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**Bret** 02:24

Hey folks, welcome to the Unity 2020 campfire, I am here with Dan Crenshaw, a former Navy SEAL current representative of Texas second congressional district. Welcome, Dan.

**Dan Crenshaw** 02:37

Hey, thanks for having me. Brett. It's good to see you again.

**Bret** 02:40

Good to see you. I'm going to give a very brief introduction since I know you're pressed for time, we use campfire as a mechanism for discussing the predicament that the nation finds itself in the unity 2020 coalition are patriots who are interested in figuring out how to escape our highly polarized partisan dynamic to save the Republic, so you are a perfect guest for such a conversation. I should say that the hope for this conversation was that it would include Tulsi Gabbard, who is unfortunately now off on her military assignment and couldn't join us perhaps when she returns we'll be able to have that conversation. But in the meantime, I'm very pleased to welcome you to the Unity 2020 campfire.

**Dan Crenshaw** 03:28

So thanks for having me.

**Bret** 03:30

Let's talk about the situation. First, I should alert you that we at Unity 2020 have just completed soliciting nominations for our ticket. And last I checked, you were very popular, nominated many, many times near the top of our list. So in any case, you are here amongst people who see you in a very favorable light. In fact, maybe before we get to the discussion, we have a graphic. This is not absolutely current data. But Zack, could you put up that graphic? So here? Oh, apparently you can't see it. We asked the question. I think this is on August 5, we asked how do you feel about Dan Crenshaw? And the answer that was submitted was always felt his statements were honest, even if I disagree. And then democrats in our group agreed with that statement at a rate of 68%. Republicans slightly better at 70. And people who have not previously been engaged in politics agree with that statement at 80%. So there's something about you, Dan, that resonates with a lot of people, people see you as as a patriot. I must say I see you in the same way.

**Dan Crenshaw** 04:46

Oh, well, thank you. I have no plans to run for higher office. But I do appreciate. I do appreciate it either way.

**Bret** 04:54

Well, we we have no plans to run you for higher office unless our nomination process goes that way and we have groundswell enough to draft you, as a matter of simple patriotism and dedication to the nation. But let's, let's talk about what our national predicament might be. The people who have joined our movement are quite concerned about what they're seeing. And although they are, of course not of one mind, I think a great many of us believe that we are watching something historic take place, and that many of the things that have felt secure to Americans are suddenly looking like they may be a bit more rickety than we thought. Do you see that picture?

**Dan Crenshaw** 05:40

Oh, yeah, I think we I think everybody feels that whether you're on the far right or the far left, or in the middle, moderate, there's, there's certainly a sense of polarization. And it's, and I think people feel a bit helpless with it, because it's it, nobody has a clear sense of how to drive ourselves out of that polarization. The the immediate reaction, if you're on the left is to say, well, the right started and if you're on the right, the immediate reaction and said the left started it, they need to change these things. And and and then we will be able to move forward. The moderates will say that it's both sides. And you know, and I'm, of course, I'm on the right, and I I do believe the statement that I think it's probably more the fault of the other and I can I'm happy to be challenged on these things. But this that's that's the helplessness that I think Americans feel that they feel like they want a way out of it.

**Bret** 06:34

Yeah, I would agree with that. Although, you know, you and I had a couple conversations on your podcast, your podcast, which is called We hold these truths, which is excellent. And although I would consider myself on the far left, and you consider yourself on the right, we found a tremendous amount over which we disagree. We agreed and very little over which we disagreed. And I must say that this has been a fairly frequent theme in my conversations of late that essentially good people seem to agree on a lot.

**Dan Crenshaw** 07:10

What's interesting about that is how people label themselves. You know, you've said that a few times that you're like, oh, radical leftists. And then, but I can't find any sort of radical left things that you believe maybe they'll surprise me. But this gets to a different problem. So labels are useful, especially for political science and for just I think, General, you know, I think study and in general politics, you have to to a certain extent, but you know, people label themselves voluntarily to and, and so this is, this is an interesting thing that I've had to that I've had to be more self conscious of, and I crossed the line, probably a lot. But let me just tell you a story. So you know, my district is it's, it's somewhat diverse in urban suburban district, we've got a lot of really like cool hotspots in my district. I like to do events at popular bars, I just find that fun, it brings a younger crowd, I think it's just fun, and you get to kind of just have a beer with people. It's one of my favorite ways to campaign and, and do my job, which is effectively representing people and communicating with people, and haven't been able to do it a lot lately, which has been very frustrating. But there's a place I like to go to often. And so they know who I am. That's kind of the point I'm making. I do a lot of events there. They know who I am. And they don't seem to dislike me. All right. And I remember just being there, you know, just getting some food one day and grabbing a beer. And the bartender was there again, this this woman who knows me, like there's, there's not a stranger to that I know exactly who I am. And, you know, she's young, covered in tattoos. I come from the military, we've got a lot of tattoos in the military, I have tattoos. And I like hey, those are pretty cool tattoos. And she says, Yeah, you know, I come from, you know, my neighborhood, you know, just north of Houston. It's more conservative, but I'm more progressive. And so I like tattoos. And I found that so interesting that she would label herself as a progressive because of the tattoos so I would never do that. And so what this what this revealed to me was that when I'm criticizing progressive progressivism, in general, she might think I'm criticizing her, when in reality, we might agree on a whole number of things and obviously from those interactions, she has no ill will towards me, you know, and she knows my political beliefs and she must so people self label and and we just have to be careful with that. And you know, I try to distinguish who I'm talking about more carefully. Again, I don't think I always do a great job of this. But I try to distinguish between a liberal and a leftist and a progressive and a far leftist, radical leftist, whatever these things might mean and I try to explain What I mean by these terms so that people so that we don't alienate people, and that's probably a good start. Now part of the way of getting out of the polarization is to stop attacking the worst ideas from the other side. Attack ideas directly. Also don't don't don't play tennis with each other in different courts. Don't talk past each other, because the war of ideas is a healthy thing. And I and I engage in that war pretty, pretty heavy handedly, frankly. But, but, you know, I have to catch myself sometimes and stop attacking the worst ideas from the other side and focusing on on the labels, or at least describing what I mean by the labels.

**Bret** 10:37

Yeah, well, I think the more I see, the older I get, the more I realize that patriotism has failed. And that part of the problem that we run into is that many of the people who are involved in these discussions, actually, for example, root for the failure of governance, when it is in the hands of those they regardless, the opposition, which is deeply unpatriotic, the fact is, at the point the other candidate is elected, you should be rooting for them to succeed, because their success is our success and to root for them to fail, and worse to engage in sabotage is, well, it's anti American. And so Oh, go ahead.

