



Episode 906: Judd Weiss, John McAfee's VP Pick, on What Really Happened Behind the Scenes – and It's Not Pretty

Guest: Judd Weiss

WOODS: I was at the LP National Convention, as you know, and that was the only time I've ever met John McAfee, and I spoke at the luncheon. And I spoke – I don't know if you were at that luncheon. Of course you had to be out campaigning.

WEISS: I took pictures of you there. Yeah, I was there.

WOODS: Okay, okay. Because that was a luncheon that I think it would have been helpful to have the whole plenary group in attendance, because the people who came to my luncheon already see the world the way I do, more or less, and I was trying to tell them not to pass up this historic moment. I mean, I was at that point – I would have been happy with the anybody-but-Johnson choice.

Now, you were the top anybody-but-Johnson in my mind, as I told people, but I say this because I do want everybody – I don't want to be pussyfooting around this and tiptoeing around it. I want to just say it from the outset that, as I've said in the past, in the past I've been friendly with Gary Johnson, I've given him credit where it's due, but I just felt like at a moment like this, 2016, do something unconventional rather than, Oh, now's our opportunity to have a policy wonk who's going to put everybody to sleep to show how serious we can be. I just don't think that was a good strategy. I mean, it got some votes, but what else did it get? Who today is saying, "I wonder what Gary Johnson thinks about such and such issue"? No one. No one cares. He's disappeared, as he did after 2012.

So that's how I feel about the subject. So this is not a subject where we're not allowed to have disagreements. This is a strategic question. Nobody's allowed to write me out of libertarianism because I was not a fan of Gary Johnson, for heaven's sake.

Now that I've gotten that out of the way, I'm going to let you do most of the talking. You ran for the vice presidential nomination with John McAfee. There's a lot of stuff we need to talk about about that, but let's just get out of the way the basics of how you got to know him and what made you think, of all the people you could work with you were candidates, that this was the guy.

WEISS: Well, I agree with what you just said about Gary Johnson, and before I got involved with McAfee, I was a huge – I was big in the Gary Johnson inner circle crew from the 2012 campaign. I threw two fundraisers for Gary Johnson. I considered – I

donated to his campaign. I wrote an article in *The Washington Times* that went viral and had hundreds of thousands of views telling Republicans to ditch Mitt Romney for Gary Johnson. So I was a big supporter and I was an important ally. I considered him a friend. I considered his campaign manager a friend. And I'm friends with so many people throughout the liberty movement, probably more than almost everybody. I've gone through all the different enemy lines in the liberty movement. I know so many people, and I was friends with a lot of the people in the campaign.

So it came as a shock to them that I joined the McAfee campaign. It was I guess maybe seen somewhat as a betrayal. But I got involved with McAfee in 2016 campaign, I was approached by the campaign manager, Chris Thrasher, to throw a fundraiser for McAfee at my house. Because I do that a lot. I think a lot of people know me — before I even picked up my photography in a bigger way, a lot of people knew me for throwing cocktail fundraiser parties, or just cocktail parties with speakers in the liberty scene. And they were cool parties. They were attractive parties. I've broken that taboo that you can't discuss politics at a hot party, and I've shown that you can. I throw really cool parties. And so when I had the opportunity to throw a fundraiser for McAfee, it was like, Hell yeah, that's awesome. I love McAfee. I'm a huge fan. I've been following that maniac for a while. He's thoroughly entertained me in the past and it would be an honor to meet him and have him at my house.

So I hadn't even met him, but I had seen that he had said he was going to run on his new Cyber Party, where he's going to be mostly focusing on cyber security and why it's so important. And then he decided to run for the Libertarian Party nomination, and when I heard that, I was so excited, just because I thought, Wow, we finally have an interesting voice in this. We finally have a cooler option. This is very interesting now. Because McAfee is a badass, so I was very excited about that.

So I was approached to throw a fundraiser for McAfee, and then while I'm talking to the campaign manager about it, we're coordinating it, the idea came up to have me run with McAfee as his VP running mate. And that idea blew my mind that it was possible, because I don't really have any political ambitions. I don't even want to be in political office. It sounds like a miserable experience to me. But the feeling was more like the band is coming in town and they're about to go on a European tour and you can jump on the bus or not, and so I jumped on it. That's basically what happened. And the truth is — not a lot of people know this, but while I'd been speaking to McAfee in the run up to the fundraiser at my house, I was on the phone with him, we'd emailed back and forth. The very first time I met him was when he walked through my door for the fundraiser.

WOODS: Now, that is fairly unusual I would think in political history.

WEISS: Yes, yes, so McAfee's an unusual guy, which is why I liked it. And now I had an opportunity — I had spoken to him before about, if we're going to do this, let's do something bold, different, completely ignoring the rules of politics. Everybody's so tired of this. I'm not interested in running a normal, boring political campaign. Then I'm just not going to do it. I have no interest in that at all. Especially if I'm running with John McAfee, that maniac, there's no way I'm going to be a conventional politician. So that was just out of the question. So we were just doing things totally different.

And that was the focus of our campaign, was to reimagine politics, to just change everything up completely and be unfamiliar, not familiar, to – Basically all the other politicians, including in the Libertarian Party, are going to the delegates and the voters who are voting for you and just trying to show that we are where you are. And my attitude was I was out in the jungle with a machete, carving a path away from where we are, because where we are is crap. We're nowhere. Libertarian Party has nothing. The liberty movement is too small to actually win this, so what we need to do is start forging and going in a different direction.

And I want to talk a little bit more about that later, but in the meantime, the reason why I started with McAfee, why I came on board was Gary Johnson has a lot of credibility in the liberty movement. He's been around for a while. People know who he is. He might not be an interesting, exciting personality, but he definitely has credibility, especially for being formerly a governor, pushing for ending the drug war in serious ways. These are great, noble things, and I'm happy about it.

And a lot of people give Gary Johnson a lot of flack all the time for not being a perfect libertarian, and I never do. I consider Gary Johnson more of a Milton Friedman fan who became governor, and I think that that's a positive thing. We should encourage more of those type of situations. So my issue with Gary is not his imperfectness as a libertarian. There's so many different types of libertarians that debate and fight over these topics. I'm happy to live in Garyland, because Gary's vision for the world is a significant improvement. I'm happy with that. But the truth is we're not going to win any elections, so none of that becomes very relevant.

My issue with him was that he was lackluster in 2012. It was pretty disappointing. And his campaign manager was a serious liability. A lot of people felt very burned by the campaign manager last time, Ron Nielson, and we're going to talk a little bit more about him as well. But Gary Johnson was disappointing, and he's kind of boring, he's awkward, and no one's excited about him, not even his own supporters. And I just felt like I was excited about him last time because he was a former governor, but he was so lackluster and disappointing, I just was not excited about him again. And it felt like he was campaigning worse than last time. His speaking ability and his presentation was actually worse than last time.

And then there's McAfee, and McAfee is an extremely interesting, dynamic character to say the very least. And the one problem that he's got is that he hasn't been involved in the liberty movement for a very long time. In fact, he hasn't engaged it. He's lived, let's say, somewhat of a libertarian lifestyle. He has libertarian instincts. He understands the philosophy in a very integral way. He's lived that for his 70 years. But he doesn't have a lot of credibility in the liberty movement as being an activist and being a part of it for a very long time.

