



Episode 576: Feminism: Enemy of Liberty?

Guest: Milo Yiannopoulos

WOODS: All right, you and I are just going to get along great. I just know that from our three-minute pre-show banter, so I have a feeling that you're like my guest Michael Malice. I could talk to you about absolutely anything, and it would be super successful. Now I'm going to jinx the whole thing. So I decided to have you on, because I've seen numerous clips of you in which you're talking about feminism, and then to my horror I discovered that at nearly 600 episodes, apart from an episode on the so-called gender wage gap, which doesn't exist, I've never covered feminism on the show, so it looks like I'm avoiding it.

YIANNOPOULOS: My goodness – well, you obviously are (laughing).

WOODS: So here you are to solve this problem for me, to fill this gap. And when we were talking about this before, you described feminism in the most outrageous way I've ever heard it described, so I must insist that you repeat that.

YIANNOPOULOS: No, I just described it in a totally factual way. I said something along the lines is it's basically an attack vector for liberal authoritarianism. I mean, feminism is just another front in the Left's attempt to language police and to bully all of the people that it doesn't like, as represented most obviously and most perfectly it finds its fullest and highest expression in the rich, straight, white male folklore. And this is a person that modern feminism has come to define itself by, you know, define itself in opposition to. Modern feminism has moved so far away from equality, it really should pick another name. It should just call itself what it is: misandry. And it's created this specter, this mysterious force that supposedly controls society, called the patriarchy. And when you look at this, you sort of unpack all of this, you realize actually it's just a sort of loose bundle of a lot of old authoritarian leftisms.

WOODS: Well, let's talk about feminism, though, when you talk about modern feminism, couldn't there be some feminists who would come along and say, look, feminism comes in many varieties? There are feminists who believe men and women are basically the same; there are feminists who believe men and women are different and that should be celebrated; there are socialist feminists; there are libertarian feminists. So how can you bundle them all together like this?

YIANNOPOULOS: Well, the reason you can do it is the time that there were different strands of feminism represented by large groups of people, different organizations, university departments, books, scholars, journalists – the time when there was variety in feminism is largely over. Now, you can read any of the books by Christina Hoff Sommers at the American Enterprise Institute if you want to find out more about the intellectual history of feminism such as it is, but I think what we can say with some confidence today is that one of the greatest movements in our intellectual and social history, one of the things that we can be proudest of is the Women's Rights Movement, something that has enabled women to vote, to participate in the workforce, to do all of the things that we think a person who is equal to us should be able to do. Women, you know, who are paid the same – and they are paid the same, by the way – for the same work, who are given the same access to all of the same institutions as men; they have equality of opportunity, which is the one that matters, which is the only one that we should be trying to enforce –

WOODS: But, ah ha, wouldn't a feminist jump in right here and say, see, you're a feminist?

YIANNOPOULOS: I am a feminist. I'm totally a feminist. I'm like a second wave feminist. I believe in equality and celebration and glory of women. Of course I do. But that's not really what modern feminism is about. Modern feminism has become a sort of, as Christina would say, a sort of female chauvinism. It's become a sort of man-hating cult of far Left activists who want to control other people, including other women, economically, socially, politically, sexually, and it's a very depressing, miserable sort of creed that has excluded more people than it's included, which is why feminism is now losing.

And we'll talk a little bit about exactly what these crazy people believe in in a second, but to put it in context, you know, these are the people who control the narrative about gender politics in the media today, the people who control university departments. They have huge sway over the entertainment industry. Every major journalistic outlet buys their nonsense about the wage gap and campus rape culture and all this stuff. It's all lies; it's all advocacy research. None of it's true.

But in broader society, these people represent a tiny fraction of the population. In Britain, a survey just came out that suggested that just 7% of British women would call themselves feminist, and in the U.S. the figure is 18%, down from 28 just a couple of years ago. So feminism, because of what it's become, because it sort of morphed into this man-hating unpleasantness, is losing support, not just from men but from women too. And like all movements in its death throes, it is becoming increasingly shrill, hysterical, hateful, angry, and unpleasant, and unfortunately, because feminism is so powerful and yet has dreamt up a variety of mechanisms to avoid criticism of itself, ordinary people at home don't necessarily always see just how much trouble it's in.

