



Episode 842: Should We Play Nice and Pretend Leftists Aren't Hypocrites When They're Suddenly Outraged by Government?

Guest: Bob Murphy

WOODS: Nice to have you not be on *Contra Krugman*, because there are issues that sometimes arise that are not connected with Krugman, and we've got to talk about them. And this is one of them.

MURPHY: And isn't it refreshing to not even have to mention the guy?

WOODS: Not even have to mention the guy.

MURPHY: Except for when you just did?

WOODS: Except for when I just did. That's right. Now, maybe we could do an awkward segue in this episode too. We'll see. I don't know how that'll work. Yeah, you know where you won't have to deal with violent leftists?

But anyway, the point of this episode, as I just laid out to people, is trying to figure out what's the right approach to take in this situation. And I know you've been thinking about it a lot. You've been writing about it a lot. I sent out an email to my list the other day that crystallized some of my thoughts, because Brendan O'Neill in *The Spectator* in the UK expressed them so beautifully it was like I wrote them – not because they're so beautiful, but because they're so much like my thoughts. So I'm going to share that with you in a minute. But you I know have kind of vacillated on this, not knowing exactly what the right position is, and you've really thought about it. So what have you decided is the right approach to take broadly? And then we'll look at some particulars.

MURPHY: Well, if you don't mind, Tom, I'd like to keep your listeners in suspense. Let me not give them my conclusion, but let me just sort of –

WOODS: Oh, good, okay.

MURPHY: – build up to it. So all along during the campaign, I was saying, Hey guys, I don't like Donald Trump. I think he's a jerk, personally, and I think a lot of his policies will be really bad. And sometimes I even put it in caps on my blog so that nobody could me saying that. And I would say, I will say, however, that these attacks against him are really over the top, and it's starting to make me sympathize with the guy.

And what really flipped it for me was when *National Review* ran their whole issue dedicated to taking him out, and I thought, these guys, I know it's not that they're up late at night worrying about civil liberties and restraining military aggression abroad, so why are they against it? And so that's when I actually flipped and stopped treating his candidacy as a joke — you know, just as kind of a funny thing because he was entertaining — and thought, Oh my gosh, this is interesting. So there was that element.

And then I thought he was going to lose the election, and when he won I could not believe it, and I was overjoyed — so I'm just putting my cards on the table so people know where I'm coming from — because I thought he was so much better than Hillary Clinton would have been, not because I would have endorsed every policy he says, obviously especially about trade. And then in the aftermath of that, on social media I was guilty of this — if it is something I should be guilty of — I could not believe the hypocrisy of how many progressives were coming out and excoriating Trump for doing stuff that was 1% of stuff that Obama did. My favorite example is *The New York Times* running a front-page article on how President Obama had a secret kill list and nobody cared about that, and yet we're supposed to be flipping out because Trump gives tax breaks to Carrier.

So that was where I was coming from, and I was just tweet — and then I noticed that I was getting a lot of people following me on Twitter who had "Make America Great Again" hats on in their profile picture and stuff, and I had even more recently some longtime friends kind of privately ask me, So Bob, did you change? I kind of thought you were like an anarchocapitalist libertarian. Did you get really conservative? Are you a big Trump guy now? And so I was like, huh. I realize it is true that's what I had been doing in my social media, was more — I like Peter Klein's phrase. He said, "He's not pro-Trump; he's anti-anti-Trump." And I thought that crystallized what I was doing.

But what made me really stop and pause, Radley Balko had a post — and I don't have it in front of me, but it was very well written, and I knew exactly what he meant. And he said, Hey guys — I'm paraphrasing here. But he said, Hey everybody, yes, progressives are a bunch of hypocrites, or a lot of them are very hypocritical. But you know, right now when Trump is in the White House doing things that you yourselves agree are violations of civil liberty or wrong on foreign policy, maybe you should stop making fun of the snowflakes who need a safe space and start addressing your criticism and targeting your fire against the person who actually has a lot of power in this country. Something along those lines.

And I thought — that really stung me. I thought, Oh man, am I really doing that? And I thought about it, and I've refined my strategy or how I think I'm going to approach this going forward. So I don't agree necessarily with what Balko was saying wholeheartedly, but it really did make me stop and pause for a few days, really thinking this stuff through. So what are your thoughts, Tom?