So I have been all over the libertarian universe because I'm just good with a camera, I'm really good with a camera, and I've now taken, let's say, over – it's crazy, but over 30,000 Facebook profile photos out there are mine and they're used for everything from all over Facebook, LinkedIn, they're even on book jackets now, Wikipedia, speaker bios, and most importantly, Tinder. These nerds are getting more right-swipes now, and I think that that's a very valuable contribution, and I'm proud of that. And if you look at all these Facebook profile photos out there that have my photo on it, my

name is there, and that was the idea, is that nobody doubts my credibility, my earnestness for this scene, my passion, and my contribution.

So it was more about bringing some credibility to McAfee while he's already a dynamic character. And also, it was just different. It was just a very different, fresh type of thing to bring somebody like me in. And so that was why I came on board. And what I wanted to do, what I ended up doing was I came on and I totally changed everything. I changed the image, the logo, the slogan to "Let life live," to those new videos that were just so dramatically different. And that was the idea. Did you see those videos?

WOODS: I did. I like them a lot.

WEISS: Yeah, so that was the idea. Basically the undercurrent behind all of that was, the idea was Libertarianism 2.0. I wanted to reimagine the liberty movement and messaging and all of that. And I have no background as a marketing guy or even an artist and a creative personality. My background is in sales. I sell commercial real estate. I deal with very stubborn bastards with a lot of money and I try to get them to work together. That's what I focus on.

But photography has been an outlet for me lately, and I just have my sensibilities, and I feel like the liberty movement, when we're not being very serious and technical, we're usually goofy and silly and kind of whacky, and I feel like what I'm trying to do with the photos is basically I'm turning these events into art pieces and I'm presenting the liberty movement as something kind of heroic and epic and grand. So I'm not documenting; I'm glorifying and I'm trying to get the liberty movement to – I want us to remember as, "These are not the silly, awkward nerds that are photo-bombing each other; these are the historical figures that we're going to remember decades from now that laid down the foundations of liberty." I wanted to treat in more of an epic way, like as if they're characters in some kind of movie or some kind of drama among gods, type of thing. I really want to elevate it.

So this photo-bomber trend, if I did pull all these libertarians and ask them what do they want from photography, they'd probably say they want more silly photo-bomber photos, to be honest with you. And while I have empathy for the mentally challenged, I don't think we should be emulating them in our photography and our photos, and that's what I see, and I think that the libertarian movement is an intellectual movement and you get a bunch of nerds – and I'm a big nerd. We're all nerds that are interested in politics. We've all crossed that threshold. I'm a big nerd. I've read dozens of books on this stuff. I write – maybe even a hundred. I write on this topic. This is a big issue of my life.

But we are the socially awkward nerds people are trying to avoid, and I want to change this into, "How do I get into that?" I want to make it into something that people are really excited about being a part of. And so that's what I'm doing with the parties. That's what I'm doing with my photography. And that's also been my focus even with those videos that I did in our reimagining of the campaign. So so far does that all make sense?

WOODS: It does, it does. Now I want to talk to you about the juicy stuff. And I heard about this, I want to give credit to Marc Clair over at *Lions of Liberty* podcast, which I

like very much. You were on with him about a month ago. And I couldn't believe what I was hearing, and I thought, I think I'd like to – I try not to poach guests from other podcasts, although I suspect they do that to me, but I have so many guests – I mean, I do so many episodes, how could you not accidentally have one or – it's fine. Anyway, I thought I've got to talk to Judd.

WEISS: Well, I've known you for years. I'm glad to finally be on *The Tom Woods Show*. It's a big honor for me.

WOODS: Oh look, I'm glad – I did not realize – if I had known half of what you had gone through, you would have been on a lot sooner than this. Let's talk about – okay, so we get the idea that you had a real vision for what you wanted to accomplish. But then what you were faced with when you actually put this into execution was the really mundane – even "mundane" is dignifying it too much – reality of what politics is like, even inside the Libertarian Party, where you would think the shenanigans would be at a minimum. And I'd like to now move in that direction.

WEISS: Right, right. So that's what shocked me. All I wanted to do was to do cool stuff. I wanted to focus on having a new vision, all of that. What I didn't expect is – well, okay. What I do know is that politics is dirty and nasty. Everybody knows that. I had a low regard for politics for a long time. But I'm surprised that it's this dirty and nasty and corrupt in the Libertarian Party, where they have nothing at stake. The Republicans, the Democrats, they have something at stake. There's a reason that they're fighting. They have something to fight over. They have diamonds or oil or something. But we have nothing. We don't have anything to fight over. It doesn't make any sense. So that's what really surprised me.

Everybody was asking me, "How cool was that? You ran with McAfee? What's that like?" Well, it was like I was airdropped into the Hunger Games. I'm suddenly in a situation where everybody is like fighting and clawing at each other, and I don't want to fight. I just want them to knock it off. I want to focus on doing cool stuff. And they won't. That's it. They're going to attack you and there's no other way around it.

And what really surprised me was that it came from Gary Johnson's campaign. I'd been around in the movement since the '90s. When I was 14, I got a copy of *Anthem* from Ayn Rand, and I just went from there. And I showed up at Libertarian Party events when I was like 15 and 16 back in the day at Denny's when there was a bunch of older people there. I've been in this for a little while. And in my 20+ years in the liberty movement, I've never seen anything as nasty and vicious as the Gary Johnson campaign.

WOODS: Now, that's unbelievable. That's going to come as a huge shock to a lot of people, because no one would think that was going on. And it doesn't seem to be part of his personality.

WEISS: Nobody is more shocked than me, because no, it isn't part of his personality and I considered him a friend. I told McAfee when I came on board that I'm really excited about this opportunity, but I'm really insistent that we're going to run a clean campaign. We're not going to run a negative campaign. And McAfee was on board with that. He said cool, he totally supports that idea. But I made a mistake.

When I announced, I said I was going to run only a positive campaign. I'm not going to have this be negative. And I'm going to be more honest than is even needed. I'm just going to be very honest about what's going on. And then I realized very quickly that you can't have both. It was a big mistake that I made. You can't be only positive and be honest at the same time, because then I'm not telling people what's really going on, and what's really going on is shockingly negative. So there's just — there's so many things involved that — let's see where to start.

WOODS: Well, I'm interested, I mean, if it would help, the thing about your campaign manager is certainly an interesting bookend on all this and the whole thing about McAfee can't come — what is it? — the convention because he has to be in New York? That whole thing.

WEISS: Oh yeah, yeah, okay.

WOODS: There's so much to tell.

WEISS: Sure, sure. so our campaign manager, Chris Thrasher, brought me on, and I'm grateful to him for that, but I quickly realized that the guy was pretty much useless. He was really sloppy and he wasn't — he just wasn't really doing anything. But I came — I was announced on March 31st was the day that I had my fundraiser for McAfee. So the news came out on April 1st that I was McAfee's VP. It was a surprise announcement at my party. On April 1st everybody thought it was an April Fools' joke, so there was nothing that I could do to confirm or deny it because nobody would believe me on April 1st, so I had to wait till the next day. It was pretty funny.

The next day on April 2nd was the California state convention, the California Libertarian Party state convention. And at the state convention where I'm brand new, I just came on board in this campaign, my campaign manager, Christopher Thrasher, told me that Gary Johnson's campaign manager, Ron Nielson, offered him \$4,000 to leave our campaign and join theirs. And apparently, not only that, but — and Chris told me, "I'm not going to take Ron's dirty money," and all this, but apparently he also was offered the same amount of money not to come aboard the Gary Johnson campaign but just to quit and stay at home. So either way, if he wants that money, he doesn't even have to come on to the Gary Johnson campaign. And I'm just like — and he says, No, I'm not taking it, and all this. And I was just like, Wow, okay, that's really interesting and a little bit surprising, because I considered Ron Nielson a friend and why is he behaving like that? This is so unnecessary.

