



Episode 607: Potpourri Episode: Guantanamo, iPhones, and the Migrant Crisis

Guest: Daniel McAdams

WOODS: I haven't talked to you in quite some time and was looking at what you guys have been talking about on the *Ron Paul Liberty Report*. Of course I'm going to link to that on the show notes page for today, TomWoods.com/607. It's RonPaulLibertyReport.com, and from there you can subscribe to the YouTube channel. Maybe I'll also put that out. And you guys are releasing new episodes with what frequency?

MCADAMS: We do it every day live at noon Eastern Time, so – every workday, I should say. Monday through Friday, live at noon.

WOODS: How about that? And you've been covering so many interesting topics, topics that I've wanted to get to and I sometimes can't figure out who would be an ideal guest. But half the time you and Ron just sit and talk, and I think, well, either one would have been the ideal guest for any of these topics. So I picked out a couple that I saw that I thought would be interesting for my audience and that people have been asking about. To be honest with you, I have not really – because I've just been busy with a bunch of things – I haven't really followed this whole iPhone thing, where law enforcement or the FBI is demanding that Apple cooperate – I guess it has to do with the San Bernardino attacks? Can you just tell me what's going on because I'm completely clueless about it?

MCADAMS: It's really interesting, Tom, because, just a bit of background, the iPhone 6S features an enhanced encryption feature. And what it means is, you know that little four-digit code that you use to get into your phone, if you use it, what they've put in there is that if you do that 10 times and you still don't have the right code, the entire contents of the phone is erased. It's gone to cyberspace. It just disappears. It's a hacking protection. So they have the phone from this gentleman who was involved in the San Bernardino mass murders, and they are afraid to try to hack it, because if it takes them more than ten times it'll be erased. So what the FBI wants to do is compel Apple, to compel its software engineers to engineer essentially a backdoor, and I'm certainly not a tech expert by any stretch, but to change the software in that phone so that it does not go to the default 10 times missed vaporizer data mode.

So that's the idea, and Apple is arguing – well, it's arguing a number of things, but essentially the case is all about whether the federal government can compel a private

company to perform labor for it. And some people have said it smacks of slavery to force this to happen, and others have talked about the privacy issue. And what we wrote about on the Ron Paul Institute website, my colleague Adam Dick discovered, you know, the FBI all along said this is only about this one terrorist's phone, how can you object to us getting into this terrible terrorist's phone –

WOODS: Right.

MCADAMS: – and this is no way sets a precedent for breaking in –

WOODS: And then I saw Adam's headline saying that they changed their mind, saying, actually, sorry, it does set a precedent.

MCADAMS: Yeah, when he got before Congress before the House Intelligence Committee, he said it "will be instructive to other similar cases." So it's obviously – and the other thing that Dr. Paul and I did an episode on it, you know, this is so much like the Patriot Act, because they have been wanting to break into these phones for quite a while, and they were looking for the right thing, so they got their "9/11" with the San Bernardino attack, and you roll something like this out, and who's going to say, hey, you shouldn't get into a terrorist's phone. It makes you look like you're some kind of a sympathizer. So they're not dumb in the way they do these things, but certainly the consequences will be for the rest of us and also for Apple, frankly, as a company, because there is a certain amount of confidence that people have now that their iPhone is secure. And now anyone in the world will know that the U.S. government has a backdoor into their phone if they comply with this thing, so it's really the federal government compelling a private company and really destroying its produce and the whole philosophy of its product.

WOODS: Did you happen to see the – well, at this point I've lost track of which debate it was, but have you been watching the Republican debates/

MCADAMS: I've watched them all; I've listened to most of your and Lew's analysis, which is better than the debates.

WOODS: (laughing) Thanks. Well, because I remember this came up in one of the debates, and Governor Kasich's answer was, you know, doggone it, we shouldn't even be talking about this publicly. The president should take people from Apple behind closed doors with law enforcement, and they should just hammer this out in secret.

