

**Episode 2,376: Libertarian Sheriff Confounds Authorities**

**Guest: David Hathaway**

**WOODS:**  David, you are sheriff of – is it Santa Cruz County, in Arizona?

**HATHAWAY:** That's correct. It's a border county right at the bottom of Arizona, right in the middle, where there's a little crooked angle on the bottom of Arizona. That's where it is.

**WOODS:** Okay. And as I recall, you were elected to that position in a rather lopsided result.

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah, There was six candidates running to replace the longest serving sheriff in Arizona. And of course, during the campaign was when all the Covid craziness hit.

And I came down hard against the mandates – mask mandates, vaccine mandates, social distancing, occupancy mandates. And I was told that would cost me the election, I'd shot myself in the foot. And it turned out that I had four times as many votes as the guy who came in second place.

So, it didn't hurt me in the long run. But yeah, that's kind of a little background on that. And I'm also a rancher, a five-generation ranching family that's been in Arizona since before Arizona was a state. Arizona became a state in 1912.

My family's been here before that. And I also happen to be a homeschooling father. I have nine children.

**WOODS:** Do you have any kind of relationship with the state government in Arizona, friendly or otherwise?

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah, well, there's been a lot of back and forth between me, the two governors. When I came in, the governor was a Republican governor. And now it's a Democrat governor. But I haven't gone along with the Covid craziness.

We had one of those Republican governors that just kind of went along with all of it. And I was opposed to that. So, the new Democrat governor came in the beginning of this year, so there hasn't been too much chance for interaction with her.

But this is one of those states where the sheriff is kind of the head of their own little kingdom. As far as I know, there's no ability for a governor or an attorney general to override me on anything. So, in this state (and maybe in most states) the sheriff kind of has the last word on what they will enforce.

So, people have a lot of interest in Second Amendment issues and other issues as far as like running your own business without interference from the government. So, I have stood up for the rights of individuals in this role.

And it seems like so far there's no ability for anybody at the county level or state level to veto me on those issues.

**WOODS:** Well, that reminds me of Sheriff Richard Mack, whom I got to know during the Ron Paul campaigns. He was always emphasizing that people were not fully aware of the power that the sheriff had.

And what an important office that is to have somebody sympathetic in, because you can do so much good in it. And he said what's interesting is that when you look at politics – you look at, let's say, the governor of a state.

Some people love the governor. Some people hate the governor. Some people love their US senator. Some people hate their US senator. He said: But in general, everybody loves the sheriff.

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah, and it's somebody you can approach at the local level. Like, I think most people have lost faith in national level politics, and so they're looking for local solutions. And if I could mention a little victory I had a few months ago.

Of course, I've been opposed to the drug war, and I was able to finally detangle my office from the Federal Drug Task Force. It took two years to do it because there were contractual arrangements, vehicles that had been received by the sheriff's office, by the prior sheriff's administration.

So, I was able to turn down all the funding and all the strings attached and no longer have personnel from this office under the supervision of a federal agent who runs the federal task force. And they typically want all the local agencies to participate.

So, I was able to extricate this sheriff's office from that. So, we're no longer participating in breaking down doors and throwing people in cages for victimless crimes.

**WOODS:** Well, hold on just a minute. First of all, the point that I wanted to make (and I better make it now before my middle aged brain forgets about it) was simply that because the sheriff tends to be a more popular political figure than other office holders, it's harder for the state government, even if it had the ability to do so, to go after the sheriff.

Because you have to expend a lot of political capital going against somebody the local citizens more or less support. And so, it's another reason you were able to get away with things. But now, what you just mentioned to me is quite interesting.

 Does this mean, though, in practice, that if I move to your county, that I can just more or less be assured that I can do whatever I want? I mean, it seems like that's not a statement you can really make. Or is it?

**HATHAWAY:** Well, in this state, they now have recreational and medicinal usage of marijuana, which is legal. But of course, at the federal level, that's illegal. And of course, various other drugs are still illegal on the state side in Arizona.

But you still have a police department here. You still have state police, and they have their task force. That same drug task force still does exist in this area. We just don't participate in it. And those things are listed in the Arizona statutes.