**Dan Crenshaw** 11:25

Yeah, I agree with that. There's polling is very detailed polling on this on this particular question about how you feel about your country? And who does it. Think it was Pew? I think it's pew research that's been doing it for a long time. And so you can see, you can see how Democrats and Republicans describe their patriotism because they're asked do you feel I think the question is about patriotism, you feel very patriotic about your country, somewhat patriotic, etc. for republicans remains somewhat constant. Democrats, it varies wildly, depending on who's president. There's a very clear swings. You know, Michelle Obama said, this is the first time I'm proud of my country, was said that in 2008, and we've elected Barack Obama, and to your point, like we can't say those things, we can't say our, it's, there's no benefit to it. You know, like this, this notion that the only way we can be proud of our country is if we radically transform it, the only way we can love our country's if we radically transform it. That's not the right attitude. It's like, would you say that about your spouse? You know, I really would love her if she would just radically change herself.

**Bret** 12:36

I have heard people say that about their spouses. But now I wouldn't, I wouldn't say right. But but not

**Dan Crenshaw** 12:41

but not a healthy relationship. No. So it we shouldn't we should desire this sort of healthy relationship with with with the ideals of our country. And and maybe that's what patriotism is, you know, it doesn't mean you don't desire, progress, doesn't mean you don't desire improvements. But but we've gotten to the point where trying to undermine the very foundations of the country, basically throw it all out, you know, kind of a French Revolutionary style. And that's that's, to me is deeply dangerous.

**Bret** 13:07

Yeah, well, you say, I mean, let me put it a different way. I think the core of patriotism is a willingness to sacrifice for your country. So I find myself very patriotic, I don't have any doubts about it. I don't wonder about it. It doesn't mean that I'm not frustrated with my country that I don't feel like we could do better. And sometimes we do things that I find maddening and needless, but it doesn't dampen my willingness to sacrifice for it, because it is an immensely powerful experiment in human betterment. It really is the first credible departure from a system in which we just battle each other based on what population we come from. And one of the things that terrifies me about this movement is that I see the far left at the moment selling a race first view of the world, which is going to drive the right the mainstream right into a race first view of the world that it doesn't currently hold. And for us to abandon the American experiment in favor of lineage against lineage, violence and power games seems to me such a tragic waste. Now,

**Dan Crenshaw** 14:29

it's critical race theory makes critical race theory, it seems to me just to be sort of a modern academic exploration of what human history has always been, which is viewing things through a through a racial lens, or a tribal lens or a group lens, group on group, you know, identity politics, which as you noted, which is kind of prior to Western enlightenment, that was a human civilization for a very long time was this the warring of factions and power struggles, whether it's again, based On land, but usually based on some kind of tribal loyalty, whatever that looked like, and the beauty of Western civilization was, was overcoming that, you know, and we, and, you know, and we do it and fits and starts, like, we have a sinful history. But we but you know, in the, in the in the long you know, in the, I would say in the, in the long perspective of history, we did it rather quickly and forcefully. We're never perfect, and we but we, no matter what though I can tell you this, we definitely can't change it, you can't change the history, history is unchangeable. Last time I checked, and, and this, this need to dwell on it. And, and sort of ruin our current history and our future. Because of it, it seems very backwards to me and I just think we're making, we're not we're not making progress with something like critical race theory, viewing everything through the lens of race or gender, or, or whatever the immutable characteristic is at the given moment. We're not making any progress with that we're we're regressing and it's it's very divisive. You know, and I don't know, that's it. Yeah, I worry about that on the right. I don't know if it'll end up that way on the right. It's, um, you know, as the backlash, I think the backlash is more chaotic than that. I don't I don't think we I don't think the right really knows how the left always accuses us, by the way. I know, listeners will say, Oh, of course, the right. Does identity politics. I, I don't see a lot of evidence for that. You know, and, again, I could go into that. But I think there's going to be backlash, and it's not going to be good. But it's, it's unclear to me what it even looks like to be honest.

**Bret** 16:44

Well, I must tell you, I don't see how it can avoid that trap. Just a simple experience that people have of not knowing whether or not they're going to be viewed as racist, for example, just simply because we are being told that you can read that on the on the surface of someone's skin means that a, a social situation that might have been ambiguous or even welcoming in the past is going to be viewed with trepidation. In in a future where we're we're told that race is everything. And I mean, you said it, I think quite well. Our history is far from perfect. This was a radical departure, and a positive one. And the thing we're really fighting over is whether or not the right thing to do about our failures is to finish the project and actually live up to our aspirations to be a race blind society, or to regress, as you say, to a former state where we don't aspire to such things. And what I find so frustrating about the presentation I see over on the far left at the moment, is that there is no awareness for what has been accomplished. The obsessive focus on what we have not yet accomplished, obsessive to the point that people even invent failures that aren't real. But that obsessive focus leaves people with the impression that they are inherently worse off. So for example, with respect to policing, right, we see failures of policing. We don't necessarily understand what they are. But we see lots of instances that we're told are evidence of brutal racist police. But the idea that eliminating the police might be the solution to that is preposterous, right? We don't see the crimes that don't get committed. And many crimes don't get committed, because you can call the police and if we eliminate them, you won't be able to and crime will predictably go up. And it's already going up in places where this experiment is being run. So there's a there's just a failure to appreciate that which you don't notice because we are successful at it and to focus only on those places where plausibly we we haven't succeed.

**Dan Crenshaw** 19:11

Yeah, there's a severe imbalance and that that sort of lack of critical thinking, I think, is purposeful. It's part of this movement. Part Part of the philosophy the postmodernist philosophy is to make the argument that two plus two equals five and if you argue with me You're a racist. And it's it's confusing it's meant to be confusing it's not meant to be logical logical logic is and they'll say this like I'm just repeating what they've said. Logic means racism you know and you know higher meritocracy means racism. This is in you're like, what Wait a second. And the thing is like your average voter, your average like moderate liberal person, I don't think believes these things. But I what worries me is in what I think see objectively Is that that radical left's ideology is taking over the, the broad sweeping left and trampling over liberals? And again, we should be protecting liberalism? I disagree with liberals, I think they I think they are a little bit too utopian. I think they want too much government to do things that government can't possibly do. But, but they're not. They're not critical race theorists. Okay. And they're not Marxist. We have to distinguish between the two, that gets to my earlier point, and I have to be more conscious of that sometimes. But you know, I can't help my frustration sometimes. I like the way Thomas Sol describes the getting getting to what you said about the getting to a colorblind society. And you know, that that can mean i think that's that, that means two things. One is our institutions and our legal system is colorblind. So that's one way of describing it. And I think we have that. And then there's then the question is society itself colorblind? And of course, we don't have that. And I don't think we ever will. And so this gets to the question, Why bring up Thomas Sol in his in his work on the the the conflict of visions, the unconstrained vision versus the constrained vision. These are two basic psychological states in humanity. And it's really interesting how he applies them. And fundamentally, how you would apply it here would be, you know, the unconstrained vision means there's no, there's no restraint on what institutions what government and confucians can do to mold human nature. So there's this belief that if we just get the right policies in place, we can actually make people a certain way. No, the constrained vision would say, No, there's a constraint on what government can actually accomplish. And and I see the policies and I see this in joe biden's platform where, where you're going to make the Fed have another mandate to fix racial inequality. So you're going to impose a non colorblind color, I guess, visible color, you know, color visible policies in order to in order to mold the the non colorblind human nature that we believe is inevitable. And, you know, the question is, is that regressive? Or is that progressive? I think it's regressive. Oh,