WOODS: Well, let me refer to this email that I sent out. I guess by the time this airs I probably will also have posted it as a blog post, so I'll link to it at TomWoods.com/842. But this is what's bothering me. This is why — People will say, Well, look, yes, it's true that Obama did bad things and these people weren't particularly alert to it, but now's

not the time to be dwelling on that. That has the ring of Krugman saying, Who cares what caused the financial crisis? We're in it. Let's try and fix it.

MURPHY: Tom, can you stop talking about that guy for once?

WOODS: [laughing] You know where you *will* probably be — Anyway, we'll talk about that later. Anyway, on Twitter, for example, there's a woman who's upset about the immigration thing, and somebody pointed out to her, Well, were you this upset when Obama did the same thing to people migrating from Iraq for six months? And her actual response was, "No, I loved President Obama." What on God's green earth does that have to do with anything, right?

So my view is I don't think these people actually suddenly understand the merits of limited government or that if I just talk to them nicely they're going to get that. Now, if it were my uncle and he was having some insight all of a sudden, I would sit him down and say, Look, now do you kind of understand why I've been having this view? Because maybe one-on-one, my uncle's a regular guy; he's not part of some left-wing violent group or whatever. I might be able to reach him. But I don't think these people do get it, and I think it is necessary to point out the inconsistencies here, because why would I want to spend time collaborating with people who are just going to turn around and stab me in the back five minutes later? I want to see if they have principles or not. There's nothing wrong with that.

So for instance, this email that will I hope be a blog post, Brendan O'Neill was writing in *The Spectator*. And Brendan O'Neill, as anybody knows, is not a Trump supporter. But his point is: I don't get why people are so willing to let others whitewash themselves by comparing themselves to Trump. So for example, Madeleine Albright, this is the woman who famously said — she was told half a million children seem to have perished because of the Iraqi sanctions, and we have all seen the *60 Minutes* clip where she says, We believe the price has been worth it. We've all seen that. Bill Richardson also doubled down on that as well. And now Madeleine Albright is saying, I may register as a Muslim to protest what Donald Trump is doing, and everybody's jumping on the bandwagon saying what a wonderful woman this is. So you forgot that she thought half a million deaths was okay?

That's what Brendan O'Neill is saying, that, Look, in the warped moral universe of anti-Trump hysteria, in the historically illiterate world that has been fashioned by the protestors against him, what happens is Albright seems good, or at least better, because Trump is abnormal. And therefore the rest of them are normal. By portraying him this way, you are implicitly whitewashing everybody else. That's just a fact. If you're going to say this guy is just so abnormal, as Brendan O'Neill says, "The out-of-control hatred for Trump doubles up as an uncritical, conformist apology for pre-Trump, for the rot that came before him. It redeems barbarism."

And then finally, Bob, he says this: "More importantly is what this de-normalization drive does for other politicians. It absolves them. It flatters them. It tells them that what they have done — the destabilization of nations, the destruction of lives — was normal, at least in comparison to this. The left's arrogant, aristocratic withholding of legitimacy from Trump by extension legitimizes his predecessors, including those who did far worse things than Trump has even countenanced."

Now, look, Trump has already started down a very bad foreign policy road, so I wrote an email about that saying, Meanwhile, while people are protesting other things, the real potential disaster of his presidency is unfolding right in front of them and they're so used to not caring what happens to foreigners they don't even notice. So I don't mind criticizing the guy, yeah, but I'm not going to say, Oh, it's a unique evil in the history of America. The only way I would say that is if I were an ignorant idiot educated in the public schools. All right, what do you think, Bob?

MURPHY: Well, it's going to be hard for me to follow that, Tom. You're kind of angry.

WOODS: [laughing] That's what makes it fun.

MURPHY: Right. I agree with a lot of what you're saying. I think you and I came to the same conclusion. Before I lose those more important things in terms of what's wrong with people saying, Hey guys, now that they finally have come around and agree with you, maybe you shouldn't slap them on the hand. What kind of incentive structure is that? I understand that kind of complaint, but I think it's misguided. I don't think it's correct. So I do want to come back to that, because that's kind of what really made me settle on, okay, this is how I'm going to handle this going forward.