So, if an officer arrests somebody for that crime and presents their case to a magistrate for an initial appearance for an arraignment, there's not much I could do since it's a law on the books. Say a local judge remands that prisoner to the custody of the sheriff's office.

If I tried to turn them loose for a victimless crime (since I also preside over a jail) as the sheriff, I would be found in contempt of court. So, it's kind of like a little dancing on the edge there of what I can get away with. And there are certain things I can't get away with without being found in contempt of court.

**WOODS:** When would you be up for re-election?

**HATHAWAY:** In 2024. It coincides with the presidential election cycle. So, it's a four-year term.

**WOODS:** Is there any term limit?

**HATHAWAY:** No. I mean, the guy who had the position before me did seven four-year terms, and before that he did 25 years as a police officer. So, he was doing basically the same thing (law enforcement) in this area for 50 some years.

And Sheriff Arpaio in Maricopa County, he was another one that did it for many years up until he was up there in years. So, in this state, there's no term limit.

**WOODS:** So, you are up for re-election a little over a year from now. What is your instinct tell you about how people feel?

**HATHAWAY:** Well, I think I'm well-received in this area. I've already started my campaign. It's a bit early. My style is just to go out with my wife and knock on doors and talk to people. And don't sell any kind of a crisis.

I don't tell anybody: *You need me to run your life for you, we need more DUI checkpoints.* It's all just uplifting, encouraging kind of contacts with the community. And that worked for me in the first election.

I never said I never articulated any kind of a crisis where you need the government to step in and run your life for you. And of course, it was in the middle of the Covid regime-type nonsense. So, that kind of helped me to make that point.

But I think there are other people that are going to file to run against me, but that's pretty typical. But so far it seems like there's no significant pushback.

**WOODS:** Do you get invited to take part in community events? Like, has any school ever invited you to come speak?

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah, regularly I get invited to school events. And now I have a whole bunch of, like, back-to-school-type events. And my wife and I were judges on the various "Teacher of the Year" awards that were handed out – that was for both private schools and public schools.

And at the county fair, I've been invited to judge art exhibits and things like that. The sheriff, kind of like you said, occupies a position of prominence beyond just law enforcement. But I get invited to speak to the Lions Club and the Rotary Club and things like that.

So, there are opportunities to articulate things. And I slip a lot of things in there. Like, the current hysteria about fentanyl, that gives me an opportunity to talk to a lot of groups, ostensibly about fentanyl, but to explain how all this happened.

How people's lives were shut down, that people are social creatures, and they were told, don't go to school, don't go to work, don't go to church, don't visit your relatives. And people fell into despair, and alcoholism went up 400%, Drug usage went up 200%.

And this is when the whole fentanyl thing became a big thing, is because people were told to stay home. And the suicide rates were high, overdose rates were really high. They were actually higher than anything that was directly attributed to Covid, according to the CDC statistics.

So, people nod their heads and go along with that. And I find agreement and concurrence with people when I talk about drug issues along those lines, societal harm and government intervention and how it caused substance abuse issues.

So, yeah, I do get invited a lot of times to just talk, on whatever subject I choose, to community groups.

**WOODS:** I'm afraid I don't exactly know how it works. Is the sheriff in charge of the police force? Like, do you actually hire and fire people?

**HATHAWAY:** The sheriff is what's called in Arizona, the "chief law enforcement officer of the county". So, that means, supposedly, over city police and over federal agents. Like, the federal agents, if they do a search warrant in my county, they're supposed to advise me.

A couple of times they have failed to do so, and I reprimanded them for that. But they are supposed to advise me if they're going to do, like, say, a federal search warrant in the county. And the city police is supposed to advise the sheriff on any law enforcement activities they're taking in the county.

But the reality of my life is, since I'm on the border here and we have – the largest Border Patrol office in the whole US is in my county, and the third largest is also in my county. And we have the largest ports of entry of any county in Arizona.

So, there's another 1,000 officers that work there. There's a large DEA office, a large FBI presence. So, for practical purposes, federal officers outnumber local officers 30 to 1. There's 30 federal officers for every local officer.

So, it's kind of hard for me to require them in any meaningful way to seek my concurrence before they do anything. But these three letter federal agencies are all Johnny come lately. They all came around in the 1900s.