**Bret** 22:15

you're absolutely right. It's regressive. And the democrats are engaged in it cynically, I don't mean the democrats writ large. But the democrats of the DNC are toying with this not because it makes the slightest bit of sense, but because it diverts attention away from their own corruption. And, I mean, it's the most unpatriotic thing that maybe I've seen in my lifetime, because what it does, is it takes the anger that people have over a system that is not serving them well. And it causes it to be redirected towards other people on the basis of skin color on the, you know, based on a faulty explanation, that the only reason that you would have an inequality is because of oppression. Therefore, there's all this cryptic racism in the heads of white people that explains everybody, any failure anywhere in the system of anybody to thrive, which is just nonsense.

**Dan Crenshaw** 23:15

The real problem with that premise is that it's unsolvable. And I think it's it's unsolvable by design. Okay, because you can always keep arguing for it. It'll never be solved this is because they're by design, they're not actually solving the core issues, which could be education, you know, poverty is is it has many different faces. There's different reasons that somebody is in poverty, it's a complex conversation to fix that. But these these conversations will never fix it. And I think that's by design, because if you fix it, well then what the heck do you have to run on? You know, how are you going to? How are you going to get this vote the next time and you know, cynically the easiest way for politicians to get a vote is to promise to do something for somebody to provide some kind of service it's a very easy campaign promise. I you know, Tocqueville said I think the the end of the Republic comes and politicians realize they can, they can promise people things with their own money. And that's true, that's always gonna be an issue with democracy. You know, it's, it's it, nobody said it was perfect. It's just the most perfect thing. We have this sort of Republic that we have, but um, but it's unsolvable and it traps people. That's the thing, it traps evil, because you're fighting against a very vague narrative, that that is undefinable by, again by design, and it's meant to trap people and that's, that's depressing. That's it's disempowering. And it's sad to watch it take place.

**Bret** 24:49

So I want to help you out as somebody who has lived on the left my whole life. There are two things going on in the left and one of them maybe it's three There's the cynical DNC version of this, where the symbolism involved in critical race theory and its relatives is useful as a an electoral distraction, something to motivate voters to turn out for Democrats, then you've got cynical actors in the mainstream left, who are actually much as you say, they've built this in. And in fact, if you listen to them, they will tell you that the racism of whites, for example, is incurable. And the job of countering it will never end, they'll just say that flat out. So I find the first time I heard that I was just stunned because so much is invested in telling us that we have to counter this and then in the next sentence, they'll tell you, it can't be countered, and it's just a very bleak and self serving portrayal. But the bulk of the people who are following this, have no idea what they're signed up for. Right? They heard Black Lives Matter, and they resonated and so they signed up, and they're not paying attention to the details of the worldview that is being advanced. And wow, are they going to be surprised that this is not about some world in which things are more equal? This is about a future world in which they're very unequal in a very unfamiliar direction. And it's completely inconsistent with any of the values that bind us together as Americans.

**Dan Crenshaw** 26:27

Yeah, I don't even know how to respond to that. It's I agree with it. It's concerning. And it this is the maybe this is what we're trying to figure out is how do you tell people that you tell them through a kind of a philosophical historical discussion, you know, it's hard for me to reach everybody with a with a philosophical discussion and kind of pointing these things out and, and because moralizing is part of the tactic. These are more realizers I think, and the they tug at heartstrings, the Jonathan heights illustration of the rider and the elephant. He's I know, he's your friends. I know, you know what I'm talking about. Yeah. But you know, the, the, the conscious and unconscious mind, there's a reason that the riders is just this little guy up there where there's, you know, kind of control the elephant, but it's an elephant. And that's the unconscious mind. And, and that's mostly based on emotional reasoning. And so the, the people pulling the strings here know these things, and they know that and they know that people want to be good, they want to feel good. And it feels pretty good to be anti racist. I mean, who wouldn't want to be anti racist? And so it's, it's by design, these these things are by design, it's very clever. But the problem is, is it's not sustainable. And it always ends a disaster, because, again, I tell that to people, you've got to show them the history of it. But big, then they'll counter it and say, oh, now this time, it's different. This time, it's always different this time. And it's again, this, this gets to this is why people feel a little bit helpless. And it's hard to find a way out of it. All we can do is keep talking about?

**Bret** 28:01

Well, let's talk about how you raise people's awareness because I do you know, it's a pity that the metaphor of being awake is being so abused in this case, because I find most people who are woke are sleepwalking, right? But in any case, I look, you said some things about liberals. First of all, you said some things about liberals versus leftists versus progressives. And frankly, I have been on the left my whole life. And I couldn't tell you a reliable way to distinguish these things, I somewhat resonate with all of those terms, that I resonate with almost nothing, that the people who who are using those terms would say about their own beliefs at the moment, I believe we need progress, but I don't believe we need progress of the type that they're pushing. But in any case, what you said, which I think is quite accurate, is that liberals tend to be too utopian. And they tend not to understand the downside of the policies that they're advocating. Alright, so that they, they're like scientists who would add epicycles in order to rescue a hypothesis rather than recognize that it's just not stable. So let me tell you what I think the flip side of this is, the flip side of this is that conservatives tend to be too skeptical about the possibility of a viable solution to a real problem. And they tend to be too optimistic about our current state. So I think you're right liberals tend to want to solve problems and they tend not to understand that they may be causing new and bigger problems in so doing, but conservatives tend to be they will leave possible solutions on the table over fear of what might happen if they attempted to solve it and disbelief over the need for it. And so, in some sense, I this is why unity 2020 is structured the way it is the way to reach people. is not to try to clarify these two messages, it's to try to bring these two messages together. Because, you know, as I've grown older, and I would hope wiser, I've come to understand that it is the tension between these two sets of instincts in which the magic actually happens, right? You need liberals to imagine what might be possible that would be better, and you need conservatives to keep them from overdoing it and destroying functional things in the pursuit of that which cannot be. And I think there's been too much Carnage that comes from the pendulum swinging back and forth, which I don't even think it does anymore. But it once did, that there's a, you know, your temperature and your body isn't maintained by going way too high, and then way too low, it's tightly constrained to the right temperature for all your enzymes to work. And it would be great if we could make governance work that way too. But it is done with tension. It's done with those who see one side with clarity partnering with those that see the other side and reaching some sort of rational plan.