MCADAMS: (laughing) That sounds like *The Godfather*: either your signature or your brains are going to be on this contract.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah. But I thought, yeah, that is the way I could imagine some of them would do it, and they would justify that on the grounds – they would say, look, this would even be good for Apple, because if Apple in effect yields to us, capitulates, nobody has to know they did.

MCADAMS: Yeah, yeah.

WOODS: But the whole thing is very off-putting. I mean, what is it they're hoping to find on this phone? Is it contacts so they can figure out who else they might have been in cahoots with, stuff like that?

MCADAMS: Yeah, I think that is essentially what it is, the contacts, and you know, they do have a search warrant for the phone, but they can't physically get into the phone —

WOODS: Yeah.

MCADAMS: — so that's the problem. They want to know who he's talking to, does he have collaborators, and all this manner of thing, apparently. But as Dr. Paul wrote in his column this week — he wrote a little bit about it — he had a funny title: "First They Came for the iPhones," which I liked (laughing).

WOODS: Yeah, that was a good title. I didn't read the column, but that was a good title.

MCADAMS: But he pointed out that, you know, here again on this whole, it's not a precedent thing, the Manhattan District Attorney, Cyrus Vance, Jr., has 175 of these phones that he wants to break into, so they're lining up, and as soon as Apple either capitulates or is browbeaten or what have you into doing it, then it's going to be a floodgate that opens. And you know, it's — oh, and the other thing, Tom, if I can add really quickly about this that's even more interesting, is that of course Congress is getting in the act. You know, nothing like this can happen, and Congress wants to jump on the bandwagon. In fact, some of the more authoritarian members said, if we only had legislation regulating encryption this wouldn't have happened in the first place. We would have just made it illegal to encrypt these phones (laughing).

WOODS: Oh, geez.

MCADAMS: So their knee jerk reaction is always to destroy our liberty, always to curtail our freedom and our ability to speak in private without the government listening. And I know this will shock you, Tom: they're going to form a commission to study it (laughing).

WOODS: (laughing) But actually, Daniel, that's probably the best thing they could do, because no commission ever produces anything of value. Let them study all they want.

MCADAMS: Yeah, yeah.

WOODS: Ah, geez, that's terrible. All right, let's talk about some other things. This will be like a potpourri episode. Maybe I'll even put the word "potpourri" in the title.

MCADAMS: Yeah, that's it.

WOODS: Still thinking about it.

MCADAMS: Fresh and smelly (laughing).

WOODS: Yeah, that's right, except this'll be like a rotten potpourri (laughing). I don't know if there is such a thing, but it's sitting around too long.

MCADAMS: The devil's potpourri.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah. You had an episode on the migrant crisis in Europe and the EU, so I'd like to hear your thoughts on that, because of course what you're dealing with in this crisis is a combination of, first, the welfare states in Europe as a magnet for people, and secondly, the question of why are they migrants in the first place. You know, it's like Paul Krugman saying about the crash of 2008, I don't care how we got into this mess; I just want to get out of it. But you know, it is kind of important to look into how you got into it. "Why are these people on the move in the first place?" is a question that tends to be left on the side. So those two issues have to be sorted out, and I presume that's what you were talking to Dr. Paul about.

MCADAMS: Yeah, and it's – what a coincidence that people are leaving every country that we've been liberating lately (laughing) –

WOODS: Yeah, it's got to be a coincidence.

MCADAMS: – as quickly as they can. They're just not happy living in the new Switzerland that we've given them, you know?

WOODS: Yeah, so they want to go to the real Switzerland or something. They're so excited about it.

MCADAMS: Yeah, I mean, it's not a laughing matter. You know, these are hundreds of thousands of lives that are at stake, and there is misery. But as you do point out, there's a lot to do with the economic migration. There's a big attraction to coming and living in a welfare state, where probably I'm guessing the worst situation in Germany is better these days than anything in Libya or anything in Syria or anything in Afghanistan. So you do have that.