What they perceive instead is, you know, feminism running wild with men being told that they're "manspreading," "mansplaining," all of these tiny, perceived infractions that men perform against women every day, none of which are really meaningful or in

many cases even true. Whilst feminism, because it's a function of leftist authoritarianism and because it comes from far Left progressive politics and engages in that crazy oppression Olympics, where it tries to rank oppressed people according to how much you're supposed to stick up for them even in the face of overwhelming evidence that they're awful, you'll find that modern feminism is even making excuses for precisely the people out there in the world who do live in patriarchies and who do want to hurt women.

For example, radical Islam or even just Muslim society generally. You'll find that radical feminists make enormous excuses for the misbehavior – and misbehavior is a very kind word for it – of, for example, Syrian refugees in Europe. Why do they do this? Why do they pick, you know, marauding Muslim sexual molesters over women? Because feminism isn't really about women anymore.

WOODS: Okay, there's a lot to unpack here. First of all, do people actually use the word "mansplaining"? That can't be real.

YIANNOPOULOS: Oh, it's a real thing. (laughing) No, it sounds so stupid. Okay, so there's a bunch of them. There's "manspreading" is when they say that men sit with their legs too wide on the subway. "Mansplaining," as far as I can tell, it's like any man who ever disagrees with a woman. She can bring out this, oh, you're mansplaining to me – because somehow disagreeing with a woman is sexist? I have no idea.

There's "manslamming," where – you could imagine it's such a comic scene; it's actually great. So imagine this sort of like angry, dumpy lesbianic blogger who's decided she wants to go out and cause trouble today, so she goes out onto the sidewalk, and she sort of walks directly at men. And if they don't leap out of the way and apologize, she accuses them of "manslamming," in an attempt to prove that men are so oblivious to the existence of women that they will just walk into them (laughing) on the pavement if the women don't move. I mean, this is the level of stupidity. It's absolutely incredible. (laughing) You can just imagine this scene, can't you, this sort of like angry, dumpy, blue-haired lesbian with facial piercings launching herself at unsuspecting men next to the road. I mean, my God.

WOODS: Yeah, but on the other hand, couldn't you say that in the same way that there are environmentalists out there who no doubt just genuinely want to conserve resources and be good stewards of the environment, and there are environmentalists who would like to see a plague wipe out 80% of the human race, and it probably is reasonable to distinguish between those, can't we offer the same courtesy to feminism? I'm just saying this as devil's advocate here.

YIANNOPOULOS: Okay, well – no (laughing). There's no question whatsoever that these people don't care. At least –

WOODS: But even Gloria Steinem doesn't talk about "manslamming," right?

YIANNOPOULOS: No. I mean, look, it's very clear to me what's happened with feminism, and it has become a vehicle for people who hate men. It's a very small number of people who still call – you know, active feminists, activists, and academics, and they all have their own reasons for, you know, loathing men, and I don't particularly want to get into their background damage for the most part. But this is not about fighting for women.

Indeed, women are the people who hate them the most. My fans, like – I'm unusual as a journalist, because I don't really have readers; I have fans, because, I don't know, people seem to like me a lot, and people are very kind, and they don't really behave like regular readers. Regular readers seem to like sort of brutalize journalists, and I don't get a lot of that. I get a lot of nice comments. And some of the nicest stuff that I get when I write about gender politics is from women who can't stand these harpies, and they describe them as harpies themselves; that's not my word. And it's very clear now, I think, that these women don't have other women's interests at heart.

In fact, what they are is an outgrowth of the middle and lower – in America you call it, I think you would say the upper classes and in England it would be the middle classes. Sort of the doctor, lawyer, teacher, journalist kind of slice of society. This is the root of all evil in the world. This is the place from which we get all the sort of white guilt, middle class anxiety, sympathy for Black Lives Matter, and feminism, modern feminism. All of them come from this sort of upper middle class bracket, and a lot of the stuff that they're doing is this sort of class war against the lower orders.

You look at the way that they hate on the choices of women who don't have their privileges and look at the objects of lots of their resentment, and it's either very rich men or it's poor white guys who don't behave in the sort of enlightened way that feminists would like them to. It's very clear this is an outgrowth of middle class, modern progressivism that doesn't have much to do with women and has a lot to do with the sort of white guilt.