But you're right, Tom, in terms of the hypocrisy of this stuff and people who are guilty of the very things they're now coming forward and trying to show what good people they are. So for one thing, David Frum recently had a cover art story in *The Atlantic* about authoritarian regimes — meaning how do we shop Trump. And it was, huh, that's interesting. David Frum knows something about that, I think.

We've got John McCain — you pointed this out, Tom, recently too — John McCain lecturing us on how we've got to treat people with civility, we don't want to sabre rattle and cause problems with our allies. And he was singing a song about "Bomb bomb bomb, bomb bomb Iran" —

WOODS: Indeed.

MURPHY: So again, it's hard for me to take this stuff seriously. And what they're doing — Here's another one, is the outrage about Trump firing Sally Yates. Now, I don't know enough about that situation to know whether or not it's correct, in terms of was she just doing what she thought — what the thing was or whatever. I don't know enough about the law to be able to say that. But what I do know is the people who are flipping out about Trump firing her for just standing up for human decency or whatever are the ones that when Kim Davis was refusing to do what was going to violate her conscience, they said, Do your damn job. I don't know if you guys remember that, but she was the — Do you remember who that was, Tom? Is that enough of a name that your listeners will know?

WOODS: I'll look it up. I know who you're talking about.

MURPHY: Okay yeah, it had to do with marriage licenses and she wouldn't give them, even though that's what now the law said, that couples, she did not think because of her religious beliefs, ought to be —

WOODS: Kim Davis.

MURPHY: Yeah.

WOODS: Kim Davis.

MURPHY: Yeah. And again, there were memes floating around with people who might have disagreed with certain things and then still did their job. So that was the big thing going around for a while, was, Kim Davis needs to do her damn job or resign. Get out of the way and put someone in there who's going to enforce the law as it's coming down from on top. And yet, Sally Yates is a hero for not doing what the new rule was coming down. So there is I think a bit of hypocrisy — and I know people can come in and quibble and say, Oh no, they're totally different because — But it's more when you agree with what the person's doing — And when that Kim Davis thing was happening, I remember thinking, Wait a minute, so now the principle is if you think what the law says violates your moral principles, you want the person to just go ahead and do it anyway? Are you sure that's what the lesson we're supposed to take from this is?

Another thing going on here, Tom, is I think that the people who are — how can I put it? So if someone really is — just rank-and-file people are really upset about what Trump is doing, I understand that, particularly on many issues where I would agree. I didn't like his recent executive order — There were people who already had visas in line; they were going to go start a job; and then all of a sudden, can you imagine, you're going to the airport, and then you realize no, it's cancelled. What a pain in terms of logistical nightmare.

WOODS: Right. And it looks like they have subsequently walked back that part of it, but they should have had their ducks in a row on that.

MURPHY: Right. So whatever everyone thinks about immigration, I mean, clearly this is just bureaucrats and government doing something and messing up people's private schedules and affairs, and that's just what happens. But you're right; I think that that is being hijacked by politicians.

Just like if you remember, Tom, the Tea Party movement, when it first started, that was pretty pure, I think, legitimate, grassroots opposition to the bailouts and when they thought Obama was going to come in and really expand government's footprint in health care. And I think that was pretty sincere and really were people who just didn't want the government bailing out big bankers and so forth. And then it got hijacked by establishment Republicans. And I get how that happens. You're going to have a rally, and then some big name from Fox News or some GOP senator's going to come in and speak, then that looks more impressive. You get a bigger turnout, but over time, it makes them take it over, and it's no longer this grassroots thing that might actually stand up to big government. It just gets co-opted.

So I think you see that happening with the genuine people on the left, the rank and file, who really are just concerned about civil liberties and so on. Yeah, they're getting hoodwinked by Democrat politicians coming in who don't care about civil liberties. They proved they didn't care during the Obama administration.

WOODS: All right, let's pick this up in just a minute after we thank our sponsor.

[Sponsored content]

All right, Bob, you were in the middle of talking and thinking, and I'm going to let you continue doing that now.

MURPHY: Because you had to try to raise money or something from your dirty capitalist enterprise.

WOODS: Yeah, you're darn right.