Like, the FBI and the DEA and the ATF – like, the DEA was a creation of Nixon in 1973. And, like, it's very recent – J. Edgar Hoover's FBI was supposed to be just an unarmed intelligence gathering service. And that morphed into a law enforcement agency that carries guns and does SWAT raids.

But all what you would call law enforcement at the civil and criminal level was all handled by the sheriff's office in the beginning of this country, in the 1700s and 1800s. There was no such thing as even police departments until the 1800s when Robert Peel created the London Police Department.

And then that was replicated in the US, New York Police Department, Chicago Police Department, Los Angeles Police Department. But before that, it was just the sheriff who was kind of the arm of the court for all civil and criminal functions.

And it wasn't a patrol function either. It was like, people would make a complaint, a civil complaint or a criminal complaint. The judge would make a ruling. He would issue a writ of execution. And then the sheriff goes and seizes the mule that was taken improperly from Farmer Brown and give it back to Farmer Smith.

It was basically the arm of the court – or the judge. It's his arms and legs out in the community. Like: Go seize that person. Go seize that thing and return it to the rightful owner. But that's what it was. The sheriff did all the law enforcement functions in the US at the inception of this country.

**WOODS:** Well, I ask because I was just thinking, what if there's some rogue officer who says: *I have a crazy sheriff who has crazy constitutional ideas and a crazy philosophy, and doggone it, I'm going to enforce X, Y, and Z if it's the last thing I do.*

Could you reprimand or discipline him?

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah. They, of course, have merit review commissions in this state where it could be if I fired somebody – I'm actually going through that right now. When I first came in, the undersheriff was an at will employee.

And I terminated him and put somebody in of my choosing. I wanted somebody that would follow my vision. And he is actually suing me for thinking that he shouldn't have been terminated. But the statute was clear. I had the authority to terminate him.

And that case has drug on two-and-a-half years now. So, it was a little over two and a half years ago when I first took office. But yeah, people can make those complaints, or they can appeal to a merit review board.

And there could be that I terminate somebody for some category that's protected under EEO, where some merit commission could overturn that. And I think they probably would have the last word because a judge would likely affirm their decision.

And then I would have to acquiesce to an employee that, like you said, did his own thing and then I terminated him. If he went through all the protocols for appeals and whatnot, and if his side was upheld, then I would have to let the guy keep working.

**WOODS:** You keep mentioning the border, so I feel like I can't avoid that question. We hear over and over again, those of us who live nowhere near the border – I've lived in Florida. I've lived in the Northeast for quite some time, I've lived in the Midwest, never lived close to the border.

And we hear all these stories about what's going on there and what should be done. Well, what is your perspective?

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah, it's a very safe region, but that sells newspapers at the national level to talk about a border crisis and a war zone. My wife and I live on the ranch right next to the border. We look right into the hills in Mexico and we take walks every night parallel to the border.

And it's safe and everything. There's a lot of attempts to conflate migration with drug trafficking. You know, that the migrants that are coming over to work are all bringing fentanyl. And it promotes this kind of crisis mentality.

And some people use that to scare people, to scare the voters. Arizona has a large retired population, so it's kind of easy to scare those people that come in from another state, Michigan, Minnesota. They move down here to Sun City or Green Valley or Chandler or Yuma because of the weather.

And then they're told you have to be scared of your own shadow down here. But I go to Mexico all the time, and I grew up, went to the public schools here, as my wife did here. And it's a very safe environment.

And as a libertarian, my thoughts on immigration and border issues all go back to property rights. That's kind of the basis of all my thinking. I've done interviews with Scott Horton and Mark Victor on his podcast on that subject.

That if a person – like, I own property near the border. If I was a landlord, I should be able to rent to whoever I want to rent to. Or if you're a shopkeeper here, you should be able to sell merchandise to whoever you want to sell to.

If you're a landlord, you should be able to have any kind of a tenant or employ anybody to work in your business. So, that's kind of the basis of my view of all those sorts of things. But there is a large state presence on the border. There's, like, thousands of guys here and millions of dollars being spent.

And of course, that's one of those kind of divisive issues for libertarians, kind of the same as abortion. But of course, my feelings on that is that you shouldn't have coercive funding mechanisms like taxation – you shouldn't use theft to support something that's going to intervene in the market.