Before I heard any of this, I went up to Ron Nielson and Gary Johnson to tell them that I have a lot of respect for them and a lot of respect for their campaign, that they have a better shot at winning than we do, and that if they win, I wish them all the best, but I just have a different vision and I have a different voice and I just want to use this platform and speak differently. I didn't get into details, but I wanted to get into the general election because all I wanted — all I wanted — wasn't McAfee and I, was for the libertarians to have a cool option for the first time in history. That's it. That's it. All I wanted was for people to be interested in what the Libertarian Party and the libertarians were doing, because that would be monumental. People just were interested in seeing what we're about. Right now they're not. Right now we're like a snooze fest. We're stale and crusty and boring. And so that's what I wanted.

And so I basically said something like that to Gary Johnson, and Gary Johnson shook my hand at the convention. He was polite. Ron Nielson kind of looked at me a little bit weird. And in any case, he ended up offering our campaign manager money to leave our campaign, which surprised me. And then Christopher Thrasher is the one telling me all of this dirt about Ron Nielson. He's telling me Ron Nielson is shady, he's a scam artist, he's stealing money from the campaign. All this stuff. He's like, You can't trust him. And I'm like, Wow, okay, sure, interesting.

And then right after the convention, for a week I have no contact with our campaign manager. Zero. Apparently he lost his phone and he's waiting for his phone to come in the mail while he's traveling. It's like a big cluster mess, and so I'm understanding, but there's no email from him, nothing.

WOODS: Yeah, that's not normal.

WEISS: Right, that's not normal. So once he does reemerge, everything is different about his tone and his personality, and he's extremely pessimistic about our campaign, saying that we have no shot, that we might as well give up. I'm like, What is this, man? This is our campaign manager. We're paying him, and he's heavily discouraging us from continuing all of a sudden, which is really weird. And I told him, Look, I'm about to release the first video. It's about finished. I'm going to post this on Tuesday in two days, so let's see how that goes. Maybe you're going to be more excited about it when you see there's going to be some reaction and people are going to share this and we're going to get some attention.

Sure enough, I post that video. It was fresh, it was different, it was original, and it was showing a very different approach to presidential politics. It was unlike any presidential ad anyone's ever seen, and that was the point. And people were sharing it, and all of a sudden, we're getting a lot of attention and we're taking off like a rocket ship. Because when I came on board, it was just McAfee and Chris Thrasher and another person that was helping McAfee, and that was hit. There was no support, no volunteers, nothing. It was a completely dead campaign, and people were even asking me why I jumped on board the campaign when it was dead. It was dead. And I felt like, well, the only reason that matters to me is McAfee is cool. He's an interesting, dynamic character and I can work with that. I can do a lot with that. So that – and he's an eloquent speaker, too. He's a great speaker.

So I'm on board. I post that video. We start taking off like a rocket ship. People are sharing it. We're finally having some wind in our sails for the first time. We get some attention. And then within like an hour or two, Chris, our campaign manager, calls me and tells me that he's quitting the campaign. And I'm so shocked about this because I was telling him – he just says he needs time off from politics, that he's not joining the Gary Johnson campaign; he's just burnt out from politics in general and he doesn't want to be in any political campaign or any political activity right now. He just wants his head clear. That's what he's telling me, which, I'm telling him, Okay, I can respect that, but right now we're taking off like a rocket ship. We're getting a lot of attention. People think this is cool. It's fresh. It's different. But okay.

I asked him to stay on board in a certain capacity, which he was considering, which he told me he was considering, just to help out tactically with delegates and getting

enough delegates at the convention. I'll get a new campaign manager that's going to manage things so that things are off of his head, and he can just focus on what he's good at. And I thought that that would be a great idea. I was still very friendly with him at the time, extremely friendly.

But what really surprised me was within an hour of him telling me that he's quitting, there was an article up on a [ALibertarianFuture.com](#), which is a blog which essentially is a shill news blog on libertarianism that was a shill blog for the Gary Johnson campaign. And there was an article saying that the McAfee campaign is disintegrating. The campaign manager is leaving and basically giving the impression that the McAfee campaign is pretty much over. And I'm like, what? What is this? We're rising like a rocket ship. We finally have attention. We finally have activity like we never have, and there's an article ready saying that we're disintegrating? And how does he even know that? I just found out the news. How is there an article already written and published? This doesn't make any sense to me. And just, it's really surprising.

So what I basically understood is Chris Thrasher took money. In fact, the total amount of money that he ended up getting paid by the Gary Johnson campaign in the FEC reports is nearly \$31,000.

WOODS: Has that ever been explained? I mean, this is just openly poaching the guy.

WEISS: Yeah, so he was paid a total of \$30,896 from the Gary Johnson campaign. The guy who posted that blog, [A Libertarian Future](#), which is a neutral news site, that had that article ready, his name is J. Wilson, and he received over \$21,000 from the Gary Johnson campaign. So this is what the liberty activist campaign donors are paying for. They're paying for shady politics like this in the Libertarian Party. Everybody knows that politics is dirty and a lot of people are totally comfortable with that. That's Tat's politics. Fine. Be comfortable with it. But just know what you're paying for. That's basically what I'm saying here.

So Chris Thrasher, our campaign manager, was paid – the McAfee campaign manager was paid by the Gary Johnson campaign \$31,000. This other guy was paid \$21,000, J. Wilson, who was running a news site that was supposedly neutral.

And then another thing in the FEC report that came out is Gary Johnson's campaign manager, what he received was shocking. And to give some context to it, apparently the most well paid campaign manager in the 2016 election was Marco Rubio's campaign manager, who received \$200,000 annualized, which was a high amount. I think Hillary Clinton's campaign manager got like \$120,000 annualized. Most received around \$100,000 annualized as a campaign manager. The Libertarian Party campaign manager, who doesn't have experience as a campaign manager – he runs a ratings company that does ratings scanning and what not. The Gary Johnson campaign manager was paid 1,850,000 for running the Gary Johnson campaign.

WOODS: Okay, that's unbelievable. Okay, so that's –

WEISS: That's a scam.

WOODS: Yeah.

WEISS: That's a scam. And Gary Johnson's campaign is being called a "scampaign," and that's what it was.

WOODS: Has he ever been called to explain this unbelievable discrepancy?

WEISS: Can you do that? Somebody should call him out. Get him on the show and talk to him about it. I'd love to hear what he'd have to say about that, because that's absolutely insane. So people are not aware of how shady and dirty it is behind the scenes in politics in the Libertarian Party. No, I've learned why there is a curtain in politics. It's the same reason why people don't see what's going on in the back room in the butcher shop. It's there because of market demand. It's just vicious nastiness behind the scenes, a lot of corruption. And it shocked me.

And I can say all of this because I have no political ambitions. I don't give a damn about my political future, so I can say whatever the hell I want. And there's no way that I'm going to see this viciousness and scamming and deception and just be quiet about it because I'm trying to further my political future. I don't care. I'm going to be around in this scene for decades. People say that I'm hurting my credibility by talking about the former candidate. I'm like no, the reason I'm saying all this stuff is because I care about my credibility, because when I say something, people know that I'm saying it like it is.

And I've been around the entire liberty movement around the world. I've flown out to shoot events all over the world. I've seen almost the entire liberty movement, and I have never spoken bad about anything that I've seen or put any organizations down because I'm really supportive of all of them. I always come bearing gifts. I always come to help out. But what I saw here was truly vicious and nasty. Nobody's ever seen me give such a negative report, but that's what it was. It was just —

WOODS: Well, give me some more examples. I mean, we've got what happened with your campaign manager. We've got this exorbitant amount being paid to this other guy. What else can you tell me?