**Dan Crenshaw** 31:09

Yeah, I agree with that. I like the way you frame that I frame it that way often myself as far as this is the healthy balance of liberal and conservative it's kind of a chaos versus order conversation. I don't mean chaos in the pejorative sense. It's It's It's but it is kind of what liberalism is, you know, it's it's just like, let's just get it done. And then conservatives are like, No, just if you do that, then all of these other things, you know, but but maybe they're but maybe they're a little too, like you said they're too tightly wound to the to that specific tradition or structure. And so you need a healthy balance on a practical level, and maybe to answer your question about how I define progressives and leftists, you know, just to just for everybody knows what I'm talking about what I mean these things. progressivism, to me is Woodrow Wilson is Wilsonian progressivism, which is a a direct rebuke to the constitutional order, rebuke to the notion of checks and balances, because it gets in the way of the progress. So it's a highly authoritarian, highly centralized, highly planned economy from Washington. That's how it started. And that, to me that appears by all the policy measures that they wish to take. That's still what it is. But progress always sounds good. And so it's a nice term leftism, I define more in like the against, and obviously a lot of these things overlap. But leftism, I tend to define as kind of the post modernist stuff that we're seeing that you really criticize quite a bit. That's what I see as leftism, as opposed to liberalism, which I want, I want to still define as a good and decent thing, which I have some issues with. But it's also a necessary balance to to conservatism. So as you noted, and it's because of that necessity, that necessary confrontation between chaos and order that isn't necessary confrontation. It's it's, it's just true. And so the practical level, how do we resolve that with good natured liberals? The liberals are really good at pointing out the the injustice is within kind of the hierarchies that are set in society. And they say, well, this isn't fair. We don't like this, okay, the markets not working in this specific case. Okay, that's a very practical example. Now, I think the liberal solution to that particular example will almost always be something I disagree with, but it doesn't mean we can't have a solution. Okay, it just means that we want the solution to be within a set of limiting principles. conservatism is, is really about the how, and I think that's incredibly important. It's why I'm a conservative, because the house is so important, especially when you're running for office, and your entire goal is to develop a governing philosophy, if your entire focus is on the what, and that's just being an activist. There's nothing wrong with that. It's also part of democracy demanding something, okay, I want this to change. But that's activism. And it's not it's not the the judgment required to actually solve the problem without creating a lot of new problems and it won't happen. So if the conservative solving it, it's not going to happen as fast it's not going to happen maybe the way it's not going to maybe maybe the maybe the end result won't be as apparent, right because there's not like a program that we want to create necessarily that you can label and you can say I put money into the program for puppies because we're trying to solve the puppy problem. And so I made the program it's puppies you know and so it's to me liberals will do that and we'll be like, Yeah, but it didn't really solve the problem and in fact, we're just wasting a bunch of money on it and it's like, puppies are still you know, whatever whatever the pumping problem is and you know, so why don't we do this was to tinker with the market stinker, you know, deregulate over here, but it's not as like, you can't wrap your arms around it as well. So liberals don't like That, but that's the conversation that has to actually happen. Like, let us, let us get, let us be more open minded about what we need to do. But liberals, Ed, be more open minded about the how and how conservatives tend to solve problems, because it's more sustainable. And it takes into account more costs and benefits and limiting principles. I can't stress enough how important limiting principles are, I can describe what I mean by that in more detail. Like,

**Bret** 35:30

yeah, no, I get it completely. I mean, I would call it conservation laws, you know, a belief in a structure that actually enforces some kind of discipline over your solution making and I do agree that it is frequently absent on the left. But in general, I have the sense that each perspective is, you know, except for the entirely cynical ones, each perspective has some sort of core insight that drives it. And it's fused with a blind spot that travels along with it. And so you're correct about the activist demanding solutions to problems, but being unaware of what functional solutions look like, often functional solutions aren't beautiful, and they don't lend themselves to some soundbite that's aspirational. And they function because of conservation laws. So what I think has to happen is that we need to each become aware of the blind spots that are coupled with what we see. And so you know, we I think both recognize that liberals are more likely to see injustice. And there's a lot of it, and some of it is from some sort of, identifiable source that can be addressed with a solution. And some of it is just noise in the system that we're probably stuck with. But the important thing is in the context of solution making to actually take advantage of things that work. So let me give you an example. On the left, people tend to be very upset at the consequences of what they call capitalism. Now, I don't know what they mean, when they say capitalism, some of the main markets, and this is an absurd position, because markets are one of the best tools we have. But they're not a tool that can do everything. There's certain things markets do beautifully. And there's certain things that they can't do at all, not even in principle. And so what I want to see in a future conversation between those who might once have been called liberals, and those who might want to been called conservatives, is a recognition that really the magic would involve wielding markets to greatest effect by keeping them out of the stuff where they do harm, by applying them to problems that they are best positioned to solve. And by adding basically a very light system of incentives in order to steer markets to solve the problems we want solved, rather than the ones that they will end up solving if left to their own devices. And so, you know, what, what do you do with somebody who says, you know, capitalism is the problem is, did I just defend capitalism? Or did I attack it? I'm not even sure.