MURPHY: So I really did have somewhat of an epiphany, and it ties on with what you said early on in the show here, Tom: that it's certainly true that if I encounter somebody who said, Wow, the stuff Trump is doing is horrible, and you know what? Obama did similar things, and I'm sorry; I just didn't notice it. My allies that I rely on, the blogs that I read, *Think Progress* and *Salon* and *Huffington Post*, they didn't really put it in my face that Obama had a secret kill list. I had no idea. And you're right, and now I see the danger of there might be a real madman in the White House from my point of view, and so really in the future, I'm not just going to go along if some Democrat says — I have not encountered a single human being who's said anything in the same zip code as that.

But what I have encountered are people — and I'm not just referring to strangers. I mean people that I went to high school with that I'm friends with on Facebook. I shared that *New York Times* thing about Obama's kill list, and I said something — I was trying to be very — I wasn't rubbing it in their face; I was just saying something very conciliatory like, Hey, I don't do a lot of political posts here — and for those who aren't my friend on Facebook, that's true. In that forum I don't try to be political. And I said, Hey, you know, if you're objecting to the stuff Trump's doing right now, I understand where you're coming from, but did you know Obama had a secret kill list that was established? And so you can see why maybe some of us libertarians were all trying to limit executive power, things like that.

And people in the comments said, You're right, I am someone who has been pretty quiet up till now, and I'm protesting against Trump, but you know what? And I admit Obama may have made some questionable calls, but I trust him. I trusted his intentions and his motives, and if he made a mistake, it was because he was trying to achieve some other righteous goal. Whereas I don't trust Trump. He's just an awful person, and that's why I'm acting this way. Okay, so far from them realizing they were wrong before, they doubled down.

I've seen other people say, Oh man, I really miss Obama now — you know, in comparison to this monster we have in the White House. Or another way of framing it: suppose somehow evidence was uncovered of massive vote fraud and it turned out that actually Hillary Clinton really won the Electoral College. And so somehow within the next month, things happened, and Trump abdicates and the Supreme Court chimes in. And now Hillary Clinton's our president. Do you think her fans would be more skeptical of what she does in office now, or would they say, You can do whatever you

want, Hillary, because we just endured a few weeks of that monster. And so go ahead; do whatever you want and steamroll your opposition. We don't care. I think they would do the latter.

So far from this episode teaching progressives the danger of having a strong executive, I think it shows them the danger of, We needed to get the vote out more in this last election. I can't believe this guy slipped in. We've got to make sure next time our person gets in there.

WOODS: Yeah, I think that is about the conclusion that they're drawing. I would also point out something like the case of Yemen. Now, not a lot of people know what's been going on in Yemen, but that's a decision that's made by them and by the media. But reputable sources say that about every ten minutes, a child is killed or perishes in Yemen, one way or another, through — basically it's a campaign by the Saudis that has resulted in the country being on the verge of starvation. It's horrible what's going on there. And Obama connived at that and partook in that completely all through 2016.

And I didn't hear anything about that. I basically didn't hear anything. Okay, a very, very small handful of people. And again, if I'm trying to figure out what is the hierarchy of statist outrages, I would say starving a country to death is pretty close to the top, and temporarily closing off immigration from seven countries is not as close to the top as starving the actual people. And yet, starving the actual people — nothing. This is no big deal. I just don't see — I don't understand the universe you could inhabit where the starving thing doesn't even — you don't even share that — it doesn't even get a share on social media from you, but you're out in the streets screaming about the other thing. Either do both or do neither one, but don't do one and not the other. That's my thinking.

MURPHY: Right, and so here's where I am altering my stance. Because it's true, like I said, friends who've known me for a while were reaching out privately and saying, Wow, did you all of a sudden — are you a big culture warrior now or something? They really were shocked by what I was doing on Twitter. And I was like, What are you taking about? And I looked back, and yes, it did seem like all I was doing was smacking down people who were criticizing Trump, and one could have understandable thought I had no problems with anything he was doing.