WEISS: Well, yeah, there's another issue with our campaign manager. So he's on the way out. I replaced him with Tiffany Madison, who was fantastic as a campaign manager. And the reason why I picked Tiffany was because she was not part of the Libertarian Party, and the reason why that's so critical was because everybody who was staff level at the Libertarian Party has worked on campaigns together. And then two to four years later they'll work on campaigns opposing each other. Two to four years later, they'll work on campaigns together on the same side again.

So what you ultimately have is one, huge mole network. If you have a leak and other people know about what's going on in your campaign, it's the Libertarian Party staff-level people that are basically talking to each other and telling everybody about what's going on in your campaign. They don't really have any loyalty any specific campaign. They're going to be friends with their friends for years, maybe decades, so their loyalty is more future-oriented. So essentially it's crazy. You've got a big mole

network in the Libertarian Party. In any party. Anybody who's staff level. But all these problems happen in the Libertarian Party as well.

And so Chris Thrasher, John McAfee's campaign manager, he's leaving. I replaced him with Tiffany Madison. She wasn't ready to start when I called her. She needed to start the following Monday and we're in the middle of the week. So there were several days where basically I was somewhat acting as campaign manager. And Tiffany couldn't start – she was organizing a funeral for I think her nephew or her cousin. It was some really sad story. So we couldn't bother her until the following Monday. So she just was checked out. But once she came on board, she was great, but she wasn't on board yet. There were issues to deal with.

And one of those was McAfee was supposed to be at the Louisiana state convention, and I got an email late at night the night before the Louisiana state convention from Chris Thrasher, saying that I have to call the chair of the Louisiana party who's throwing the convention. I have to call him and tell him that McAfee's not going to be there. And I even – you know what? I have this email right here. Hold on, let me actually pull this up – that McAfee couldn't be there. I was told – In fact, this email was actually addressed to Tiffany. He originally wanted Tiffany to call, but she wasn't available so it got sent to me. And it said, "Please call Daniel Hayes at the LP Louisiana ASAP to inform him John cannot attend the convention debate tomorrow. The proper spin" – these are Chris' words, Chris Thrasher, John McAfee's campaign manager. "The proper spin is that he is in 'high demand' at the moment due to cyber security issues and has to go to New York City immediately. Mention the Panama Papers if he presses."

So I was told McAfee's not going to be there because he's got to discuss something about the Panama Papers in New York or something, and I call up the head of the Louisiana party, and it's like midnight his time right before his big event. And I tell him that John McAfee can't be there tomorrow, and he starts freaking out. Why, what's going on? We've got a convention tomorrow. He's throwing a huge event tomorrow. This is like his big thing. And I told him he's got to be in New York; it's something about the Panama Papers. And he just starts losing it, freaking out, screaming at me that McAfee screwed him – actually, he didn't use such nice words. And he just starts screaming at me and saying John McAfee's going to lose this nomination, he has no integrity, I'm going to make sure that he loses. And I have sympathy for this guy right now, to be honest with you, because he feels like he was cheated and deceived and he's throwing a big event and he's got stress and he doesn't need –

WOODS: Yeah, sure.

WEISS: – on the night before. So I'm not knocking that guy at all. But he was furious with me, and I'm just the messenger and I don't even know what the hell's going on. He starts posting all over Facebook, tagging John and me in the posts, saying that McAfee is dishonest, he has no integrity, and just writing all this negative stuff. And it's like the last thing that I really need.

So essentially what happened there, the truth was that McAfee was sick with the flu. And I didn't call McAfee first because it was late at night and he's 70 and I didn't want to bother him late at night, so I was told to call the Louisiana guy, so I did. I thought,

Sure, I appreciate the tip. I'll take care of that right now. Better not to have him realize this in the morning, so I'll call him right now, sure. I called immediately.

But McAfee was sick with the flu. He was posting photos like the next day of he's in bed with his dog and he was really sick. And I was talking to him on the phone the next day and the next few days. His voice was very hoarse. In fact, when we recorded that Vote Different ad, on a side note, he was sick with the flu and I kept bugging him to redo these takes, and his voice sounds particularly raspy in that ad because he was sick. In any case, McAfee was sick with the flu. All I had to do was tell the truth, but what happened there was I walked into a sabotage trap. Just walked right into it. Ron Nielson's controlling this stuff when —

WOODS: Hold on; hold on. Back up a minute. So you're telling me this — so this whole thing was a setup?

WEISS: Yeah. It was a sabotage trap and I walked right into it, just stupidly. I didn't know what was going on.

WOODS: Yeah, but — I mean, I wouldn't reproach myself too much if I were you. You just wouldn't think this would happen.

WEISS: I didn't — yeah, I had no idea. I was like, Oh, thank you for telling me. I need to call the state chair and tell him about this. When Chris Thrasher pulled out and we had that article, what really happened there was we were getting some attention and interest, and a level was pulled and the headline had to change. And as I've learned more, that's Ron Nielson's style: change the headline. The headline isn't that McAfee's campaign is doing well and we're getting some interest and excitement; the headline now is McAfee's campaign is disintegrating.

And it's the same kind of thing. These are like levels being pulled. I was shocked that I walked right into that. And it wasn't actually meant for me. Chris originally sent that message to Tiffany, the new campaign manager. He was actually trying to sabotage the new campaign manager, but she wasn't available so I stepped into that trap. And he even ended that email to Tiffany — he says to tell the guy he's in New York, mention the Panama Papers, and he said about the state chair, he says, "He'll be a lot nicer to you than anyone else since you just came on board. This is one of those things where they may make a lot of noise, but in the end it will not matter a bit."

Anyway, the point was that he's telling Tiffany in that message, and essentially me, that this guy will be nicer to Tiffany than anyone else because she just came on board. This guy is known as a yeller. The chair — and I don't blame him. He's not a bad guy. I totally empathize with his situation. He didn't need that kind of stress. But he's already known as a yeller. He even self-identifies that way in videos where he — recently, he posted a video where he was yelling about something. It's kind of like almost his fun persona. He's known as being a hothead. Chris Thrasher knew what Tiffany or I was getting into by telling him the news late at night right before the convention. So this was just complete nonsense. He wrote in the email that he'll be nicer to you about it. He knew what was going on; this was just a setup.

WOODS: All right, so let's talk then about, to what extent were you frustrated with the Gary Johnson campaign and to what extent were you frustrated with the Libertarian Party in general?

WEISS: Well, there was another interesting example from the Gary Johnson campaign about Alicia Dearn, the vice presidential running – she was running for vice president as well. There were other vice presidential candidates, and I liked all of them except for Alicia Dearn. I thought she was slimy and I had my reasons for it, and I was telling people it and people thought that I was just saying it because she's a competitor, but no, I was so cool to all the other vice presidential candidates.

But she was super deceptive. She was a Gary Johnson campaign plant. Really, Gary Johnson's asleep at the wheel. All this stuff is being coordinated by Ron Nielson. Ron Nielson is the campaign manager. He apparently – I was given – I have friends everywhere and I found out that essentially Alicia Dearn, one of her jobs is to counteract me and my influence. So she started posting videos talking about art and its importance in the movement and stuff. It was just kind of weird and awkward. She's a lawyer. I don't know why she was talking about it. But apparently, she's talking about art because I was showing it. I was showing a very artistic approach, and so they needed to counteract that.