**Dan Crenshaw** 38:30

From a conservative point of view, defended it, put the Soviet but so like, the health care debates, a good, good, you know, policy example of, it can't be a total free market, it's a luxury good. And with a, you know, defined, there's little just like anything, there's scarcity there's there's a lot of demand, you know, it's it's complicated, it's hard to, it's hard to say that that could be a total free market, conservatives would say it's never been a free market. It's the most highly regulated industry in America. And it's, it's got all these strange traditions built into it, that that have a history to them, and a reason for them that are very difficult to break free from at this point. And we sort of piled a lot of weird policies on top of it. And but it doesn't mean you you displace all market incentives, you know, so you should use the market incentives, right. And we have good examples of how that might work. I mean, Medicare Advantage, uses, it's obviously a government program, but it uses the forces of the market to make insurance companies compete against one another, and therefore lower prices and premiums for seniors. And it came in way under budget. So this is kind of the republican i was a republican plan and I'm just trying to, like, pat ourselves on the back here, but like, we're still allowing government to do it, because we understand that it's, you know, it's it's not going to work as a free market. We know that. And so how do we expand on that like, so like, that's sort of the direction we want to go with with healthcare and I, you know, if it were up to me, we would start solving it with primary care. I think that's like, I know, this isn't like a whole long discussion on health care policy. But direct primary care is a phenomenal gateway to I think solving so many issues with health care, is that, you know, the best way, the thing that people need the most is as a, as a doctor, they trust that they choose that they have a relationship with just a primary care doctor, this is very important, I think in health care, we have a system already in place that's just sort of grown slowly. Big here in Houston, I don't know how big it is around the country. But a direct primary care system means you know, you're a doctor and you have a subscription service. Basically, if 75 bucks a month is about is considered the average, that's a cell phone bill is a cheap cell phone bill. And now you have total access to a doctor, as a primary care doctor, it's not insurance, it's not catastrophic care. But it's total access to a primary care doctor and then evolves quite a bit of services that you're never paying for, because you just have a monthly bill. And people really like that it also, it also has the effect of reducing premiums, because because companies will, I'm really passionate about this, that's what I'm kind of going along with details on this one. But so companies will actually, you know, contract with a primary care doctor in this in this particular model, and then everybody's premiums go down as well. So you have to have both, but you're reducing costs massively. And you're giving people what they want, again, which is a relationship. And it's also an easy relationship like okay, I'm still sick, I've got this or I've got this like, weird mole on my nose, something. If I go see my doctor, is there a copay? Do I have to call my insurance company? Like, how do we set this up? I mean, it's it's people get very annoyed with this for good reasons. And this takes all of that out of it. And it's it's I think it's it's it's a great step forward. So but how do you do it? But Can everybody afford 75 bucks a month? Well, no, not necessarily. So so this is a simple question is that just subsidize it and give them an HSA account? a health savings account is something everybody shouldn't America should have. And you can in for the people who can't afford it, can you subsidize that that cost. And so again, government has a role here, but it's a light touch, and, and you're allowing market forces to compete. Because,

**Bret** 42:23

well, a couple of things about the healthcare system, one, it's a very difficult problem to solve, in part because of the political feedback loop in which very well resourced industries have a lot of influence over policy, which amounts to a veto over whatever policy might best serve the public. And so one of the problems if you try to apply insurance, in a market context, without proper regulation, what you get is the inevitable discovery that the profitable way to make money in the context of insurance is to ensure that people who need at least, and abandon the people who need it most and externalize the cost of their having been abandoned, which we see again and again. So this is why we don't have universal health care is because it doesn't serve the interests of those who are making a profit in health care at the insurance level, even though it would certainly serve the nation. And it's another place where, you know, I'm not a socialist, but there are places where we need to socialize something. And it is, you know, a risk pool that distributes bad luck. So that the cost of it are evenly borne is desirable. Now, not everything medical is bad luck. If you're smoking, that's not bad luck, that may be the result of bad decision making. But in general, if you're struck by a skin cancer, because you happen to get hit by a bit of UV radiation, and it caused a mutation, then we, you know, we all should pay some cost in order to deal with the consequences of that mutation, rather than those people who have the bad luck can be medically wiped out by it. And those people who have the good luck, effectively profit by having rolled the dice and then, you know, coming up positive. But in any case, there is a readily available set of solutions, they will be far from perfect. But they could be vastly better than what we have. And I can't speak with any authority to the situation you describe in the plan you just mentioned. But nonetheless, it's a perfect case for a hybrid approach that leverages our ability to socialize costs that have no informational value, right? The same way we do with you know, Paramedic Services or fire suppression. We should incentivize people to behave in healthy ways to minimize the overall cost of the system, all of these things are readily comprehensible and could be built into a comprehensive system. Were it not for the fact that our collective interest is probably for the foreseeable future, in competition with a private interest that has more power in government, then then citizens do?

**Dan Crenshaw** 45:22

Yeah, it's a lot to respond to that. That's part of it, that the healthcare industry and their lobbying industry, they all compete with one another. It's not like they're all united against, you know, the interest of the people there, they're united against each other, they're, they're in combat against each other, which isn't all that unhealthy, really, because that, you know, the competing interests kind of keep one from becoming too powerful. It's extremely complicated. The the key problem that you know, which is which, which drives a lot of people towards Medicare for all, is, you know, the the pre existing conditions issue, the catastrophic injury issue, you know, the, the brain tumor that costs ungodly amounts of money to, to deal with, and, you know, one solution is okay, so we can do socialized medicine and just pay for it out of federal tax dollars. The Obamacare solution was basically just require insurance companies to to, you know, cover pre existing conditions. The other solution is, I think, dividing healthcare up in about three categories. One is the direct primary care that I that I talked about earlier. The second is sort of your intermediate insurance, you know, a broken leg, a temporary illness, things like that. And then there's the catastrophic stuff, you know, the pre existing conditions, the lifelong issues that you're just going to have to deal with, you know, the catastrophic injury. That's where the risk pool idea comes in. That's where we're going before Obamacare, the state run risk pools, I still think that's the better solution or reinsurance programs, a lot of states that really have driven down premiums while still protecting people with pre existing conditions using reinsurance, which basically means once once it gets to a certain points, the cost gets to a certain point that goes to it, you know, the bill goes to the government. And that's just a much more reasonable way in that in that what that does, is it maintains the market forces because I want all of these health care entities to continue to compete against each other, right? You don't like Big Pharma? Okay, well, then you should really like insurance companies, because they're the ones who negotiate with Big Pharma are the ones who keep those prices down. You could have it be the government, but you'd still have the same it wouldn't change anything, people think it changes something that doesn't, what what socialized medicine would do is basically the way it even the way it even comes into the budget that Bernie Sanders proposes or that Elizabeth Warren proposed sure basically all around the same budgets and everybody kind of agrees upon. The way you even get to that is by maintaining current Medicare and reimbursement rates, which is by definition about 7070 cents on the dollar. So what you're really doing to maintain that budget without you know because you're still gonna double people's taxes but if you really wanted to pay what the hospitals need to stay up to their current level, you need to pay in botany the triple people's taxes and so you're you're talking about price controls fundamentally so that's that's a big consequence when you implement price controls what happens when you do that well you just produce less This is a simple rule of life if you have price controls on something that the person who produces that good will produce less of it doctors have less incentive to to get that next specialty to become the best doctor possible to do that next you know, breakthrough research because they're not getting paid for it anymore. I've taught I can talk to a million places around here and used and like more like independent service industry know people that places that do dialysis on it you know and that's their core thing and that Okay, so if Medicare if you guys only get paid with Medicare reimbursement rates what happens so we just closed down we're done that's it. It's like not even it's not even a complex question for them it's just yeah, we just closed down so there's there's just less there's just less of things and we start to look a lot more like Canada than UK and I think we have this sort of like romantic view of what EU Canada the UK look like. But we should we should talk to more Canadians and Britons about that it's it's very it's different you know, it's it's, there's there's costs to what they're doing. There's trade offs, and we can't pretend there's no trade offs with this conversation. I know this wasn't meant to be like a super in depth healthcare issue thing, but I I'm very passionate about healthcare in general and fixing it so I don't like talking about it, but I know that wasn't the point.