WOODS: What about women's studies departments? I remember when I was a college student – and I'm a little older than you; I was a college student in the early '90s, and there were women's studies departments at colleges around the country, and no doubt there still are. And they would resolutely deny that they were engaged in ideological special pleading or that they were anything other than hard-nosed social scientists. And everybody knew that was false, and they knew it was false –

YIANNOPOULOS: Isn't that an interesting term? (laughing) "Hard-nosed social scientists."

WOODS: Well, the thing is I thought to myself it would be great to have a university department where I could go and take courses, and I would just be affirmed in everything I already believed, and I would get a lot more arguments to help defend my beliefs, and that's exactly what this was. Have you looked into this at all? Because I just couldn't bring myself to – especially, even the way they described the courses. They couldn't even keep themselves from being ideological in the course catalogue.

YIANNOPOULOS: Oh no, there's no question — they have no desire to go out and find the truth about the differences between men and women or about how men and women can best navigate this messy and complex world together, how men and women should interact with one another. They have no interest in that. These courses are about hating men, and you'll find very few people who are prepared to put it quite that bluntly in public life, but that's what it is. You know, they will give you a variety of not just weird and wacky post-modernist, you know, social science mumbo jumbo to try to give you what looks like an intellectual framework for explaining what a poor, oppressed little thing you are as a woman in America today — by the way, you're not. Sorry, get over it. What they'll do is they'll give you this weird intellectual framework, and then they'll provide you with a variety of bizarre conspiracy theories that look like nothing so much as the religions that these Leftists love to hate on.

Consider the patriarchy as an example. It's a sort of article of faith among feminists that's taken as a sort of what J.S. Mill would have called a dead dogma; it's taken as a fact. And it's used as justification for things like affirmative action, which negatively disadvantage young boys. Now, I'm not a men's rights activist, but most of their arguments are rights. And you look at education, for example, you know, boys falling horribly behind girls in education. 2015 Cornell study showed that men and women going for the same job in a science academia job, women had a 2 to 1 advantage against the boys. Where there used to be structural oppression against women, there isn't anymore, and in many cases, it moves in the opposite direction. Yet this article of faith about patriarchy is taken as prima facie evidence that men are victims, and this is one of the reasons women have been getting unhappier every decade since the Second World War: because feminism has been telling them that they are victims.

And this patriarchy thing is used as justification to punish young boys. What does that remind you of? It reminds me a little bit of original sin. It reminds me a little bit of a parody of religious dogma that no doubt feminists would find horrifying. They would hate the comparison. But is there really any practical difference? No. Both of them are based on faith not fact; both of them are based on leaps of logic and not reality. Now, I'm Christian, by the way, so I don't mean to come across as disrespectful to religion. But the patriarchy operates very much like the concept of original sin. It's used as an excuse to beat people up for the sins of their forefathers, whether or not those sins are even real.

So it's a remarkable and I have to say a very hateful kind of creed that feminism, which, as I said earlier, has such a proud and brilliant history, such a wonderful set of outcomes for women as a result of the brave, intrepid figureheads of the feminist movement who have achieved wonderful things for women, now it's about hating on men, beating up men, and it's sort of become open season on men.

If you look at the headlines from, well, just think about *Jezebel* — you know, the *Gawker* women's blog — or *Buzzfeed* or *Vox* or *Gawker* or *Mic*, any of these new media publications, the sorts of hateful nonsense that they publish every day. They'll publish things about, you know — like *Jezebel* published "How to Kick a Man in the Balls Most Effectively." Journalists for all these publications — journalists from *The*

Guardian are tweeting, you know, "I bathe in male tears," and, "Kill all white men." I mean, this is just absurdly hateful rhetoric, and if you would substitute any of those words for any other groups – you know, anything nonwhite, non-male, non-heterosexual – people would be up in arms about it.

But it's become open season on men, and I've kind of got into this as a gay man who doesn't have a dog in the fight, who doesn't really have skin in the game as far as the war of the sexes is concerned. I've kind of come in and just seen this half or 49% of society – yeah, so technically men are the minority, ladies, not you – 49% of society just being routinely lied about and lied to and beaten up and ridiculed, and I thought, you know what, something has to – somebody has to step up about this.