But one of the things that she did was she pretended like she was upset with the Gary Johnson campaign, that they had burned her, that she was – especially when Bill Weld came into the picture, she was supposed to be the official VP running mate with Gary Johnson and that they screwed her, and she convinced everybody of that, including Austin Petersen, who thoroughly endorsed Dearn. The Petersen campaign people were wearing Alicia Dearn pins at the convention. And people thought maybe it was just bad behavior on my part that I thought she was a slimy person and I was saying it, and then she proved me right in a crazy, spectacular fashion that I couldn't even have imagined.

At the convention, after getting Austin's support, she also tried to get McAfee's support to endorse her as a VP nominee, which would be ridiculous because we're kind of branded together. I'm running the entire campaign essentially. We have a campaign manager, but I'm calling a lot of the shots, the creative vision. I'm putting together the strategy. It's kind of ridiculous. But McAfee did entertain a meeting with her, because McAfee is an information guy. He loves information. So he kind of let her think that there's a possibility of him endorsing her. And she promised a ton of dirt on the Gary Johnson campaign in that meeting with McAfee. She promised that she could seat a whole bunch of delegates for him and that she'd probably tip the whole election to McAfee if he would just endorse her publicly. Crazy stuff, right? I'm going to assume – I have no idea, but I'm going to assume she probably said something similar to Austin and all this kind of stuff – and trying to get other people's support.

Well, sure enough, once she goes up onstage to give her nomination speech, she shocks everybody by calling Bill Weld up to the stage and withdrawing her nomination and throwing all of her support behind Bill Weld.

WOODS: Which, by the way, sounds like something that somebody might spontaneously do, right [laughing]?

WEISS: Right. Apparently Alicia Dearn's campaign manager was shocked and she was in tears by this afterwards. She was really upset with Alicia Dearn. She didn't know that that was going to happen. I even gave her a hug afterwards. She was crying. Like, tears were coming out, because it hurt her credibility as well. And I don't know. Alicia Dearn, I don't know what the deal was behind the scenes, what was worked out. But there was so much shady stuff going on. There's so many more stories I could even get into. But this gives you a little bit of a taste of what's going on behind the scenes, what kind of dirty stuff that you can encounter in politics.

And yeah, I'm happy to start talking more now separately about the Libertarian Party if you'd like.

WOODS: Yeah.

WEISS: You know what? I want to talk a little bit more about what kind of vicious nastiness you can expect, what we were experiencing from the Gary Johnson campaign. When I came on board, I was really turned off by Austin Petersen's constant fighting and attacking of Gary Johnson. I just wanted to run a clean campaign. I just wanted to focus on my thing. I didn't really want to focus on the other candidates. I was expecting Austin to attack me when I came on because I'm young and I sucked a lot of energy and attention away from what he was doing and his specific brand, and I kind of brought some of that to McAfee, which I did. But no, Austin actually was cool. There were people on his campaign that weren't, but Austin was cool. He didn't want to fight with me, and it was smart that he didn't. It wouldn't have been good for him.

It was Gary Johnson's campaign that was vicious. And I told you about some of the dirty stuff going on behind the scenes, but another thing that they did was they created this troll army online of fake accounts, where they would have cartoon characters for profile photos because for legal reasons they didn't want to use somebody's face. And they were just posting such vicious, nasty stuff all over the liberty universe but specifically areas where the Libertarian Party delegates were. They were posting nasty stuff about McAfee, like they would show McAfee married a former prostitute and she's got an arrest record, and they would post pictures, arrest photos, a mug shot of her with the caption, "This is your next first lady."

Stuff like that that's coming out of the Gary Johnson campaign. If you're okay with that, cool, just know what you're paying for. The Gary Johnson campaign became a conduit for more vicious infighting in the movement. That's what you're donating to, and people just don't realize that, especially since he seems like a nice guy.

WOODS: Right. Hold on just a minute. I definitely want to come back to that, but what I wanted to ask you was, in the upper reaches of the party — now that we've talked about these other people, in the upper reaches of the party, we know that among the Democratic Party, we know that there were certain things that were done obviously to benefit Hillary at the expense of Bernie Sanders. And I'm just curious if you happen to be aware of anything similar in the higher echelons of the party that were aimed at you guys or at least that were pro-Johnson.

WEISS: Actually no. So I —

WOODS: Well, that's good. I'm really glad to hear that.

WEISS: I actually have lots of positive things to say about the Libertarian Party leadership.

WOODS: Good.

WEISS: My issue is actually not at all with the LP leadership. In fact, Nick Sarwark, the chair of the LP, I think he's the best Libertarian Party chair that has ever existed in the history of the LP. I don't know if I can say that with absolute, but I feel that way. And honestly, this guy is basically babysitting – you know what? I want to get back to that, because I wanted to talk about the LP a little bit more.

But I want to say that Chris Thrasher wrote a response to the fact that I've been saying these – I've talked in that interview with Marc Clair and I gave another interview before. And Chris Thrasher wrote a response. And you know, he could – he was doing dirty stuff. He betrayed my trust. There's things that we discussed privately, situations that we discussed privately while he was our campaign manager, and he talked about that with the Gary Johnson campaign and gave them the ability to smear me in a way that was like really hard for me to explain now. So he used our private conversations against me. Total betrayal. But you know what? He could apologize for that. He could use the opportunity to – he could use my exposing this maybe to make amends or something. But no, this is what they do. They go further into lies.

Ron Nielson's like that. And this is a guy – I never push people out of the movement. I think we need all hands on deck. People know that I don't start fights in the scene. I resolve conflicts. But the only time I ever push people out is when they're being destructive or deceptive. Either they're causing damage or they're scamming or lying or stuff like that. That's when I think that people do need to be called out. I rarely ever do that over just political disagreements. Even behavior, I generally – even aggressive behavior, I generally don't try to push people out of the movement. But like these blatant politics, they're all in the Libertarian Party. It's like that's the worst of it all. But I'm going to get a little bit more into that.

But he says in his response – "To Whom It May Concern" is what he called it – he says, "I was vehemently opposed to Judd Weiss' candidacy for a variety of reasons right from the beginning," which is a complete lie. Like, how do you figure that? He gave me McAfee's number. He's the one who pushed me to come on board. He was really excited. He sold McAfee on me, and now he's writing things like he was vehemently opposed to me from the very beginning, which is complete nonsense.

And there's a – he's digging up some dirt. I'm happy to talk about it, but it's another distraction about a legal issue I dealt with, which was a serious injustice. I don't know if we have – I don't think we have time to get into it, but he distorts the situation and tries to use that against me to hurt me after betraying our trust.

And by the way, this guy, John McAfee's campaign manager, I paid him in full the day that he told us he's leaving. I paid him his balance owed in full. I was really nice. I wanted him to be taken care of. I wanted nobody to have a balance. I didn't even pay

that from campaign funds. I paid that and I started raising money for the campaign. I just came on board. I paid that because I didn't want anybody to feel like the campaign's being sloppy and not paying anybody. And it was that day, that day that he turned on me that he started yelling at me, right after he got paid that he started yelling at me, telling me I need to play the game. And he was yelling, "Judd, you need to play the game." And this was the kind of stuff I'm dealing with me. And you know, I think that he could have an opportunity to come straight and apologize for his behavior, but no, the guy goes further into lies, goes further into being vicious. And this is what you expect.

And so let me talk a little about the LP and why you see this in the LP.

WOODS: Okay, before we get to the LP, I have to ask you just one quick thing about Gary Johnson.

WEISS: Sure.