You should make decisions based on private property. But it is very safe here. And I promote this area as being a safe place. And all that kind of rhetoric about a war zone doesn't do the local businesses any good.

We have a very symbiotic relationship with the community in Mexico, which actually has the same name, "Nogales, Sonora" in Mexico" and "Nogales, Arizona" in the United States. It's one city divided by the border.

And actually 50% of the produce (fruits and vegetables) consumed in the US during the winter (because the US doesn't have a growing season in the winter) comes across this border here through my county.

And there's also a lot of what's called the "maquiladora" industry, the people that produce wiring, harnesses, and subcomponents for the US automotive industry. What little is left of the US automotive industry wouldn't exist without these subassembly plants in Mexico right across the border.

So, it's a very hustling, bustling, busy area, a lot of buying and selling both ways, tourism going both ways, a lot of medical tourism for cheaper medical procedures and dental procedures in Mexico.

But it does bother me when people try to make hay out of this idea that it's a war zone, and everybody's getting inundated and killed with migrants that come and rape and plunder and pillage and loot and all this kind of stuff.

And it's just not true. Like, my family has had ranch property along the border my whole life, my dad's life, my grandfather's life, my great-grandfather's life. And it's just been a peaceful relationship.

**WOODS:** We do see video footage that seems to indicate that something, though, is going on. And that people aren't imagining it, they're not just being unkind for no reason, that local facilities are being overrun.

Like, there's no point in even bothering going to the emergency room anymore because forget about it, you're going to be there for three days. And eventually they'll get to you, but before then they have to take every non-paying customer who presents himself, according to the laws.

So, you can leave libertarian philosophy to the side for a minute. One can imagine that there would be, shall we say, a rather grave inconvenience associated with something like this.

**HATHAWAY:** Well, you get a lot of this looped video that you see on the national media outlets of young people – or "children", a lot of talk about like unaccompanied children. But there's certain images that are kind of heart wrenching or that will appeal to people.

But there's a story behind those things. And since the federal law enforcement agencies here have a policy of not doing interviews, I've just become, like, an expert on all the statistics on these issues – unintentionally, no intention of it myself.

But there's these things called Title 42 and these restrictions that came about during the Covid regime. For example, under the Trump administration, they used this thing called Title 42 to immediately do an expedited deportation of entire groups, including young people, old people, family units.

And then when the Biden administration came around, they wouldn't deport under Title 42, which was a Covid provision. Title 42 just says people can't do any processing for immigration issues because of Covid.

So, this was kind of the last lingering Covid prohibition, Covid mandate. But the Biden administration redefined that, where children would not be deported along with groups unless there was a suitable parent or a suitable guardian within that group.

So, you started seeing the buildup of children in these detention centers with these little Mylar foil covered blankets. And this kind of imagery that would be played over and over again, which actually was not what you think it is.

And then there was an increase in what they call "southwest border encounters" if you look at the homeland security statistics during the Covid era. And this thing is kind of cyclical.

It's like you've had Democrat and Republican administrations that have had high levels of migrant apprehensions, and Democrat and Republican administrations that have had low levels.

Like, ending with Trump, the previous 14 years there was no year where there was over a million apprehensions on the southwest border. So, that was all the years of Obama, all the years of Trump.

And then the previous 24 years before that, during Democrat and Republican administrations, all the years of Clinton, and Bush senior, Bush junior, Reagan – almost every year it was over a million apprehensions.

So, it's kind of cyclical, but there's a big attempt to place it on the current administration. But yeah, the imagery is out there. And what Title 42 did, it allowed people to not make their visa claims right at the official ports of entry.

So, then they crossed between the ports of entry and then they went through this expedited deportation process under Title 42. And for a whole year and a half, people that had legal visas couldn't cross. These were the B1 and the B2 visas for day shoppers and workers.

They were considered nonessential travel. So, that really bumped up the statistics in the first two years of the Biden administration. Because people who had families in the US and jobs in the US and they actually had legal documents, legal visas.

They would go back to their job in Phoenix and back to their family in Phoenix and cross between the ports of entry through the desert, which increased the apprehension statistics. So, there's kind of a story behind the story, and a lot of that was to do with the Covid stuff.

And now that Title 42 has ended, things are going back to the way they were before Title 42. The apprehensions are going way down. So, a lot of this is to do with government intervention, that people don't describe it that way.