So I am trying to come forth — Here I think, Tom, the model is — and this shows why I'm willing to work, you know, build alliances with people who don't agree with me on everything. The person I have in mind is Glenn Greenwald, who I probably talk about him too much at this point, because he is one of the few exceptions to this rule, where he was against violations of civil liberty under the George W. Bush administration, and he was consistent when Obama was doing similar or even worse things. He was one of the few people. And a lot of his friends who loved him during the George W. Bush years all of a sudden turned on him during the Obama years because they thought, Oh, come on, look at all the good stuff Obama's doing. You don't really need to focus on that negative stuff. Obama's given us health insurance, and he's going to raise taxes on the rich, and he cares about the environment, and let's have a balanced view.

And that's the thing that happens with all of these administrations, just like there's a lot of Republicans I know who don't like what Trump was doing with the executive orders on immigration — they might be for tightening immigration, but they don't think the way he did it was good and they certainly think he's insensitive — to use a PC word — the way he did it. He just comes off like he doesn't care at all about messing up people's lives and what have you. And they kind of say, But, you know, let's work with him on these other places where he's so good, especially compared to Hillary Clinton. He's great on energy policy, and I have colleagues who are working with the Trump administration on that stuff. So in their point of view, we're getting such good stuff here, that's what we're going to focus on.

So I'm not saying anything's right or wrong here, but this cycle, that's how it plays out. And so when people say, You know, you can't just be a purist and if people are opposing Trump on issues X, Y, and Z that you agree with him on, build bridges. And again, I will do it if I think they're going to be consistent. So I'd give talks to the local NORML chapter when I lived in Nashville, and I'm sure the people in that room, many of them were progressive Democrats with a capital D. But that was fine. We all agreed on the issue of ending the drug war, and so I'd go and talk to them about the economics of drug prohibition and so forth, because I was pretty sure if you're going to NORML you're pretty consistent on that issue.

But again, people who are in the same breath saying how they are upset about Trump doing things and then you bring up that Obama did similar things and they don't care, well, yeah, why would I work with somebody like that when I know they're going to support someone who's going to come in later and do the same thing. That's strategically stupid. So it's not a matter of me just catering to me entertainment and, Oh, it's so fun to just put on the hypocrisy of the left while I'm ignoring these abuses of power. I think it would actually in the long run solidify abuses of power if I throw my lot in with people who I know are hypocrites on this and they're going to flip the moment their person's in power.

WOODS: Yeah, that's it. That's exactly it. So there's nothing wrong with what I've seen some people doing, which is writing articles aimed at the left and saying, Look, if you really want to think this through, maybe you understand now that it wasn't racism and slavery that made us have our views all this time; it was that we have felt about pretty much every president ever the way you feel about this president, and so maybe now you can try and be a little bit more sympathetic. I'm watching people in the streets burning things and assaulting people, and I'm not thinking these are folks who want to sit down and say, You know, doggone it, I really need to look at the world in a different light. I see people who are quite sure that they already know everything there is to know.

MURPHY: And also, Tom, that they're so horrified at, [gasp] Trump wouldn't answer the question from the guy from CNN. What a violation of free speech — while they're punching the guy in the face because they disagree with his views and then joking about it afterwards, and then pepper spraying a girl in the face when she's standing their calmly saying, Yeah, I support their right to free speech and I support Milo's, and she's got a MAGA hat on, and so that's why someone comes up and pepper sprays here. So like I say, how can you possibly be supporting that while you're then complaining

about Trump cracking down on free speech? It's amazing to me. I don't understand how they can do that. But all right [laughing].

WOODS: Yeah, but I think the way you understand it is to realize something that it took me a long time finally to acknowledge, that maybe you are dealing with people who simply don't have universal principles. They have particularist desires. *I want what's good for my group, and for my group free speech is good. I want what's bad for that group, and for that group suppression and muzzles are good.* I think that's genuinely what it boils down to. It's not that they're hypocrites.

It's like saying — and you get this all the time in a first grade classroom — the Puritans were hypocrites because they fled England seeking religious liberty, and yet they wouldn't give religious liberty to other people. Wrong. They were not seeking religious liberty in the abstract; they were seeking it for themselves. They were seeking to practice what they believed to be the proper Christian religion. At no time did they say, And we want to be a haven for all people who have oddball ideas. They never said that. So they were not hypocrites at all.