WOODS: Given all this – I can understand how obviously you can't oversee everything that an underling is doing and all that, but does it seem plausible that like the nastiness you mentioned against John and his wife or the exorbitant amount being paid to the campaign manager, how much of this could – is it plausible to claim Johnson didn't know about it? And if he didn't know about major things like this, then wouldn't he have been a crummy president?

WEISS: Yeah, absolutely. Essentially the buck stops with him. I've heard from lots of people even back in the 2012 campaign that Gary is asleep at the wheel. So I'm trying to give him the benefit of the doubt. I would like to be able to give him the benefit of the doubt. But ultimately, the buck stops with Gary. It's his campaign. However, I did just come upon something recently, some info – you know what? I'll share it with you. This is the first time people are going to know about it – that really now makes me believe I can't give Gary the benefit of the doubt anymore. I would like to.

And I want to make this clear. My issue isn't that the Gary Johnson campaign committed a crime. Maybe they did; maybe they didn't. I don't know. That's not my point. My issue isn't even quite that they're behaving unethically. They were, clearly. I do have an issue with that. But that's not my main issue. My main issue: this is supposed to be activism in the liberty movement. This is supposed to be libertarians are donating to achieve some political goal. And this is terrible activism. This is backwards from that perspective, where people are funding political candidates that are essentially creating more vicious infighting in the movement. That's what your dollars are doing. It's like instead of putting out fires with water, you're pouring gasoline on them and you're paying for it. This is really terrible activism. Fighting with other libertarians is not how I want to spend my activism. And that's my main issue. If people are okay with this kind of behavior, fine. That's politics as usual. But I want people to be aware this is terrible use of liberty activism. So that's my main issue.

But I do want to bring light to something I discovered recently that really proves how dirty this was. First of all, Alicia Dearn, the vice presidential candidate that I was talking about earlier who I said was dirty and corrupt, she posted on this post that I was tagged in something really shocking saying that – about Gary and Ron. Because

Gary is known as being asleep at the wheel. Ron is running everything. And Ron is known as dirty.

Before I get into this, I also want to say that I know so many people on the Gary Johnson campaign, and I heard in the general election, they had a challenger in Utah, Evan McMullin, that was giving them problems in their Utah run. He was getting the Mormon vote in a big way. And Ron Nielson told the campaign team – he didn't actually do this, but he told the campaign team that his solution to this problem of Evan McMullin is to start a whisper campaign that Evan McMullin was gay so that the Mormons would disavow him. Like that's the kind of stuff. And people on the campaign team threatened to leave if they were going to do anything like that, because they thought it was so mind-numbingly stupid. But that's the kind of guys that Ron Nielson is. He wanted to do – he's always just coming up with shady stuff. So he wanted to do some whisper campaign that Evan McMullin was gay to help Gary Johnson.

WOODS: That's the first I have heard of that. That's amazing.

WEISS: Nobody knows about that. That's something I know only because I know people on the campaign team, and they're all – generally, the people on the campaign team hate Ron Nielson but they still love Gary Johnson. They still think he's a really nice guy and he's a good guy; it's just that, they say to me, that Ron Nielson is a scam artist and he's completely incompetent. Everything had to go through him.

And sure enough, Alicia Dearn wrote – she's not even that happy with Ron Nielson apparently. She says, "I don't agree with how he treated a lot of people this time. He acted greedy and selfish." She says, "Gary isn't gullible; he owed Ron a run where Ron could make some money." Let me repeat that. Gary "owed Ron a [campaign] where Ron could make some money."

And then she goes on: Gary "turned a blind eye and gave Ron unquestioning allegiance because he owed Ron." Like what is that, you know?

She says, speaking about Ron Nielson, "He paid himself a really high fee for 2016 and had all his business expenses covered by 2016 while it lasted. That's why he ran it through a corporation. I believe he took well into the seven figures, even if he spent a lot of that on running and repairing his business."

She goes on: "My main criticism of Ron is that he's just bad at his job. The results and the experience speak to that clearly." But she's also just saying that Gary Johnson owed Ron Nielson.

I'm going to give you copies of all of this stuff. Even the email I talked about, you can put it up on the show notes page afterwards. Everybody can look at this. And I'm kind of glad that those are your platforms for more people to look at this all themselves.

But here's something really shocking that I just became aware of. It's crazy. There was a huge controversy at the beginning of Gary Johnson's 2016 campaign, because there was some FEC debt of like \$330,000 from 2012 that they were almost going to revoke his right to run a campaign if that wasn't paid. It was some serious controversy. And a

bunch of libertarians, they were concerned that their donations to the 2016 campaign would pay to cover that \$330,000 debt owed to the FEC or the Treasury Department or whatever it was for the 2012 campaign. So Gary Johnson assured everybody himself personally that no money from the 2016, none of the donations from libertarians is going to pay for that debt in 2012. He's going to cover it himself, right? That sounds like an important thing, doesn't it?

WOODS: Yeah.

WEISS: Right. Like, I'm donating to the 2016 campaign. I don't want to pay for the debt of \$300-something thousand for 2012, right?

WOODS: Yeah.

WEISS: So in the FEC report for Gary Johnson, he pays DB Capital Strategies for – the purpose of disbursement says "legal fees" – one payment of \$115,000, then another payment of \$345,000. So that's almost – it's getting close to \$500,000. It's like 460-something thousand. In any case – 456,000 he paid to this organization, DB Capital Strategies. Then I've got a – I'm going to pull this up right now, and I'm going to give this to you. I have the receipt from the United States Department of Treasury for that \$333,000. I even have a copy of the check, which the FEC posted, paid for by DB Capital Strategies with a message from DB Capital, which is basically Dan Baker, is their attorney, DB. He says, "Enclosed please find the check to the United States Treasury." He paid the Treasury 330. Do you think he paid off Gary Johnson's 2012 campaign debt out of the kindness of his heart? He was paid that amount from the Gary Johnson campaign, and then the lawyer paid the fee.

So that might actually be a crime. I don't know. But that is scamming libertarians. That I do know. That is a lie, and that's a lie that Gary Johnson for sure knows, that his 2012 debt was paid for. He knows that that happened. So this is where I no longer have any faith that Gary Johnson is actually innocent in all of this.

WOODS: Judd, what do you think about the 2016 campaign debt? They had plenty of that, didn't they?

WEISS: I don't know. I don't know –

WOODS: Because I was hearing stories about, this is an extremely badly run campaign.

WEISS: It was an extremely badly run campaign. I'm sure there's more shady stuff in there, but they got a lot more donations this time, which essentially Ron Nielson, the campaign manager, pocketed. So I now understand why they were so vicious during the nomination, because I was actually surprised. Why is Gary Johnson so vicious? And it's – Ron Nielson, why is Ron Nielson so vicious? It's because I threatened payday. In fact, if we had gotten 45 more votes at the convention, we would have won the nomination, and so he considered me a real threat. They had a better chance of winning from the very beginning. They had more in place, better odds, but they couldn't take that chance. I almost cost Ron Nielson a million-eight. He wouldn't have been able to pocket that from libertarian activists. And this guy's not some sort of –

he's not a libertarian or libertarian activist. He's not involved in the movement. He just comes around every four years and gets paid. And he got paid very well. And that's what's really going on.

And the thing is, like about that secret attorneys paying in lieu of the campaign, this is how everything is going on in politics. People are spending more time distancing themselves from what they're doing than actually doing it. I have never been in an open secretive environment. I've never had more people tell me, "I'm going to tell you this, but you didn't hear it from me," in my life. So many people are telling people things like that. Everything is happening that way. A lot of stuff is done with wink, wink, nudge, nudge, and everybody's trying to make sure that they're three degrees separated from what it is they're actually doing. This is what's going on. This is politics.