**WOODS:**  What's the toughest part of the job?

**HATHAWAY:** I don't know. It seems like what I do is a lot of community outreach, and I have a good number two that I can trust that kind of runs the day to day things for me.

A thing I've had problems with is dealing with my local county board of supervisors, which were very much into wanting to vaccinate everybody in the county and wanting to accept all this Covid money with all the strings attached.

Which, I was against that. I think fighting back against the local politicians who want to be part of the gravy train. They want to accept all the money with all the strings attached. Which, I don't like. That's why I pulled out of the federal task force.

There was money that came with that, but there was strings attached to that, where I'm obligated to go along with federal priorities. And the same thing with all the Covid money. There was additional positions funded in local government to get over "vaccine hesitancy" as they called it, under the CARES Act.

 All the thing to make sure that people were reporting their data, and it was all making its way up to the CDC under an executive order from a Republican governor here. All that stuff was going to the CDC. They had to report name, address, date of birth, phone number for everybody that took the shots.

And that was all reported on a daily basis through the governor's office to the CDC so that they could qualify for the Cares Act money. So, just kind of pushing back against the bureaucracy that doesn't mind doing whatever it takes to get the money, to get the federal funding.

Like, this county, 30% of the funding comes from grants – including in this office. 30% of our funding comes from grants. Like I said, I just turned down the one that's for the task force. But these 911 systems, a big part of them are grant-funded and they're mandated by federal law.

So, I guess just pushing back against the bureaucracy would be the hardest part. The most fun part for me is just going and talking to community groups and school groups, and just kind of telling them things that are outside the law enforcement realm.

Like, I tell young people about, you know: listen to your parents, they have your best wishes in mind. You know, this kind of eternal wisdom of just trying to empower people to take control of their own lives, and telling people that I don't have any desire to run their life.

So, I enjoy that the most. But dealing with the bureaucracy, pushing back against state, county, federal, and city officials, that's not fun.

**WOODS:** By the way, the last governor, the Republican, was that Ducey?

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah. Doug Ducey.

**WOODS:** Did he leave office? Did he run for re-election? I don't remember what happened with him.

**HATHAWAY:** He was term-limited at two terms. And him and I had just continual running battles. He wanted to send the military down to the border. Because, like I said, Arizona has a lot of retired folks that will vote for anybody that articulates this border crisis.

So, as the chief law enforcement officer for the county – well, first of all, there's a federal law called Posse Comitatus. That the military cannot be used for domestic law enforcement. So, they had to send the military here under the auspices of the sheriff.

So, he, at the expense of Arizona taxpayers, spent millions of dollars to deploy the military (the National Guard) to the border. Now, I had turned him down, and I told him: *No, you can't send the people here.*

But they did go to two other border counties that welcomed the military. I didn't want to turn this into East Berlin, having guys walking up and down the streets with machine guns and Humvees. It's a very peaceful community.

The local merchants wouldn't like that. We have very friendly relationships with people within the community. So, I fought back against that. So, he didn't send them, but he didn't like me for that either.

I also fought back against a spy blimp (it's called an "aerostat") that they put over our community two miles from the border with cameras pointing down into the community.

I made a big stink about that. You can see YouTube videos about me complaining about that, how they're spying and it's turning into a police state and a surveillance state. And eventually they took that thing out of here.

So, I just kind of digressed a little bit there. I remembered some fighting I did with the Feds, with CBP and Homeland Security on that.

But yeah, there was no love lost between me and Ducey because of me holding his feet to the fire on the Covid stuff, saying: *Look, are you putting up all these highway signs telling people to get the Covid shots, just because he was getting the CARES money?*

And also, him sending the military to the border at the expense of Arizona taxpayers. Now, if you know the way the National Guard is used, say the National Guard in Louisiana declares an emergency for Hurricane Katrina and he deploys the National Guard.

That will get reimbursed if the federal government declares a parallel state of emergency. So, when Doug Ducey declared an emergency on the border here and then he deployed the National Guard, the federal government did not declare an emergency, so they refused to reimburse him on that.

So, it's now up to the tune of like $40 million of National Guard expense of militarizing our community. Which, I don't like to see that. I don't want it to be East Berlin. And another thing people don't realize, now they are doing 100% southbound inspections.