But the issue that we discussed on the episode, the other part of it was Brussels' blind following of U.S. foreign policy. You know, this is what's gotten them into it. And you can argue that on Libya the French did sort of play the lead, but it really was Washington's backing and Washington's doing that led it to happen ultimately. So Europe is following this aggressive interventionist foreign policy, and they are alone enjoying the benefits of a disaster created. You know, thankfully we're not facing the crisis. They can't walk to America.

The other countries that are involved in destroying Syria, namely Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Israel, of those three Saudi Arabia and Israel are not interested in taking a single

migrant and won't allow any refugees in, and Turkey is playing a super dirty game, because they've got a lot of them there, but Erdoğan, the Turkish president, is essentially using them to blackmail the EU. He cut a deal last November with Brussels, saying, hey guys, I need a few billion dollars or I'm going to let the floodgates open. And they agreed to give him I think \$3 billion, and they're going to fast track Turkey's EU membership application, and so he's continuing to do that. He's continuing to hold – because there are many, many, many of them in Turkey now that he's continuing to hold Brussels hostage for money and access, etc., etc. So it's a terrible situation.

WOODS: And in a number of these countries, I mean, bearing in mind that Europe has been obviously very socially liberal for quite a long time, and that includes their views of multiculturalism and so on, and there has been a nationalist strain, but it's been kept pretty well under wraps by shaming them and by just the complete triumph of political correctness. But now all of a sudden there is this anti-migrant sentiment that is popping up in a lot of countries, but I don't know how strong it is. Apparently it's strong enough that Facebook will censor stories about what's actually happening, and there are journalists and news agencies that are self-censoring stories about crimes committed by the migrants, that people can't be allowed to know this. Even though all they do all day long is talk about the wonders of democracy and freedom and so forth, when it conflicts with their agenda, they could not care less about these things. Where do you see this going? I mean, is it possible – is there enough electoral strength on the part of these anti-migrant folks to put a stop to some of this?

MCADAMS: Well, on the one point you made – and this is an anecdotal point, I think Lew Rockwell put it up on his site, but it was really awful. But it was in Sweden where a young gal was being raped by one of these migrants, and she pulled out some pepper spray and sprayed him, and she's the one that got prosecuted for using the pepper spray.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

MCADAMS: So I think you're right that the media has been in collusion with the governments. The German media did not even report these horrific New Year's Eve events in Cologne, where there were hundreds of attacks on German women from these new immigrants – sex attacks on German women – and the German media just covered it up at the best of the government. But I think when it did finally come out, I think it was a real wakeup call for Germans, and there has been a real backlash. But here's the problem, Tom: when you suppress this natural revulsion and this natural anger at the economic dislocation that will happen with these hundreds of thousands coming in and joining the welfare state and the cultural challenges of living in a village of, say, 200 Germans for the last thousand years and all of a sudden 1,000 foreigners come in, when you suppress this what happens is you get the far right parties that emerge, and there are a number of them in Germany and elsewhere who have leapfrogged over the healthy criticism of the situation to being extremists. And thank you, Angela Merkel, because this is what she's created.

So that is what's happening in the west, but interestingly in Central Europe, there is a different movement that's happening, and this I would say is led by Viktor Orbán, the prime minister of Hungary. He had the gall to challenge Brussels when Brussels said, okay guys, we messed up when we welcomed in these several hundred thousand refugees; we're going to have to share them equally with all of you guys, so each member state is going to have to open up and take in however many thousand. And Orbán said no way, we're not going to do it, we refuse. And it shocked them. And as of now he's going to hold a referendum in his country: should we listen to Brussels and take all these people in, or should we tell them to take a hike? And it looks like about 80% of the people are going to vote with him, to tell Brussels to buzz off.