You've got academics who have been marginalized, like Christina Hoff Sommers. You've got veteran journalists like Cathy Young, who have been very diligent and reasonable about this, but nobody's really kind of cracked the mainstream as a sort of anti-feminist. And you don't want to be an "anti"; "anti-feminist" sounds a bit hateful, like who would be against women? But this is of course the thing. This is the battle we have to fight, which is to explain to people that feminism doesn't mean what it used to, and the modern version of feminism – which people are abandoning, by the way, in their droves, as I said earlier – is a sort of hateful, ugly, authoritarian creed –

WOODS: By the way, some people may think some of your language is a bit over the top, but let me try and help justify it –

YIANNOPOULOS: Not even close. I'm being polite (laughing).

WOODS: Yeah, no, I appreciate that you're holding back here. But what would you say are the chances of Christina Hoff Sommers being hired by a women's studies department?

YIANNOPOULOS: Absolutely zero.

WOODS: Zero?

YIANNOPOULOS: Because she's off reservation. Now, you see the thing is about these departments is they're not really interested in the truth; they're interested in politics. Look at the gay rights lobby, which is a very similar example. You know, the gay rights lobby's given up talking about AIDS and given up talking about equal rights, and now it just wants to bash conservatives at every opportunity. It's become obsessed with transgender pronouns. Any kind of vaguely gender-related topic of the day, they can use to bash conservatives and bash hetero-cis white men, they'll do it. They've sort of left gays behind slightly.

And you know, I'll tell you this. I've never, traveling in the south in America, traveling in very conservative places in Europe and Austrian – you know, I've been all over the world, and I've never received the kind of hatefulness that I have from other gay people for revealing that I was a conservative and from other gay people – the sort of

gay establishment who run the magazines and the charities and what not – for saying that if I were an American I would probably vote Republican or even just being libertarian and not going along with their ridiculous, you know, sort of nannying gender politics.

People like Christina Hoff Sommers, who are – I don't mean any disrespect when I say she wouldn't hurt a fly, but she's a very dangerous and effective critic, because she skewers the arguments of her opponents so brilliantly. But as a person, she's a polite, classy, very genteel lady. And she's not like me. She's not a hell raiser, you know? At least, when she does it she does it with cold facts rather than the inflammatory language which I like to use. But she would never be allowed within a million miles of a gender studies department, because they believe she has nothing interesting to say, because of course she disagrees with them.

These places are not about intellectual inquiry. They're not about the purpose of higher educational institutions, the purpose of education in general, the purpose of university, which is to open and broaden the mind, to bring students into contact with different points of view, to let students wallow in contradictory and confusing and challenging ideas. Well, there's a problem with that on American campuses generally, but there's particularly a problem with it in these race and gender-based courses, which don't exist to explore these subjects in an intellectually honest way. They exist to push one particular answer to the question, and I can't think of a gender studies department that would hire her.

WOODS: Huh. Well, it seems borderline criminal to pause this conversation, but you and I believe in capitalism, and I must do so for just a minute. We'll be right back.

[Sponsored content]

Can you give me three things –

YIANNOPOULOS: Oh, I hate these questions (laughing).

WOODS: Yeah, I know. But in a way it's arbitrary. I'm not asking for the top three; I'm not asking you to rank them.

YIANNOPOULOS: Okay, do it, do it.

WOODS: But three things these people believe that are demonstrably false, but that they repeat incessantly.

YIANNOPOULOS: Sure. Well, the wage gap. The wage gap isn't true. If you've heard that women get paid less than men for the same work, that's a lie. What you have to do to – shall I go through them super briefly?

WOODS: Yeah, sure, and I'll link to it on – let's see, this is going to be Episode 576, so on the show notes page I'll also link to the whole episode we did on this. This'll be

TomWoods.com/576. It'll have links to all your stuff too there. But yeah, give us the — let's say you're on Fox News, and they give you just five seconds to talk. How would you explain it?

YIANNOPOULOS: If you take all of the money that men earn and all of the money that women earn and do a simple division, you will find that women earn less totally. But that confuses wages with earnings. What women hear when feminists tell them that they're 77 cents to the dollar is that they'll get paid less for the same work as men. That isn't true. The reason that overall women earn less total money than men is, well, guess what, they have kids, and they make different life choices. Women very often work shorter hours, take longer holidays, irrespective of children.