The CBP is searching Americans as they leave the US before they go into Mexico. Which, there's no searches when you go into Mexico. But they're seizing money under civil asset forfeiture.

And this was just a pilot program 12 years ago where they would sporadically put somebody in the southbound lanes saying that under our border search authority, we have the authority to search people leaving the US.

Now that is morphed into a full-time structure, inspection booths. And it's like I tell people: Look, if you want them to build a wall, you're also creating this situation where it's going to be harder to leave the country, if you ever want to expatriate and leave, and take your gold coins, take your money, and leave the country.

And it's gotten more like East Berlin. And sure enough, that is happening here and at other ports of entry where they're doing 100% inspections.

This is US officers, American officers, searching you as you leave and taking money under civil asset forfeiture, and leaving it up to you to prove that you lawfully possess that money.

So, I tell people: *Be careful what you ask for. If you want to build a wall, it doesn't only keep people out, it keeps you in if you want to leave.*

Where before, you could just run across an open gap and just leave your country and not face some Stasi-type East German protocols where they shoot you as you're leaving your own country.

And that is actually happened, where people have tried to ram through, leaving the country to go into Mexico and US officers have fired at them going into Mexico because they didn't want to be subject to a search.

**WOODS:** I think you know I followed the Covid thing pretty closely, but I didn't follow Arizona specifically all that much. So, the impression I get – I just want to know if this was right – was that your governor in a way resembled Governor Abbott of Texas, who was all over the place on Covid.

And then he noticed that among the right-wing masses, let's say, Ron DeSantis had become extremely popular by giving the middle finger to the whole thing all of a sudden. And then he wanted to jump on board: *Hey, look, we're opening up this state!*

Was that kind of like what Arizona was like? Because it was certainly better than California.

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah, he kind of took a middle ground. Like, there was a bunch of local city and county mask mandates. So, on the mask issue, he was kind of in-between-ish. He would say: *Well, it's very important to wear a mask and everybody should wear a mask.*

But 90% of the territory of Arizona is already covered by mask mandates, so I don't need to do a state-level mask mandate.

But like I mentioned before, he had all these digital highway signs that are run by the state police set to tell everybody to take a shot: *Taking your Covid shot is the last hope to beat Covid. Make sure you get your shot and get vaccinated*.

So, he was very much a preacher for vaccines. And I don't really remember it tapering off much at the end. He was just kind of always in-between-ish all along. Like, depending on who he was speaking to, trying to avoid certain topics.

But he was very much saying you should get your shots, and you should wear a mask, and social distancing is important. So, he pushed all that. he didn't fight back against any of that. And he operated under an emergency order for a long time.

I think for his whole governorship he was under a state emergency order. And there's actually language in Arizona statutes that says the governor cannot act under emergency authority for more than 24 hours without convening a special session of the legislature.

But since the legislature wasn't in session because of social distancing, he never made that call. He was supposed to make a call to convene an emergency special session so that the legislature would take over making the rules in the emergency, where the governor had 24 hours.

So, that's actually in state statute. But he never complied with that, and they never convened a special session. They eventually went back into session, but he kept this emergency going the whole time. And he wasn't supposed to have emergency authorities under Arizona law for more than 24 hours.

But he definitely usurped the authority. He probably saw that other governors were doing it and getting away with it so he could, too.

**WOODS:** What would you urge if you – let's say you had a roomful of sheriffs, as I once did. I got to speak to 100 sheriffs at once, thanks to Sheriff Mack. You've got 100 sheriffs who are, let's say, broadly sympathetic with your worldview. How would you advise them in their capacity as sheriff?

**HATHAWAY:** It's a difficult question because the sheriff's office is not a market creation. The board of supervisors picks a number out of thin air and says: *You need to have X number of officers.*

And, who knows? People may want more than that or less than that, or they may want to do their own security. There's no price signal to indicate whether people even want something like a sheriff's office to exist.

So, philosophically, for me, that's a conundrum, that this is a theft-funded organization, coercively funded. But they do some things that people would think are of value, like, maybe upholding property titles and deeds and things like that.

