds me of the Nazis. That's really perverse and wrong. And that whole agenda has the full-throated support of the academic left, as do the lockdowns. How on earth is that left? How is it that anyone who identifies as *left* support policies that are not only medically and scientifically groundless, but that have – you've gone through this. I've seen your talks. I mean, they're brilliant on this. I mean, the toll that these policies have taken in starvation and malnutrition and in medical neglect and in domestic and child abuse and in substance abuse, all of these things are directly attributable to the supposed remedy for the COVID crisis. And to question them is to earn yourself nothing but hostility and threats from the academic left.

And why is this? I mean, this is so interesting. I've been trying to wrap my head around it for some time now. I've discussed it with Mike Rectenwald, who's a friend of mine. I mean, Mike's a former communist who underwent a conversion to libertarianism because of his ordeal at NYU. I was never a communist and would not have been. He and I agree on the fact that – he tends to think that Maoism had a some kind of an inordinate influence on all this. I hope I'm not misrepresenting him. And I don't think that's it.

There is demonstrable evidence that the intelligence agencies here in the US on their own undertook, starting in the late '60s, to depoliticize and divide the left by encouraging black separatism. Ron Karenga, who is now an esteemed professor in California – he's the inventor of Kwanzaa, actually – he reportedly had FBI connections, and I think he killed a Panther in a gun battle in Southern California. Those extremely divisive figures had significant covert state support.

And if you know anything about how empires have infiltrated radical movements – the British certainly excelled at this kind of thing – it shouldn't come as any surprise, really, that there

were people within SDS, in Weatherman, in the black radical community, who were actually agents, cops infiltrating, making trouble, sowing division. Whereas then you would have somebody like Fred Hampton, this very brilliant, charismatic, young guy who was the chairman of the Illinois Black Panther Party. And by the way, I have to – I don't know, have you seen the trial the trial, *The Chicago 8*?

WOODS: I have not.

MILLER Okay, I'm not recommending it. It's Aaron Sorkin's Netflix movie about that trial. It is really infuriating, because one of the things that it does is it shows Fred Hampton as a kind of BLM activist before there was a BLM. He sits in the courtroom with a phalanx of scowling Black Panthers around him, and there's a kind of strong separatist vibe about him. He's there to champion Bobby Seale, who was the only black defendant in that trial.

Well, as a matter of historical fact, Fred Hampton had absolutely no interest in that kind of separatism. And for some pretty vivid evidence of this, I recommend a documentary called *The Murder of Fred Hampton*. Came out in 1971. Hampton was killed in 1969 by Chicago police, who were acting basically at the urging of the FBI. And they've blasted their way into his apartment late at night. He was unconscious, having been drugged at dinner by an infiltrator. And he was executed at point-blank range, shot in the head as he lay on his mattress. And another Panther named Mark Clark was killed as well.

So in '71, this documentary came out, and it was cinema verité, it just followed him around for weeks. And you see that his audiences were completely mixed racially, that half of them are white. And there's a scene where two guys come to see him. They're separatists. And they want to get his blessing for their movement, which is a kind of – well, it's a black separatist movement, a little like the black Muslims, but not religious. And he has absolutely no interest in this. He tells them very pointedly: this is not what I'm doing. I'm not interested in this kind of division. He wanted to make revolution.

And I was lucky enough to hear him speak. He was only 22 when he died, and I think a month or so before he died, I was a student at Northwestern and a bunch of us went downtown to hear him speak. Very impressive. And I think that's why he was killed, because that's what he was interested in doing, and that's what the Empire never wants. It never wants solidarity. It wants division. Well, they've got it now, as you know. And it's not going to do any of us any good.

WOODS: What's your, let's say, parting message other than – first of all, I want people to support you. They should go to [TomWoods.com/Miller](https://www.tomwoods.com/miller), sign that petition. Once you get your GoFundMe thing up, I'll help get that out there too.

MILLER Thanks.

WOODS: But let's say you have two minutes to make a pitch, or a minute. What do you want to leave people with?

MILLER Well, I want to leave people with a warning not to be passive and not to give way to fear. And that's difficult now, because these are frightening times. I mean, the lie, the big lie seems to reign supreme to an extent I had never really thought possible. And this is coming

from someone who's taught propaganda study for decades. What we're seeing now is the kind of thing that starts in World War I with the big lies about Germany with the so-called Hun. And that brought on a war that had catastrophic consequences. We could spend another hour just talking about those. For most of us, it's just this iconic series of jerky, silent movies, but it was a catastrophe.

And it was the beginning of the increasing sophistication of the process of mass deception. That's the inauguration of modern propaganda practice. And Britain and the US were the leaders in this. Germany under Hitler learned from them, adapted them what they did. They were the leaders. And it hasn't stopped. It's continued. It's become more sophisticated. And it's been enhanced by various technological and possibly chemical innovations. And now we're living in a moment that is straight out of 1984. It is not hyperbole to make that claim, that you can pick up *The New York Times*, and page after page, article after article is completely false. It is indeed fake news. And it's not just the *Times*; it's so many outlets.

So we have to be brave, and we have to resist, but we also have to be smart about that. We have to prepare ourselves for serious resistance, I hate to say. I'm not any kind of a survivalist so I can't give advice like that. I wish I were. But I don't believe that something of this enormity, something so grandiose and so destructive can survive. I don't think it can succeed. It may feel like it is succeeding at certain points, but it is so perverse and so contrary to human nature and the best impulses of humanity that it has to go down. But it will not go down if everybody simply acquiesces in the face of it. So that's what I would end by saying.

WOODS: Well, I appreciate what you're doing and I'm sorry that you have to endure it. It's a shame, but I'm glad you're doing what you're doing. And as I say, we'll do what we can to help. At the very least, people go sign that petition. I mean, over 20,000 signatures, that's really, really impressive for somebody who doesn't have a television program, who isn't on MSNBC or Fox News. That's really a significant groundswell of support. That's great. And then say tuned and listen in for how you can help defray the cost of this, because I feel like these people deserve it. All right, anyway, thank you very much, Mark Crispin Miller. I appreciate your time.

MILLER Well, thank you, Tom. I very much appreciate your having me on again.