All sorts of other different life — and they choose different subjects. Like if women want to earn more, they should stop doing liberal arts courses and major in engineering, but they choose not to do that, not because of some patriarchal super structural conspiracy, but because they don't choose to. If you think there's a conspiracy that's holding women out of physics and math, you have to explain why there isn't one holding them out of biology and veterinary medicine, where they dominate. Women simply choose different things to men. And you know, the wage gap is like babyish economics that no serious, reputable economist would take seriously — and none do, in fact. And it's advocacy research designed to bash one half of the population by the other group which is currently in power, at least in the media, which is women. So that's a lie and ridiculous.

The second crazy thing they believe which is demonstrably untrue would be campus rape culture. The idea that on liberal, progressive campuses in America, there is — liberal campuses in America are hotbeds of racism, sexism, and rape is funny enough on its own merits in the same way that liberal-run cities are the only ones that have problems with black riots and violence, because there always seems to be a left-wing politician in charge of these places. It's ridiculous to suggest that American campuses, which all of the data shows are some of the safest places for young women, are hotbeds of rape with comparable sexual assault statistics to war-torn African countries. It just doesn't pass the basic common sense test.

Indeed, many of these moral panics, and that's what we call them when there's something so stupid it can't possibly be true, nonetheless kind of grabs the public imagination and becomes a meme in the press — whether it's acid rain, for example, or the Satanic abuse panic in the UK in the '80s and '90s — these things that are just so obviously not true become somehow embedded in popular culture and the press, and campus rape culture is one of them.

The reason I really object to it is that it hurts women horribly. If I were a professional rapist — is there such a thing? No. But if I were a rapist, the best thing I could hope for would be liberals, because they create such a panic about rape and so many of these stories turn out to be untrue, because when you tell women that they will be listened to and believed no matter what they say, the liars come forward, and you get Jackie at UVA, you get Duke lacrosse, you get Emma Sulkowicz at Columbia. Now in a

situation where most people, even like right thinking, good, decent, honest people who have love and compassion and sympathy for women, their default position now when they hear about a rape on an American campus is to think that's a lie, that must be a lie. That must be a lie like the rest of them. Because we've accepted narrative over fact.

Rolling Stone, one of the great magazines in American culture, is just publishing outright lies almost knowingly. Just the level of negligence, like, stepping into outright mendacity is extraordinary, because they think it's just an important subject to write about, and who's going to dare check? You know, it's a rape story. Who'd be such a monster to check that it actually happened?

Well, many of them aren't happening, and you know, the demonization of men in colleges, them being subjected to compulsory consent classes in school before they can graduate, the underlying subtext of which is you're all potential rapists, and all of the fake rape stories that are coming out because journalists are so stupid or just outright mendacious and wicked and don't care who they're lying about and the reputations of the young boys they're destroying – they'll write about all this stuff, and the net result is that women aren't believed. Of course, the Left turns around and says yes, there's still a problem thing women not being believed about rape. Yeah, you made it. You did this. And so that's the second thing.

Probably the third thing is – well, I'm not quite going to answer your question, but I'm going to try and be interesting. The patriarchy. Is there a sinister, mystical force underpinning all of society that keeps women down, that makes women victims? Well, yes and no. As ever, feminists get it 40% right and the go off the rails. It's certainly true that men are just better at some things. There's a different IQ distribution between men and women. Men seem to have different aptitudes. Women are better at some things than men. You know, we have different brains, and some of that is socialization, but some of it isn't.

And it's certainly true that of the things men are good at, many of those things are stuff that really move civilization and culture forward. So art, philosophy, engineering, mathematics, physics. Much of that stuff has a high prestige value in our society. So if the patriarchy does exist, women should be grateful for it, because it's men who made the Pill and the washing machine, enabling them to go to work instead of being stuck at home with babies and mangles.