But Orbán has been joined by the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Poland all to a degree in bucking the trend of Brussels railroading them. You know, they were pushed around by Moscow for a long time, and I think they're starting to wake up and realize that Brussels is not much different. So there is kind of an interesting, I think healthy reaction in the former east Central Europe now, and we'll have to see where that leads.

WOODS: Well, in general everybody has to be in favor of resisting the EU in general. I don't care — oh, but the EU, they're doing a nice thing here and there. I don't care (laughing). I mean, talk about the absolute enemy. So it's good that somebody has the nerve to stand up to them.

I want to shift to one other thing before we move onto the Institute. You did an episode I think on the whole issue of Guantanamo, and I'm looking over my episode list here. This is Episode 607, and I have not covered the Guantanamo issue. When you talk to somebody, let's say, out of the stable of neoconservative writers, what you get is, Guantanamo is a place where we put people who are exceptionally dangerous and with people who have been let out, they've gone right back in to terrorism, which goes to show that we need to have Guantanamo. What can you share with us about this whole thing?

MCADAMS: Well, I think what's so funny is these people will be the first ones to be waving the flag and talking about patriotism. But what you have in Guantanamo was the powers that be decided that the American justice system was no good, because it offered the possibility that if someone's tried they may be found innocent, and that can't happen. These people are horrible terrorists. Never mind innocent until proven guilty; we have to have a military commission where you don't have the same rights to face your accuser, to see the evidence, to have decent representation. No, it's simply a show trial. And when that's not possible we're just going to hold you forever.

And Peter van Buren — I don't know if you read Peter's stuff, but Peter's very good on many foreign policy things. He did a piece — he's a former State Department guy who was in Iraq. He did a piece a couple of weeks ago about this young fellow who was picked up at age 24, he was held for 13 years, protesting his innocence the whole time, and finally after 13 years they said, yeah, you know what, you're right, you weren't guilty, you weren't a terrorist, so good luck, sorry for the inconvenience. And

here the guy goes with his life ruined. He's in his 30s now; he was in the prime of his life. And there have been many cases of this, of people being held – remember we offer rewards to people in Afghanistan for turning in terrorists, so you can imagine if you had a real beef with the guy in the village down the road, all you had to do was drop a dime and call Uncle Sam and say that dude's a terrorist. And he's gone; your problem's solved; you get a few thousand in the process. So this happened over and over again.

The other thing that Dr. Paul's mentioned many times is that there have been I think 4 or 500 trials of people that have been accused of terrorism in the U.S. federal courts, there have been however many convictions – I think most of them if not all have been convicted – but they've actually gotten real trials and fair trials, and they're being held in prisons in the U.S. So I would turn the table and say the people who don't believe that our system of justice, for all of its flaws, is better than a system of a military tribunal, they're the ones who lack patriotism.

WOODS: Well, on this Guantanamo issue, if you do listen to these Republican debates, you find that they're all in favor; they want to put more people in there, because they say it's necessary for the safety of the country. You're saying that we can have security without this thing. That's what you're telling me, Daniel.

MCADAMS: Yeah, it's called a trial, you know? None of these people are terrorists. They're suspected terrorists. Nothing has been proven. Nothing is proven without a trial. So if you believe these people are this, then have a trial. Have a trial in the U.S., and if they're guilty, they should be locked away, and if not, they should be freed. And sadly, the recidivism problem, I don't have any data, but I wonder if it's not related to the fact that these people have been tortured for 15 years by the U.S. When they come out, they are going to be a little irritated. They probably will look for a target to take out their anger. It doesn't justify it. We certainly can understand their feelings.

WOODS: Okay, I want to talk about what you're doing these days, and I want people to really listen in, because when I had Dr. Paul on one of the times I've had him on the show, I asked him if he could think in U.S. history of any organization that was formed for the sake of consistently promoting nonintervention as a foreign policy position, and he couldn't think of one – because I couldn't think of one either. So the Ron Paul Institute for Peace and Prosperity, of which you are the executive director, is unique in U.S. history. Now, that's no surprise in a certain sense, because for 100 years we weren't even allowed to consider nonintervention as an option. That's not on the table. It's varieties of intervention. But now you guys are here, and I do want people to listen as you take a few minutes to tell us exactly what you guys do. The website of course is RonPaulInstitute.org, but what are your activities? I know you're doing a lot of really important work, and I want people to know about it.