And likewise, I think in this, maybe the left are not hypocrites, because they genuinely don't believe in free speech. They never said they did. I mean, well, their parents said they did, and maybe their young grandparents in the early '60s said they did. But that was a long time ago. That's like saying that Alan Greenspan is an Ayn Randian because he wrote for the newsletter in the mid '60s.

MURPHY: Well, I understand your point, Tom. I think you're letting them off the hook too easily.

WOODS: Oh, okay. That is the one correction I will permit on this show.

MURPHY: Yeah, because they're not just saying, No, CNN should have the right to — you know, without a strong media, journalistic integrity, and freedom of the press, how can we possibly contain abuses? They're not saying that. They're just saying, Oh my gosh, Trump's cracking down on free speech. So if that's something we're supposed to go and march in the streets for, that makes it sound like they think free speech is an important thing. So you're right that when you try to analyze it deep down and explain their behavior, it is that they don't believe in abstract principles, but I'm saying they talk like they do, at least in several contexts.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, that's true. Yeah, they do talk like they do. So in the case — But on the other hand, there are plenty of leftists who don't talk that way, and they're getting their inspiration from the new left hero, Herbert Marcuse, who basically said you can't have free speech for intolerant groups — and by "intolerant," of course he meant everybody except himself. You can't allow that, because they use the speech as a structural means of oppressing others, so we can't allow those people to express their thoughts. And so you do start hearing a bit of that now, when we say, We can't allow white supremacists to speak.

Look, Milo Yiannopoulos is a lot of things. He obviously isn't — by no non-hysterical definition is he a white supremacist. You don't have to like the guy, but for heaven's

sake, point out to me where he has ever said there should be laws in place that privilege white people over other races. I don't see anything like that, and that is the only non-hysterical definition of white supremacy that there is, and that is the definition that every person — every thinking person accepted that definition all the way up until the definition suddenly got changed in 2016.

MURPHY: Yeah, let me also just mention — So again, I don't want to make it sound like, You know, after further review, everything I've done is fine. I do realize that if it was coming off that all I had to do was be smug and criticize progressive hypocrites, that's not too productive, and so I am trying to make sure nobody misunderstands my views, even though I don't regret any particular tweet I would have sent out or anything.

But and this is true and this is the danger of people mindlessly sharing stuff that's bogus — like all that crazy stuff about that dossier that was compiled against Trump and there's factual errors in it and they're all unverified statements from anonymous Russian sources and things like that. Because of that, if I see something that looks like a legitimate news story about something horrible happening under the Trump administration, I don't just retweet it and say, Okay, guys, let's be fair here; this is bad — Because half the time it turns out the story's wrong.

WOODS: Oh yeah.

MURPHY: Just to give one specific example, with my son — I was talking about this stuff with my son a couple of weeks ago. He's 12. And I saw a *New York Times* headline saying something like, "Trump Administration Poised to Reopen CIA Secret Prisons." And I was like, whoa. And I said, Okay, hey, you know what? I was talking to you about how people were overreacting, but here's something that — and then I explained to him the whole history of secret prisons under the Bush administration and whatever. And I said, so you know, It may come off like I'm just defending Trump against his hysterical critics, but that's really — Oh, and then it turned out no, that wasn't true. That was a leak of a draft executive order memo out of thousands that had been prepared in the transition that somebody sent and *The New York Times* ran a headline on it as if Trump was getting ready to announce the thing the next day. And the White House denied it and said no, we're not going to do that. So maybe they floated that to see what the reaction would be and then backed off. Who knows?

But the point is the *New York Times* headline misled me. And I know people — please don't contact me, everybody, and say, I can't believe you trust — There's a difference between being misleading and just saying something that's flat-out false. And so that burned me so badly that at this point, no, I don't trust anything coming out of CNN. No matter how bulletproof and sourced it appears to be, I don't trust those people when they say an anti-Trump thing. And so I've lost the ability to be able to stand up to abuses of power, because I no longer can trust most of the sources.