But what I would say is, just keep it simple. If I was speaking to a group of sheriffs – which I have done. Just say, like: *Look, I have no desire to run people's lives. You should have no desire to run people's lives. Let the market figure things out.*

*People get rewarded in the market. They vote with their dollars. They get more of good things, and they get less of bad things. Let's not go out there and pitch a crisis.*

Unfortunately, that's kind of one of the main strategies of running for a position like sheriff, is: *You need me to go out there and take care of all the problems in the world. All the scumbags and all the people that are going to break into your house and rip you off and run you off the road because they're a bunch of drunk drivers.*

So, unfortunately, that's one of the main ways to campaign. I didn't campaign that way and it worked for me. But a lot of people are pushing for government to expand: *I need more officers. We need more overtime, We need newer vehicles. We need better pensions. We need more pay.*

So, I think I would just keep it simple, something along those lines, Tom. And just say: *We should strive to let people live their lives, that the foundation of this country, free markets, capitalism, let people run their own lives and make their own decisions. Let's get involved as little as possible and just let people make their own decisions.*

**WOODS:** I was just looking at your Twitter feed because I was trying to think: Well, if people are interested in Sheriff Hathaway, what should they do? So, I thought: *Well, let me see if he's on Twitter.* And I see that you are.

And I don't know how many tweets down I am – I know we're not supposed to say "tweets" anymore, now that it's been rebranded, but don't care. You have a tweet from April 18th. And I guess you were with county supervisors and you're like a foot and a half taller than almost everybody in this picture.

**HATHAWAY:** Yeah, well, I don't know how much the optics of the situation help you get elected, but am a tall guy.

**WOODS:** Doesn't hurt.

**HATHAWAY:** I usually do wear a cowboy hat. Not to try to fit the role, but just because I live on a ranch, and I grew up on a ranch.

And by the way, when you have your murder mystery dinner party, you should come have one out here at the ranch. You know, we could dim the lights and make it real scary. That that would be a good place.

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah, yeah. I did mention that on the podcast that I was doing one at my house. And if it's fun, I'm going to take it on the road. And we'll see what we can do. What are you closest to? Like Santa Cruz County? What's that? Is that close to anything I would know?

**HATHAWAY:** Tucson, and about three hours to Phoenix, and it's an hour to Tucson. And Tombstone (of movie fame) is about an hour and a half away from here. But it's a mountainous region, high desert. It rarely gets 100 degrees, which is – like, Phoenix is usually up in 118 and things like that.

But yeah, like, if you were going to do an event here, probably Tucson or Phoenix would make the most sense. Of course, Jeff Deist is up in Phoenix now. But Tucson, it's a little higher elevation and it's cooler than Phoenix. So, that could be a good location.

But yeah, you probably wouldn't get too big of a turnout if you did it down here on the border at the ranch.

**WOODS:** Yeah, I figured we'd have to compromise somehow. So, we'll see. If I'm able to get out to Arizona, I'd certainly love to. I've been there a few times and always had a happy time. So, I was going to talk to you about an article you wrote, but then I decided it's more interesting to talk about being a sheriff.

So, I'm going to link people to the article we would have talked about, and that'll be a way they can find out more about you and follow you a bit. Because you wrote an article for the *Libertarian Institute*, which is a great bunch of folks.

So, I'll link to that at TomWoods.com/2376 and continued good luck. And I'm sure we'll talk before then, but I hope you are able to take that landslide victory you had last time and make it even more devastating this time around.

**HATHAWAY:** Okay. Yeah, great, Tom. A little note about that article. It kind of points towards what you're doing with the School of Life. It's kind of the big picture of, there's more than just talking about liberty.

There's all of the other things, all the other actions, taking action in life where we can just get bogged down in libertarian philosophy and think that encompasses everything else. But it doesn't. It's just the ideas of liberty are just a very narrow thing, just disavowing coercion.

We don't use aggression to attain our way and that everything else is fair game. People have their, what I call their "beliefs" in that article. And libertarians should be able to get along with each other. And even if they have different philosophies on religion and lifestyle, as long as they agree on the principles of liberty and not using force to get your way, we can agree.

People say libertarians can't agree, but in my mind they can agree as far as what makes them libertarians and everything else is just the spice of life.

**WOODS:** Well, Sheriff David Hathaway, thanks so much for your time. Great talking to you, as always.

**HATHAWAY:** Thank you, Tom.