MCADAMS: Well, first of all, we're actually going into our third year as of – I forget the exact date in April, but we'll hit our three years, so that in itself, I'm pretty proud that we've lasted this long.

WOODS: Yeah.

MCADAMS: But you're right. We focus without hesitation, without compromise on the issue of nonintervention, and we've done it by creating a broad coalition of people together with us. And it's interesting; I just put up an interview I did on *MintPress News*, which is a very progressive website. The editor in chief is a Muslim woman, very progressive, and we had a great talk about the neocons. So it's pretty unique what we do, in that we reach across the aisle and we want to have a trans-partisan kind of approach to these kinds of things. We also focus a lot on the civil liberties issue at home, and I think the two of them are so important. You know, the aggressive foreign policy, the interventionist foreign policy, the forced democratizations overseas, they do come back on our shores; they come back to haunt us, so you have to look at them both.

And frankly, we also have to look at the Federal Reserve and economic issues as they relate to issues of war and peace. We would not have the wars that we've been suffering if the Fed wasn't there to print the money up whenever they needed it. If the neocons has actually reached into their pockets to pay for these wars that they're arguing for, they'd probably be singing a different tune, or at least Americans that are being forced to pay for it would sing a different tune.

So what we do is, we're a little bit different from, say, an AEI or one of these enormously funded think-tanks, sitting around with a bunch of PhDs writing these long policy statements, arguing for this war or that and then being funded by Lockheed Martin, in that we want to talk to the average interested person. We want to write in a journalistic style, and my background before I came to work for Dr. Paul was as a journalist and an analyst, and so we want to write in a journalistic style, in short articles that people can read in five minutes, can easily digest, and to give them an alternative to the mainstream take on things, to let them know that there are a lot of other people out there who are thinking and writing and being active in these areas. They're not alone. And we've been able to reach — it's interesting; our viewership and our readership overseas is huge as well, and that's one of the things that surprised me. So many people overseas are thrilled to see that there are people here who don't want to bomb them or give them democracy or whatever it's called these days.

So we do that; we publish articles; we're in the media all the time. We published Dr. Paul's book last July. Adam Dick, my colleague who focuses on civil liberties, is coming out with a book in a couple of months now that we're going to publish. So we do quite a bit of these sorts of things to wave the flag, that there is a noninterventionist movement here and we are not going to let you ignore us.

WOODS: You are really filling an important void. As I say, I mean, really before 2007 there wasn't really any national awareness that this was an option at all, and now with the Ron Paul Institute you're sustaining what Dr. Paul was doing in public life while he's now in private life, and that is just so important. And I want to just take a moment — I have a lot of people, it amazes me, who have listened to every single episode of this show or who listen to it every day as of a year ago or something. They've listened to a

lot. And they know that when I have a guest on, almost never do I just come out and say I need you to donate to these people. Almost never. I say they're doing great work and you should check them out, but I almost never say you've got to donate to these people. But I'm going to say that. I'm going to expend a bit of my capital that I've built up on behalf of a cause that I believe in deeply, that there is nothing else quite like the Ron Paul Institute, and it can do so much more.