On the other hand, the world that feminists paint, the world that they describe simply doesn't reflect reality for many young men of 20 who are going through school having been thrown on Adderall or Ritalin – what is it, 1 in 7 American boys? You can check the *Esquire* article from, I think it was almost 10 years ago now, we've known about this. Nobody cares. Boys thrown on these psychotropic drugs, because they're too boisterous; in effect being punished because they're boys. Through to university where there are endless classes and programs for women, consent classes for boys because you're all potential rapists. Into the workplace where men are systematically discriminated against, and that's not an exaggeration. There are so many people

coming out and saying I was passed over for promotion. My boss specifically told me that the company has a diversity problem, so we're not allowed to promote any more white men.

We live in a society now run by people who do not believe in meritocracy and who do not believe in freedom of speech. They don't believe in the free open marketplace of ideas. They don't believe in classical liberalism. They don't believe in hard work and talent being rewarded. I find that terrifying. And the way in which they articulate their fundamental hostility to freedom, to liberty, to individual choice, freedom of creative expression and all of the other things that libertarians hold dear and cultural libertarians like me think are utterly essential – the way they express that is this sinister conspiracy theory called the patriarchy. And again, it is used, just as an example, to hate on men. And it's nonsense, doesn't stand up to scrutiny.

And in the respect that it does stand up, women should be very, very grateful for it. Just to give you one last thing – because I've been talking for a long time – one last thing: is there a patriarchy? Well, if there is, women should be grateful for it, because men, for example, who work all the difficult, dangerous, dirty jobs – 97% of workplace fatalities are male not female – because if the patriarchy is around, it's not doing a very good job, because it's putting men in all the dangerous positions, all of the low paid positions, all of the terrible, hazardous conditions, like the frontline.

And it's also forcing men to pay vastly more into the tax system than they will ever take out. Men of course pay far more in taxes than women do, die sooner, and don't have kids. So they don't use public services that – women are sort of clamped to public services their whole lives in some cases, depending on how many children they have and how sick they get. Men very often pay huge amounts into tax and never really use very much of them. That's a slight generalization, but not really. The statistics bear me out on that. If there is a patriarchy, thank God for it, because me as a gay man, I don't particularly want to subsidize your pregnancy. Why the hell should I? But I have to because of the way the tax system's set up. So you know, most of these things, to the extent that they are even true, actually feminism should kind of, you know, hush up about it, because the more men find out about it, the more men might start to object.

WOODS: Well, I was feeling particularly controversy averse today, so I thought I'd have Milo on to talk to us.

YIANNOPOULOS: (laughing)

WOODS: (laughing) Listen, how can people find out more?

YIANNOPOULOS: No, I'm just talking about statistics and science.

WOODS: Oh, I agree. No, look, I completely am with you.

YIANNOPOULOS: There's a word on the Internet for this: it's called "hatefacts." They're the incontrovertible facts that nobody wants you to talk about, because you're not supposed to, because it's not polite. This is the thing: feminism picks on men, because it counts on – well, it often picks weak targets, because feminists are bullies – but it picks on weak targets like, you know, it'll go for the sort of dorky – there's a reason that feminism always goes after comic books, tech, video games. Why? Because these men are weak, easy targets. They don't have any social cache. They don't have any purchase in the media, so feminists can go off on them and beat them up.

And feminism also, it relies on chivalry to make its case. It relies on men being too polite or being too scared because they want to eventually have sex with women and don't want to say bad things about girls, because then they won't get to have sex with them. Relies on the fact that women have all the sexual power in every relationship, and it relies on the fact that men are, in many cases, just too polite and too kind, and just go, yeah, all right, dear. The problem is that that's been happening for so many generations, so many decades now that the feminist arguments that aren't true have come to become accepted because men just didn't stand up and object to them.

Well, as a homosexual, I can, because I don't have any skin in the game, and I don't mind about upsetting women. I don't want to have sex with them whether they're fat or thin, and once in a while when they say something egregiously untrue, I don't have a problem going on TV and telling them.

WOODS: If people would like to follow you, what's the easiest way for them to do that?

YIANNOPOULOS: Well, you can find me on Twitter, at least for now. Twitter doesn't like me very much. It unverified me a while ago, because I make naughty jokes about feminists and Black Lives Matter and all the other things that it loves so much.

WOODS: Oh, so it un verifies you, which I guess is a penalty, but it's funny –

YIANNOPOULOS: It's a little slap on the wrist.