**Bret** 49:42

No, look, I like it for one thing. You You are living up to my expectations of you. which is you know, I've heard you say this is about trade offs. I don't know how much you know about my scientific background, but trade offs are where it's at with respect to cost. complex systems, if you want to understand them and fix them, if you're in a position to manage them, then trade offs are the only game in town. But I've heard you say that there are aspects of this that should be socialized, there are aspects of this, you want to use markets to address, you know, I hear a perfectly reasonable person, recognizing that you have various different levers and that they have, you know, different costs and benefits associated with them. So that's all music to my ears, it does not sound like the normal political conversation I typically hear where people have, effectively religious devotion to some set of policy proposals that they've been told constitute the solution, and therefore, anybody who stands in the way of them as the enemy, you know, I hear a practical person saying, look, this is complex, it's never going to be perfect. Even the systems that we think we would prefer, you should talk to people who actually live under them, which is very interesting when you do I never hear British people rave about their system. But if you ask them, what they prefer our system, I hear them say, No, typically, I'm victim, I'm not sure I've ever heard one say that they would prefer to live under our system.

**Dan Crenshaw** 51:11

So unless unless they have, unless they have a very bad cancer, then they're coming right here to Houston. You know, that's, that's the only that's the only difference. We're the best at treating the most cutting edge diseases, we have the best of everything. The That's it, we pay a hell of a lot more for it. And it's too complex. But we that it's definitively true. And this gets lost in the conversation. Like we have access to I think like Australia, I can I can pull up so many stats on this, but they have like access to like only 60% of the drugs that we do. And that's the cutting edge stuff, right? They obviously they have all the generics, they have all the old stuff. But the new stuff that's here now it's it's expensive, and people get really upset about that. So it's not super obvious what you do about that, because you want it to be produced in the first place. So I can put price controls on that, which is HR three, right? That's been voted out of the house twice now this past year. That's it's this price controls. It's a very simple solution. But it also means you'll never create anymore. Yeah. Which is like it's a bad thing to

**Bret** 52:11

know, that's a problem you could solve with subsidies. And of course, that becomes a problem of its own if you become addicted to the subsidy mechanism, rather than using it judiciously for things where it actually needs to be applied in order to get research funded. But so if we could step back a second,

**Dan Crenshaw** 52:29

away from healthcare,

**Bret** 52:30

well, yeah, healthcare can can recede into the distance here. But I have the sense if you and I were to meet at a barbecue, right, didn't know each other, just happened to be standing in the same corner of the lawn. I have the sense that we could go a long time in discussion that we would disagree about some things, we'd agree about some things, but I'm not sure I would necessarily know where to place you politically. After that discussion. I might just have to ask you.

**Dan Crenshaw** 52:59

That's because republicans are really bad at communicating. And so one of the reasons I ran was because I want to communicate our ideas better. Everything I've said is very Republican. And and not all of it, you know. So there's some super conservatives who are like, Wait a second, did you say you wanted to say you want to subsidize the DPC, the direct primary care to a health savings account, but like, Well, yeah, but yeah, I did you know, no, like I can't say that. But But what we're really doing is actually combining it with Medicaid. So there's, it's it's actually not this. Everything I've said is not controversial on the right at all. There's gonna be some slight disagreements. But the problem with the republicans with respect to health care is this. We haven't really I know, we're not supposed talking about health care anymore. It's just we haven't like come together. But in the broader sense, Republicans are very bad at explaining conservative ideology. We get way too wrapped up in, you know, responding to the left. And this, it always makes us look bad. Like I for some reason, and I do feel unfairly treated is that as a conservative, I think I think somebody is a centrist will, for some reason gives the left a lot more leeway in criticizing the right but as soon as we criticize the left, it feels like it feels like all my centrists are like why are you so divisive? Like, I'm like, I'm not just I'm just responding, like, come on, you know, so that's it. The Conservatives feel that frustration, it makes them very angry. And then they don't communicate well. And I like it, you know, proper communication, and I gave it but proper key to make communication based on a common set of logical rules of thought would go a really long way. I think so that's, that's my criticism of the right so I got to I got involved in politics.

**Bret** 54:48

Well, I mean, I think there's something else going on here. And I frequently hear people on the right decrying the failures of the left as if the left has has never made any sense. And this, I think, is another tragedy because the left has been correct about a lot of stuff that's now become part of mainstream American values. And so now I hear people on the right commonly espousing positions that were once solidly on the left and have now just been adopted as part of our, our core belief system. And so I think I think you're, you're both right.

**Dan Crenshaw** 55:33

But what? Well, I was gonna ask you, what do you what do you mean by that? What are what are some values?

**Bret** 55:39

Let's say, tolerance. Tolerance is something that was fought for by the left, and I now find people on the right, not the far right. But the majority of the right is now entirely on board with this idea that has become comfortable with it. And, you know, that's, that's an achievement, right? And so, you know, I'm not looking to claim credit for my side where it hasn't succeeded. And indeed, it's failed in many places, but, but there is some sort of recognition that we have the left and the right, have been navigating together, and they have achieved a great deal. And then maybe progress has stalled. And there's a question about where it stalled, how good are things? What still remains to be solved? And what would be what would we be foolish to attempt to solve? Because will cause greater problems than we have? And you know, that's a conversation I want to see I don't have the answers. myself, but I do you know, I probably have talked to you before about the hidden tribes report, have you looked at it?

**Dan Crenshaw** 56:53

Ah, no, I'm not I think we've talked about that.