We really do want to see programs for students so that we can train up a generation of students who will be able to see through the propaganda and help other people see through the propaganda. It's so important and valuable what they're doing. It really is what Dr. Paul has wanted to do for a long time, so I hope people will visit RonPaulInstitute.org and help them out. I will also link to it at TomWoods.com/607. But it's just so essential, and it would be a shame – you know, we get jaded when we get fundraising appeals, because every institution is just on the verge of going bankrupt unless you send \$10 today. Like, we all know that's phony, especially when it gets sent to us by institutions where we know the executive director is riding around in a limousine and so on and on. Daniel McAdams ain't riding around in no limousine, and they run an extremely tight ship, and you can be sure that they're going to put your hard-earned contribution to good and practical use. So please consider a contribution to the Ron Paul Institute. I hope I didn't embarrass you in any way here, Dan – well, first of all I disclosed that you're not riding around here in a limousine. I'm sorry for giving away some of your personal details.

MCADAMS: (laughing) No, there's no limo down here. As a matter of fact, we had a donor and a supporter of ours came down to visit us from the Midwest yesterday, and he said he was on his GPS or he was looking at his Google Earth, and he thought for sure there must be a mistake because the address we had looked kind of like a junky building, and he wanted to make sure that it really was our headquarters, and I assured him this just proves that your donation is not wasted on a fancy locale (laughing).

WOODS: (laughing) That's right. That's exactly right. Before I let you go, tell me something about the *Ron Paul Liberty Report*. I'm curious about – so every day, you and Dr. Paul and occasionally with a guest are doing a video program. It's a bite-sized length basically. How do the topics get decided? Does Dr. Paul decide them? Do you decide them?

MCADAMS: Sometimes on a good day we'll know the night before what we're going to do, but that does not often happen. Sometimes I'll be sitting there waiting to hear from him and hoping to hear from him, and probably the same is true for him, but we're poring through the news in the morning. We want to make is something that's pulled from the headlines as much as possible, so we'll scour the news, and he'll send me an email, what do you think about this, and I'll say, what do you think about that. And I'll tell you, Tom, there's nothing that focuses the mind like a live show (laughing).

WOODS: Yeah, really. I'm not sure I could do exactly what you do. I have plenty of prep time in advance, but you've got to just go in there cold in some cases. But it's so

natural. You guys have a great rapport, and you're both knowledgeable. I mean, of course you were in Dr. Paul's office for so many years; you guys worked together. So the finished product comes out very well, and I'm glad to know that you guys are doing it and that he's enjoying it, and you know, I mean, he turns 81 this year, and what does he want to do more than keep doing what he's always been doing? That's fantastic. I just love the fact that he's not spending his alleged retirement going around playing golf – not that we would have begrudged him that.

MCADAMS: (laughing)

WOODS: That's the last thing in the world I would want to do. I mean, yeah, I want to enjoy my family, but while they're doing their things, I want to go on doing my show.

MCADAMS: Yeah, and he's working harder than ever. I mean, he's constantly studying material, getting ready for material. But you know, the funny thing, Tom, all the time I worked for him on Capitol Hill, it was a little more formal. You went in there when you had an issue that you wanted to talk to him about. But the fun thing that I have to say about working with him down here is you kind of see a different side, and I almost wish that we'd record some of our blooper reels, because he's so funny –

WOODS: You should.

MCADAMS: His humor is so –

WOODS: That would get you a lot of viewers. Ron Paul bloopers, are you kidding me?

MCADAMS: It's just a joy to work with him, and it's just a lot of fun every day, so despite the stress of having to do the show, I really enjoy it in a way that's very different from how I enjoyed Capitol Hill.

WOODS: Oh, no doubt, no doubt. But you know what? It's funny. I'm only 10% joking here: that's a great premium to give to your top donors: the Ron Paul blooper reel.

MCADAMS: (laughing)

WOODS: People would donate for that. Are you kidding me? And don't put it on YouTube. The only way you can get it is by donating like \$100 or something. People would do that.

MCADAMS: That's a great idea.

WOODS: I'm telling you, you think about that. All right, listen, RonPaulInstitute.org is where I'm urging people to go, and Daniel, we should talk more often, because I love the fact that we can have a potpourri episode, cover a lot of ground, and still get in under 30 minutes of interview. Very well done. Thanks so much.

MCADAMS: Thank you, Tom.