At this point, if Glenn Greenwald writes something showing something bad the Trump administration's doing, I will retweet that in good conscious, because I know Glenn is really careful about not sharing something that's going to blow up in his face and he's going to have to retract two days later. But other than that, I've seen *Reason* share a story that then they had to say, Actually, no, it turns out this is probably the guy was

making it up. Sorry. Our bad. And so it's like there are lots of places that are so eager to show something awful the Trump administration is doing, they don't carefully check. And so the fans of doing it are going to say, Oh, who cares? It's Trump, after all. He's a jerk. But no, it's having the exact opposite effect. His diehard fans are going to say, Yep, fake news, lying media. They're just out to get him. So that's going to embolden their support for him. And for people like me who want to be fair and balanced, I no longer have an avenue to learn anything bad about him because I don't trust these people.

WOODS: Yeah, exactly. I have to just sit back and wait four weeks after something happens, for newspapers in other countries to maybe tell me what's happening or for independent people to figure out what's happening, but I certainly am not going to read some — for heaven's sake, I have more dignity than to read some crummy *New York Times* article and come to a conclusion. These people, they're Judith Miller — Judith Miller repeated every lie related to the Iraq War there was, and as far as I know, she still writes. She should be in a convent somewhere living out the rest of her life in sackcloth and ashes. I mean, that's amazing to me.

And yet people are upset about Alex Jones, who is a drop in the bucket compared to *The New York Times*. How do you — I just don't. And frankly, all the — this is very therapeutic for me to get all this out. All the libertarians on Twitter who are virtue signaling to make sure everybody understands that, you know, CNN may get something wrong once in a while, but this is an institution of American society. These are the sort of people who want to make clear that they respect our wonderful institutions and they don't like people who are disrespectful toward them. And boy, that Alex Jones, he sure is a joker — or whatever. I'm not saying I agree with Alex Jones. I mean, sometimes he's right, but I'm not saying I agree with his approach or his style or whatever. But I have some sense of proportion. What possible reason would I have to go around denouncing Alex Jones of all people, when the entrenched institutions of American society are at war with everything decent and lie 24 hours a day? Why would I possibly do that?

And yet I'm surrounded by these libertarians who want to make absolutely clear that everybody understands that they have all the correct likes and dislikes, as if the regime is interested in making distinctions like that, as if the social justice warriors are interested in making distinctions like that. If you even slightly favor the free market, you're a neo-Nazi fascist, and they're going to get to a point where they're going to feel like you can be punched in the face, and all your little protests on Twitter about how sweet and pure and wonderful you are, and you're not like those other libertarians, that isn't going to matter a thing. It's not going to matter. They're not going to make that distinction, so don't even bother. All you're doing is cluttering my feed bothering me.

MURPHY: Yeah, that is a good point, Tom, that people who have no problem calling someone a neo-Nazi, when really what it means is he doesn't believe in racial set-asides or something —

WOODS: Right, yeah.

MURPHY: — or thinks Planned Parenthood's funding from the government should be cut — oh yeah, he's a neo-Nazi or whatever or hates women. People who are that careless about actually getting their opponent's position correct, they're not going to remember, Oh, you know what? Yeah, you did share that CNN story about Trump, so we're not going to go after you; we're going to go after guys like Tom Woods. That's not going to happen, for sure.

So let me just say — I guess we're probably getting close to the time here, Tom, but what I am going to try to do is, like I said, number one, make it clear that I'm not just giving a blank check to everything the Trump administration does. I certainly don't want to fall into that category, because I also think what I want to do is just have some legitimacy. Just like I can respect somebody like Glenn Greenwald and a few other people who are being principled about it, I'm hoping that therefore people can realize okay, yeah, this guy Murphy really does mean it when he believes in limited government and so forth — or actually go further than that, but you know the way somebody would phrase it, that it's not merely that, oh yeah, when a Democrat's in there it's because he hates poor people and wants to cut food stamps, but when a Republican's in there, oh yeah, sky's the limit; go ahead and boost the military budget. I certainly want to make sure people don't ever think that that's true of me.