**Bret** 56:55

The hidden tribes report is very interesting. Basically, it describes a set of different ideological tribes that are cryptically within the American population. And the part of it that is so startling The first time you read it, and then in my case, certainly matches my experience talking to people is that almost 70% of the American population is in basic agreement about what America should look like. And it's just not extreme in almost any regard. Right? It has, you know, it's queasy about abortion. It doesn't want to see it outlawed. It doesn't want to see it in the third trimester, except in some extreme circumstance. But there's some sort of, well, what the hidden tribes report calls, it is the exhausted middle. It's this large group of people who are feeling unrepresented, because what happens is that our fringes start bossing around the discussion, and they put a giant divide between factions, and it keeps people who are on the mainstream left in the mainstream, right from recognizing that actually, they, you know, in my experience, I would say, the mainstream left in the mainstream, right, agree about what society should look like. They disagree about how close we are to that state, and they disagree about the ordering of priorities, they have the same values, but they disagree about which ones are the top values. And this is a place that actually I think, the right has been more correct. One of the things that I've come to understand is that there's a trade off between values, but there's one value that doesn't fit that rubric. And it's liberty. And the reason liberty is special, is because liberty, realized liberty, not abstract liberty, but real liberty that you can exercise requires other problems to have been solved, right. So if you're medically compromised, then you're not really free. So to liberate you, we have to solve your, you know, your medical Jeopardy problem. For example, if you want to be really free, we have to figure out a way to get you a proper education, because education provides the tools that will allow you to use that liberty for something worthwhile. So liberty is the integrative value. At the point you've achieved all of the stuff necessary to get Liberty you don't have much left to do. And so now that said, I think the right has been a little bit Deaf to the distinction between abstract liberty, you know, in theory, you're free, but in a practical sense, you're not because you're you can't earn a wage, for example. But that were we to recognize that we could use Liberty as a proxy for the overall success of our system. And that our obligation was to try to get liberty to as many Americans as we can, which is to say, to free them from the things that block the exercise of liberty, then that's a pretty good way of dealing with the trade offs because as you go too far in the direction of one value, and it begins to erode and other it shows up as a deficit of liberty. And so in any case, it's a way it's a way to recognize that, although we sound like we disagree very frequently, we're not disagreeing over something substantial that we, you know, I almost never meet an American that likes the idea that your skin color should be an important indicator of your likelihood of success. Right? Whether you're on the right or the left, you want to see a nation in which skin color just doesn't have an implication for success. Right. That's what all the decent people want. And so anyway, that's great that we've achieved that it wasn't always that way. So I hope that those on the left and those on the Right who are not part of these fringes that have a, a toxic view of how we should behave towards each other, can actually recognize how much we would have to gain if we could have the conversation about where where we disagree, for example, about how to prioritize our liberties, or our values.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:01:06

The distinction on how we view liberties, an important one I've actually wrote, I agree with it, and I wrote about it in the op ed, I did on, on the reason, the reason that we're so divided politically on whether lockdowns are good or bad, and the notion that different that there's a different description of liberty on the right and the left and that and that's, and that is, that's one of the reasons we differ politically. So I agree with that. And I certainly fall into the category of, of believing that more liberty is good. And if we're going to take away some kind of liberty, for the sake of a service, we better have a very, very good reason for doing so. And, and we can, it's not to say we can't have both, but we need to be very careful about what that looks like, of course, you know, in providing government provided institutions like education makes a lot of sense, if you want people to pursue their happiness, which is the ultimate goal of government to protect the right to pursue your happiness, and your life and your liberty. And these are an animal rights that it's government's job to protect. And, and that and that involves setting up a set of structures so that you're able to pursue those things. And if those structures are failing, then that's something we should know. So yeah, I think we we could we could agree on that we probably still fall a little bit different on the on the spectrum of how far to go. But, you know, the other thing you were saying about the the the exhausted middle? That's an interesting part, you know, this gets into some political science insights, I think and, you know, how the heck do you establish a sort of moderate platform like, what does that look like? And you know, I don't know, I'm not there yet. I can't figure it out, necessarily. Because what I've noticed is that the, it's very difficult for politicians on the right or the left to even like, figure out what the middle is because people have different opinions in the middle. And it can mean a few things. Sometimes you just have different opinions sometimes agree with the less sometimes you agree with the right, no, maybe you're really politically attuned, but but you just have different and so you consider yourself an independent. But sometimes it just means I just take my kids to school, I'm trying to just work. And I'm just independent, because everybody seems crazy, right? And so they're just if they're not just, they're just not involved in politics. So you really don't even you're not really sure how to reach that vote, or they might have just seen you on TV once and they kind of like you. They like the way you talk and Okay, that's it. So it's, um, it's very difficult to capture that movement is my point. And it's very difficult to establish a platform around it. And I think that's the that's the that's the challenge that we'll continue to see. But it is frustrating because I used abortion as an example. Yeah, I mean, public opinion would show exactly what you just said, but 12 weeks, if we went by pier 12, like a public opinion on abortion, the limit would be 12 weeks. I'll tell you what, if that was that was proposed right now, all conservatives would vote for it, we think it's an amazing victory. And it would calm the conversation down quite a bit. Quite a bit. We are extreme in this country on abortion, compared to France and all European countries, basically, they all have 12 weeks as the limit. Now it's, it's an interesting example that goes to show like how strange this system is, is because people play in teams, you know, people have a need to play in teams. And it's also I've noticed that voters it's about trust. And so they, you know, maybe a lot of you know, independent liberals and independent conservatives. I might disagree with me or Tulsi on on something. But they just there's it's more of a predisposition. You know, conservatism is a disposition liberalism's kind of a disposition Then, you know, you're just predisposed to trust whoever espouses you know, the most amount of your ideas. And it's really difficult to find that that middle because it's the knife edge falls away rather quickly. That's the challenge. I don't have the solution necessarily. It's just, it's interesting to

**Bret** 1:05:18

talk. Well, I got two last points for you, I know you have to go. And I want to be respectful of your time. But one thing that we discovered, I was surprised to add it was that the Unity 2020. platform, that's not even the right word for it. But the structure that brought people to us did something unexpected, which is not only did it bring people equally from the right and the left, but it brought in something like 25% of our volunteers or people who were not going to vote. So this disengaged group who I think you know, the disengaged group involves two subgroups, one of them is apathetic, and the other one is so frustrated that they've walked away. And the difficulty that you talk about, of finding something that actually appeals to that exhausted middle is something I think we've tapped into. And so maybe that's a model of something. But the other thing I wanted to say is I, I have now run into this as somebody who doesn't think of myself as a centrist. I began when I introduced the plan, I described it as taking somebody from the center left and the center, right. And I realized quickly thereafter, what a mistake it was to use the term center, because center means two different things, and one of them is not very useful. The center has a kind of a tepid feel to it, right? That it's not very ambitious or interesting. It's just it's almost kind of resignation. The other thing that the center is the reason I invoked it is that I know that even those of us who aren't anywhere near the center politically have to meet there in order to discuss what's actually in the interest of the nation at the center is the natural meeting place, even for those who don't see themselves as as centrist. And so what I really want is a view of center in which we don't assume a mild version of policy, but we take kind of an ala carte version where there are things that the right has correct, and where the right is correct, we ought to go with it. And there are other places where the left has it correct. And we ought to go with those things. But we ought to do it in discussion with each other, so that we don't keep suffering from the pendulum swinging or the excesses of one side versus the other. But what we really find is, what is possible, and how we can get there at the lowest possible price. And, you know, isn't that inherently the patriotic conversation?