And it blew my mind that this is happening in a third party without anything at stake, and now I realize they did have something at stake. They had donors. I wanted to use — I wanted to up the production value of our campaign once we got in the general election if I had more funds and do something bigger and bolder. We had some crazy ideas. Politics has never seen anything like we had planned. It was going to be something different. But they spent that money with like terrible messaging, terrible marketing. Everything was very boring and lackluster. They put up like billboards where people didn't see them, without even saying it was Libertarian Party. They just had Gary Johnson and Bill Weld. They had some terrible wastes of money that they were doing.

WOODS: So are you definitely out of this scene forever? Would you ever do something like this again?

WEISS: Well, I'll be in the libertarian movement and the liberty scene for decades. As far as the Libertarian Party, well, you be the judge after I tell you what I'm about to say about the Libertarian Party.

WOODS: Oh, okay. Go, go.

WEISS: Maybe we should get into that.

WOODS: Yeah.

WEISS: So the Gary Johnson campaign and Libertarian Party are completely separate. I don't want people to link the two. They have — they're just totally different people involved and they're run differently. The Gary Johnson campaign was vicious, but they were trying to scam people. The Libertarian Party has a different problem. I've been through all the libertarian universe. I talked about that earlier. But I can say without any hesitation that the biggest sinkhole of time, energy, money, resources, and emotion in the entire liberty movement is the Libertarian Party. Useless would be an improvement for the Libertarian Party, because basically what it is, it's a cage match arena where libertarians fight with each other over positions of no power.

I told you earlier that wherever I go in the liberty movement, I come bearing gifts. I'm trying to improve everywhere I go. Well, if you come bearing gifts to the Libertarian Party, no matter what, you're met with baseball bats. Everybody's got agendas and they're all doing these political maneuvering, some of which I just talked about in the Gary Johnson campaign, but it's happening even on a lower level on like stupid races that nobody even pays attention to. Everybody's fighting for these useless titles.

And I come down – I came in there to try to contribute something, and I'm just faced with a lot of people trying to tear me down in response. Okay, that's politics, but this is terrible liberty activism. Whatever you do in the Libertarian Party has a subtext question: you and what army? No matter what you try to do, no matter what you try to contribute, you're going to have to fight for it and you're going to have to bring an army to fight for it.

And I can. I can raise an army. I have so many connections and friends throughout the liberty movement, I have so much good will. I throw parties, parties at my house pretty much as big as all the delegates that I need at the convention to win the nomination. It was like a thousand delegates at the convention. My New Year's Eve party had 400 people. I'm almost there. I can bring people together to win this if I wanted to. But if I bring an army together, then I'm another retard fighting with other nerds, and it's just, I'm part of that mess. I just don't really have much interest in fighting. That wasn't what I was trying to do.

So I'm kind of left with this impression, I think being an unpleasant jerk must actually be mandated in the Libertarian Party bylaws. I wouldn't know for sure. I would never waste a minute of my life actually reading bylaws, but it's a reasonable assumption to make if you had any interaction with the Libertarian Party. It's that nasty.

And there's a reason why. Essentially, we're an intellectual movement and we have – the way I like to explain it is there's a reason why most organizations, the engineers are not the salesmen. It's a different skill set. The engineers have to be right. They have to eat, breathe, and sleep their product and understand it. And salespeople have to eat, breathe, and sleep people and connecting with people. Their focus is not primarily on the product; their focus is actually primarily on people. And it's a different skill set. And so we've got, in my opinion, the whole liberty movement is suffering from this – all intellectual movements are – is you have a bunch of engineers dominating the sales department. That's what I ultimately see as a problem in the liberty movement, and that's where I'm trying to bring my influence.

What you've got in the Libertarian Party is this huge war between the purists and the moderates. In fact, there's like 17 different warring factions, if you want to think about it. In some way, everybody's fighting with each other. But the purists and the moderates is the biggest debate, and I think both sides of that debate are offering absolutely nothing – they have no viable path to offer any positive path forward. The reason is because ultimately you've got a bunch of socially awkward nerds arguing for purism fighting with a bunch of socially awkward nerds fighting for moderate viewpoint, and essentially the problem isn't either of those. The problem is we have a bunch of socially awkward nerds that nobody wants to pay attention to. That's my truth. That's how I look at it, that it's embarrassing to even admit to most people's

friends that you're even a part of this. That's what the real issue is, and they're not focused on that.

And I'd like to explain a little bit about this purist versus moderate debate and what the problem is with that. Because the purists are essentially — I agree. I like that they're radicals. I like that they care about the ideas. For the most part, most of them are the ones with the most integrity in the movement. There are some shady people on the purist side that, they're still hardcore liberty activists, but they feel like the only way to get ahead in the Libertarian Party is to be shady and cheap and lie and deceive people and that's how the purity movement's going to win. But for the most part, those are the ones with the most integrity, is from the purist side of the debate.

I like that, but the problem with them is that it's essentially, all marketing has to appeal to them and their sensibilities, and essentially, they just recite from the liberty engineer manual. They don't even like any sort of packaging or ability to really portray this in a different way to different markets. Everything has to appeal to them and their sensibilities, and that's why I think the purist side is unfortunately lacking.

And then there's the moderates, where I like the fact that they're trying to get people to feel comfortable with these ideas. I like that they're trying to connect with people. That's really critical. But what they're essentially doing is going back to the engineers — it's like, it's a sign of bad salesmen to go back to the engineers and say, "I need you to design a weaker, lamer product that's less interesting and less exciting so that I can sell this." That's bad sales. That's not sales.

And so essentially you've got the liberty purists that are citing the engineer manual versus the guys that want this tame and boring and uninteresting and just like everything else. Neither side of those debates are effective. And everybody keeps arguing about what's the right libertarian marketing. Like that's the big debate. Everybody in the Libertarian Party that I've encountered that discusses the word marketing has no clue what they're talking about whatsoever. They're not offering anything positive. They start screaming about, "This is bad marketing," but they have no idea what they're talking about. They have nothing actually of value to offer.

The way I look at the Libertarian Party is essentially — Actually, let me back up. I said before that we're all nerds in this scene. If we're into politics, we've crossed that nerd threshold. But among the world of nerds, there's the cool nerds and there's the uncool nerds. And the cooler nerds you'll see throughout the liberty movement, they want to feel like they're being productive with their free time. They want to feel like they're achieving something. They don't want to fight with each other.

And sure enough, throughout the libertarian, wider liberty universe, there are scuffles here and there. You'll see people argue and fight a little bit. But for the most part, people do their own thing and it's okay. You'll see Mises fight with Cato a little bit. You'll see Ayn Rand Institute fight with everybody. But for the most part, people just do their own thing and it's okay. But Tom, imagine what would happen if all of the libertarian and liberty-related organizations suddenly disappeared and you had all these activists that were suddenly congealed and formed into one organization. There was only one liberty organization to represent the whole movement and we had to

vote on which direction that liberty organization was going to go in. Can you imagine the utter warfare that we would have?

WOODS: And you're saying that's basically the Libertarian Party?

WEISS: That's the Libertarian Party. That's the problem. It's a structural problem. And so what you get is you get basically a very tight, exclusive membership club for the uncool nerds in the movement. This is the sinkhole of the – it's where – basically I think of politics as like a game of chicken for who can be the most unpleasant, and if you're more unpleasant than the other person, then the other people will go away and you'll get your way. That's what goes on throughout the political world. In fact –

WOODS: But isn't that true of other parties, though, that it's always the uncool nerds who are running them?