WOODS: Right, but the funny thing is by un verifying you, it makes it look like, well, we can't be sure it's really him. But that would be evidence it's really you, if you're making statements like that. That proves that you're the real person.

YIANNOPOULOS: Well, it's a political thing. They're using – I'm a public figure, and I am probably one of the most imitated people on the Internet – mostly out of affection, but whatever. I'm one of the most imitated people on the Internet, I would imagine, and the verification symbol is indication that you are talking to who you think you're talking to, so it has implications for privilege, for instance, when people are talking to journalists online. But they've used it as an ideological weapon, which is a little dodgy, but we can get into that another day. Yeah, so you can find me at Nero – like the emperor, who is awesome in every way, except for the burning Christians thing, because I like Christians, but aside from that he was great. So follow me at

Twitter.com/Nero, named after the best emperor, and I'm on YouTube and various other places, and you can read my columns at *Breitbart* news. I'm the technology editor at *Breitbart*, so I run the Tech section, and I also oversee our social justice coverage. So I supervise writers talking about campus crazies, protests, feminism, Black Lives Matter, and all that kind of thing.

WOODS: Well, that's great. We're going to link to everything you just said; we're going to link to it at TomWoods.com/576. You're not on Facebook? Because I have the verification checkmark on Facebook.

YIANNOPOULOS: Oh, I am. You know what? I am verified on Facebook. I completely forgot. It's /MYiannopoulos, which is impossible for anyone to spell, so just Google me and cut and past it. (laughing) But if you search for me on Facebook, you'll see the blue tick. I am verified on Facebook, thank God. Yes —

WOODS: Me too, me too. And they haven't —

YIANNOPOULOS: I'm verified on Rap Genius (laughing), the website where you can go and explain, like, what rap lyrics mean.

WOODS: Oh, I was going to say, I guess I'm so old I don't even know what that is (laughing).

YIANNOPOULOS: No, it's great. You can go on and there'll be all these sort of like hideously explicit rap lyrics, and you can go on and sort of explain them in nice polite English, which I occasionally do when I'm bored at home.

WOODS: See, since I listen to progressive rock, I go to sites that try to explain what all this LSD-induced lyric is supposed to mean.

YIANNOPOULOS: Of course you do. Libertarians always have such bad taste in music.

WOODS: Oh, you're — look, that's another episode. We'll —

YIANNOPOULOS: No, it is, and we're going to do this. I'm going to come back, and I'm going to tell you why libertarian taste in music is so awful.

WOODS: Now by the way, I agree with you. I think most of it is awful, because they don't listen enough to what I say on the subject.

YIANNOPOULOS: (laughing)

WOODS: I know you disagree with me. Because you think all libertarians listen to Pink Floyd and stuff, right?

YIANNOPOULOS: Progressive rock, give me a break.

WOODS: Oh, you are the worst. All right, look, I've completely changed my whole view
—

YIANNOPOULOS: (laughing)

WOODS: Ugh, and it's funny, every once in a while I do an episode on music on the show, and by the way, this goes to show people agree with you: my download figures for those episodes are cut in half. They don't care what I have to say.

YIANNOPOULOS: (laughing)

WOODS: And you know, I had, Milo, for a brief moment, I had this naive view that people listen to The Tom Woods Show because they cared about Tom Woods, and that's really not it. (laughing) That's not it at all.

YIANNOPOULOS: They listen to an episode of you talking about dad rock and say, oh my God.

WOODS: As soon as I step one foot off the nonaggression principle onto some other topic, they are gone (laughing).

YIANNOPOULOS: (laughing) Well, I'll come back, and I'll show you some good music, and we'll listen to some rap; we'll listen to some Wagner; we'll listen to some '80s and '90s pop diva ballads; we'll listen to some Nine Inch Nails. I'll take you through a musical odyssey — maybe some Beethoven. We'll listen to good music, and you can throw all that dad rock away.

WOODS: All right, let me tell you something, Milo: that ain't never going to happen.

YIANNOPOULOS: (laughing)

WOODS: (laughing) You can forget about that. But I am glad we got a chance to talk today, and I appreciate you, and I hope people will check you out. All the links will be at TomWoods.com/576. Thanks again.

YIANNOPOULOS: Thank you so much for having me.