And if I can get people in a more prolonged discussion or whatever, a reasonable, civil debate, who right now are furious about Trump and the things he's doing, I think it would be good to put them on the spot — not in a hostile way, but just to say, Okay, Obama did similar things, right? Or you're worried about somebody cracking down against someone because of their religion. Well, you know, under the Clinton administration, there were some religious extremists who were all burned to death with chemicals that had been banned in international warfare. It was called Waco. Go look it up. And was that big on your radar? Were you really concerned about that at the time, or that doesn't count because it was some weirdo Christian cult, you were told, and said, eh, who cares, that's not going to affect me? Things like that. And get them to then explain the difference. Why is it? Or maybe hopefully they'll say, Oh yeah, you're right; maybe I shouldn't have been so dismissive of that and I shouldn't have given a free pass — I think that might be a way to try to effect some change, if you will, is to get people to at least confront that and say something.

But like I said, I have yet to see it work on someone. They will say like what you said, Tom, in that video, that woman going, No, no, I wasn't against Obama. I liked Obama. What are you talking about? She was mystified. She didn't even understand the point of the question. Like, why are you pointing out that Obama did something similar. Didn't you hear me? I like Obama; I don't like Trump. That's what was so amazing about that. Not just her hypocrisy; she didn't even get the question. She was like, What are you asking that for?

WOODS: Yeah, I think she might have now, because that was retweeted thousands and thousands of times on Twitter, so I'm pretty sure it's gotten back to her that she's now a social media celebrity. It might get through the old noggin now what the problem was.

MURPHY: Hey, if we can just change one mind, it's all worth it.

WOODS: [laughing] That's right. All right, well, look. What was the point of this episode? Can you sum it up? What was the point? Why did we have this — I don't want to say rant. I hate the word rant. People use that word just for — an impassioned speech they disagree with is always called a rant. So the word rant, I ban it. It is banned.

MURPHY: If you try to use the word rant, Tom is going to pepper spray you, just so you know.

WOODS: That's right. Now, I'm not going to say it's a stream-of-consciousness episode, because it was more structured than that, but this sort of "let it all flow, say what you want to say" — summarize for everybody why it was important for them to hear this.

MURPHY: Okay, because I think libertarians who are outraged by abuses under the Obama administration, now when they're confronted with the utter hypocrisy of the presses, they need to find a way to be productive and not just cater to their own pleasure in mocking other people's hypocrisy. And so I think you and I needed to sift through and say, Okay, what's a good strategy for going forward? So I think what we concluded was we're not wrong in pointing out the hypocrisy and being very wary of allying with people who we think with justification are going to flip as soon as the tables turn, and that would just be stupid. That's not us being smart and putting aside our differences and building bridges. No, you're allying with people who really haven't changed. So that's number one. Make sure if you're supposed to build a bridge with someone, they really have come around.

But number two: okay, don't push such people away by being a complete jerk about it. Try to be approachable, and there may be people who learn from this. Look, I learned — I remember the eve of the Bush-Gore election, when that was up in the air, and I went to bed that night before it was determined, of course, and I was really worried, Oh no, if Gore wins he's going to wreck the economy. So in retrospect I realize how foolish that was, let alone the invasion of Iraq stuff. So that was a learning experience. So I would just say try to foster that with people that you're friends with or what have you that take your opinion seriously, that generally you just point out if you think they're being utter hypocrites on this stuff, marching in the street for things that in the grand scheme aren't anywhere near the stuff Obama had done, and just try to get them to articulate why is that, what is your view. And maybe in so articulating it, they'll realize, Oh yeah, I really can't defend that.

WOODS: Well, and with that, we will say goodbye here. TomWoods.com/842, we'll probably have a few links up there related to all this. I'm going to have on tomorrow's episode Angelo Codevilla, and if you're familiar with that name, you know he's written some fantastic essays on all sorts of topics. And it's on the origins of political correctness. And it's not just another neocon, "political correctness originated in 1966 out of nowhere." It's nothing like that. He's writing at a very high level, and it's astonishing stuff. It's one of my favorite episodes of all time. So we're going to carry this conversation forward a bit. And then, because if all we talked about was this the terrorists would win, it's back to regular topics coming up soon.

But anyway, Bob, I'm really glad that we were able to catch up and do this. And you suggested this topic, and I'm really glad we did it. We didn't rehearse anything — as if I

needed to tell the audience that after this episode. But we just talked, and I think it came out well. Thanks for doing it.

MURPHY: Sure thing. Glad to be here. I always love to hear your rants — I mean, your impassioned pleas for liberty.

WOODS: [laughing] There you go. Thanks.