WEISS: Yeah.

WOODS: I mean, nobody really wants Mitt Romney or John McCain –

WEISS: Sure.

WOODS: – but yet they always wind up in charge. Nobody really wanted Hillary Clinton, but they always wind up in charge.

WEISS: Well yeah, so basically what I mean by that – I'm talking about the people that are fighting with each other, because fighting with other nerds is actually better than what these guys would have been doing otherwise, I don't know, in their basement reading or whatever. Like, this is actually a better use of their time. This is their fun time to go fight with other nerds. So that's what I mean. This is like – this is the uncool nerds.

That game of chicken analogy is relevant not just to other parties, but it's also relevant to warfare. I mean, ultimately warfare is a game of chicken. Who's going to make this more unpleasant for the other side in a brutal way? And you get that in the Libertarian Party as well. It's brutal. And so who remains? Who remains when it's that unpleasant where it's just a den of wolves clawing and scratching at each other? Only the most miserable people. The most unpleasant people that you can imagine are what remains.

So I feel like – I've been thinking about it. What is the value of the Libertarian Party to the movement? And I think I've actually come up with an answer, that there is a value that the Libertarian Party gives to the wider liberty movement. It's not to win elections or achieve anything at all; it's basically the liberty movement's convenient quarantine pen for the most toxic elements in the movement. The Libertarian Party, in my opinion, is essentially a dog kennel. You can't have the rabid dogs loose, biting people. You need to put them somewhere. So that's the Libertarian Party. It's a place for angry libertarians who need a chew toy, and that chew toy is each other. And that's why the liberty movement actually needs the Libertarian Party. I wish I could report better on it.

WOODS: Well, let's try and wrap up. What are we supposed to walk away with here? I mean, this is a lot of pretty grim stuff.

WEISS: Right. So I'm not saying this to discourage people. I'm not discouraging people because I want to be a jerk. I'm not saying any of this — I'm saying there's a better way. I'm giving tough love because it is love. I'm contributing a lot to this movement. I've put a lot of energy and time, and I don't want that to go to waste, and I don't want us to constantly be embarrassed by this stuff.

So what I feel like the Libertarian Party should do, my two cents is the word "electability" should be banned. We shouldn't even discuss the word electability, because we don't have the ability to win elections. It's not a relevant factor. All that's relevant is whether a candidate is able to garner attention and interest. That's what's relevant. Electability is relevant if that vague concept could garner more attention and interest. That's relevant, but only insofar as it serves the prime directive of gaining attention and interest. We should never sacrifice interest for electability or we'll have neither.

So the way I like to think about it — have you seen the show *Game of Thrones*?

WOODS: I know of it, but I'm the only person in America who hasn't watched it.

WEISS: Phenomenal show. Best show I've ever seen. And I don't watch TV. I just download it. It's absolutely amazing. There's this area north of the Wall where the Free People live. Or they're called Wildlings. They know themselves as the Free People. And winter's coming and they're all going to die, and so they need to get on the other side of this wall, but it's being guarded and it's a suicide mission if anybody tries to climb it. It's a 700-foot wall of ice and it's being guarded, and they can't come over so they're stuck in their quarantine pen, essentially. And this guy takes leadership in that area, and he gets all these people together and he ends up getting an army of like a million of them to storm it and climb over and get to freedom. And that's fantastic, but he couldn't have done it earlier; otherwise it would just be suicide missions.

And that's my opinion of the Libertarian Party right now. All of these campaigns that we're running are essentially suicide missions. No one's going to win any elections. Right now what we need to be doing is gathering. We need to get more attention, get more people interested in what we're doing, and build to the point that maybe one day we can actually discuss things like electability. But right now it's not relevant because there just is not enough angry libertarian nerds out there to win any election, so we're going to have to reach out beyond that.

And the only way past 5% is to stop being the party focused on 5%. We need to be just the party that's doing the most interesting, exciting things, and that's how we're going to build towards the future. Otherwise, if we're playing it safe, we're cutting off our ability to be interesting. We're not relevant. I say if there's two options on the market, cream cheese or butter, blander butter is not a legitimate third option. Nobody wants that. Us being like Republicans or like the other parties but having no power is not a legitimate third option. This election, there was door A. That sucks. Door B, that

sucks. And everybody's desperately looking at what's behind door C, and then we tell them we suck too. We suck just as much as everybody else.

So that's what I think is a shame. Half of the country, half of the world, half of the population of the human race by definition is below average. But we're not – we're only speaking to the 2 to 5% of the people that are intellectuals. We're ignoring not just the bottom 50%, which is pretty much a voting majority, a majority; we're just focusing on an intellectual battle. I want that intellectual battle to continue, but in addition to that, we need to start branching out. We need to start speaking to people who are not intellectuals.

And if we start doing that, what we'd find is we actually don't even need to win arguments. All of us are intellectuals. We want to win arguments, but we don't need to. We just need to be the cooler option. And take a look at a movie like *Avatar*, for example. These bastards came in; greedy capitalists came in and knocked down the tree and scattered all the natives, and everybody was like, That's terrible, and they're more inclined towards environmentalism without any logical arguments about it. All we have to do is guide them through the experience of what this is and create experiences. That's what I was trying to do with our videos: create experiences that guide people along and suck them in that way.

And if people want to look, we have the source code. We have volumes and volumes of books that you can read, tons of articles to read to see that we're actually right about this stuff. But we just need to be the cool option, and we can be. We can. We need to sell a better vision, and we need to create a better experience, because right now the experience in the liberty movement is not great, but the experience in the Libertarian Party is absolutely horrible.

So ultimately what I want to leave people with is this idea that the old rules are dead. Stop playing them. No one's interested in them. The rules that the Republicans and the Democrats follow have some purpose because they have something to protect. But those rules aren't what dictate what the Libertarian Party should do. So everybody's comparing us with, "Republicans and Democrats wouldn't do that." Of course. They have something to protect. We need to be operating on a different rule.

And I only have two rules. Really, it's one rule. But the first minor one is: have a little bit of tact. Just some minor tact. And then the second rule, and this one is hardcore, this is the most important rule: do what pulls at you. Only do what pulls at you. If you're not a fan of it, don't do it. Be the badass that you want to be. And if we could all be more interesting, more exciting people and stop playing it safe, I don't think that the other movements even have a chance. We are neutering ourselves. We are cutting off our own legs and playing it safe. There's no reason for that. We need to be the interesting, exciting option, and we need to demonstrate the innovation in our messaging and in our movement that we want society to have in its economy. We need to be a messenger of that innovation, and that's what I was trying to do with the campaign.

WOODS: Judd, how can people follow you? What's the best way?

WEISS: Best way is on Facebook. I post everything, even my photos. I don't even have a photography website. I'm not a professional photographer; I'm an enthusiast. It all goes on Facebook, Facebook.com/JuddWeiss. Judd Weiss is the handle I use for everything. Instagram: @JuddWeiss. Twitter.com/JuddWeiss. So they can find me there.

WOODS: Okay, I'll put those things up at TomWoods.com/906, and now I've got to go take a nap. I'm overwhelmed. I've got to think this through and see what I come up with. But thanks for sharing a lot of this information. It's better for it to be out there than not to be, and I'm glad you're doing what you're doing. Thanks so much, Judd.

WEISS: Thank you so much for having me on the show. It's a big honor. And hopefully in the future we can talk about some more positive things.

WOODS: Yeah, that's right. That's right. Thank you.