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:07:52

Yeah, I mean, you know, an easy way to solve that, you know, is maybe a, an agreement in Congress to have more discrete voting. What I mean by that is, the Coronavirus packages are a perfect example of this. where, you know, we don't have to wait multiple weeks to spend trillions of dollars that's kind of absurd thing it's like oh, no, because we got to negotiate they want this so we want this it's like, by the way the thing we want you also want it's bipartisan legislation like oh, we give you an example. The restart act is basically more targeted PPP funding. We would spend money on that tomorrow, and it's all democrats would vote for it. Republicans would vote for it. I need Nancy Pelosi to bring that to the floor. I've called for dinner on Twitter today. I gave everybody a number so they can call and ask her at a just I'm sure she does not like but but I was like why don't we just vote Okay, you want to vote for post office stuff on Saturday? We can vote on this too It's bipartisan American needs it like just just vote on that oh cuz it doesn't give you leverage for the for the other stuff you want. And that's what that's gross that's not patriotic. It's like we agree on it. And this evening, you can argue with this about All bills and I'm sure Republicans have done the same thing. I just wasn't in Congress, you know, so and they did but honestly, I don't think it was to the same extent like if you get there all of these major bills that get pushed through they're very easy for me to argue against. And you don't have to make the med easy for me to argue against you know, it's just what I do I create these here's the truth videos, I say like why I'm not voting for this, why it's bad idea why it's bad policy. Don't vote for this, even though it has a nice sounding name right like that. They always have a nice sounding name. But they do the democrats could make it very hard for me to vote against that they could they could strip out some like, like 10% of what's in that they could strip out the poison pills. And we could just vote on stuff. We agree On the Senate would vote on it, it would go to the President's desk, he would sign it. You could do that. It's not it's very easy. It's just a decision that has to happen. You know, and it's like, it was that simple thing, you don't need to change the superstructure of, of who's going to run for president, right? It's just like a just vote for discrete solutions for discrete problems. You know, and some people call for this often, right, like the one issue voting. I don't know if that's the right answer, either, because like, that would take just a lot of time. And sometimes it's okay to just have a bipartisan negotiation. And sometimes it works. Sometimes. It's happened a few times throughout this session, like on big stuff, it happens every day on little stuff that nobody knows about. But on the big stuff, like informing retirement savings, for instance, like that was a big one, the first step act like that's a that's a decent one. I mean, you could argue the cares act is, you know, it happened that way. But the police reform bill that easily, that was not very far apart, and easily could have just because we're always like, hey, fine, you want to do all that? Fine, but please just do a little bit less. But you know, I were agreeing that on the action, but like, just just don't spend three times as much money, please. Like, it's not necessary. You know. And if we agree on everything at that 80% level, it's hard to argue against why would wouldn't just pass that, especially with something like the restart act, again, small business funding right now is extremely important. So, you know, you don't even need two candidates in the presidency to, you know, different sides for this. It's just that's a simple solution.

**Bret** 1:11:44

Well, I hate to say it, and I hate to say it to you of all people. But this really is the point is that the system, the mystery, you point to about why we just don't simply do the stuff that's obviously at the public's interest. And that would be popular is because the system is built to serve a different interest that its real constituents aren't the public. And so the public is I mean, this has now been established through research that the public's desire for policy has almost no influence over what legislation we pass that, you know, the public is playing a role in that game, because it's votes, apportion power between the parties. But the public's well being is not the purpose of policy at this point. And you know, that's deeply unpatriotic. It's a solvable problem, but it can't be solved if we subscribe to the rules we've been told we have to stick to, which is exactly why unity 2020 exists, and why something like it must exist.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:12:47

Yeah, one of the reasons that's, that's true, also, is now having been in politics for a pretty short amount of time, and kind of seeing what incentives do we respond to as a politician. It's really simple. It's your votes, like you need you need your constituents to vote you back. And so you have to do something, you have to do things that they like, at least 51% of the time. That's always fundamentally true. I know a lot of people put a lot more weight on like the lobbyist interests and all that in my very limited experience that has that has a lot less weight you know, the the lobbyists in Washington provide a lot of they're like a, they're a provide details that you would never know about for a given industry. And it doesn't mean there's some conniving ill intention there. It's just, you know, we, it's good that we know these things, because these industries tend to employ hundreds of 1000s of people. So that's, it's okay for us to know that. I i've never, I don't see them holding a lot of sway, because they also compete with one another, too. So it's, you know, it's your job as a good politician with good judgments to be like, are you be guessing me? Are you, you know, it's like, that's your job is to figure it out and figure out like, what's actually going to do for my constituents. And so I guess you might fear that some group hates you so much, that they might spend a lot of money in your district, but that's also very rare. That more happens when that does happen from say, a super PAC. It's always it's funded by one person, it's like, you know, it's it's billionaires on one side versus billionaires on another side. And that's, like, I don't really have a problem with that it's competing. I don't know how to stop that without truly infringing on people's rights to free speech. Maybe there should be more transparency behind it. I think we would all agree on that. But but there is in fact that people don't realize how much there actually is when super PACs donors are known. So, you know, I guess what I'm getting at is so Okay, so why won't Pelosi put that stuff on the floor and Because I guess it may be because everybody's first elections a primary election, you know, maybe that's it. Maybe it gives the loudest voices tend to tend to have the most influence. And the, the there's a graph, one of my political science teachers drew for us. And it's very insightful. And it was the, it was the the word. So think of it this way. It's it's hard to visualize, but try it's think of like a smiley face graph. So that kind of bell curve. Alright, and what is what does that represent? And so on the x axis, your, you know, the left and the right, okay. And hanging out, I will say the draw to, like, describe it correctly. But it's, um, it's, you know, it's, it's trying to describe a simple fact, which is that the people in the middle, by nature of being in the middle are not very passionate about a given policy, you know, they're more likely to say, I mean, that kind of makes sense. And that kind of makes sense. I don't know, people on the fringes are far more likely to, to be extremely loud about a policy to be highly passionate. And this is the voices that get heard in politics. And this is what politicians have to respond to. Because these people, these people influence that, whether we like it or not, those people on the fringes influence the people in the middle. Because the people in the middle have, again, they have a disposition, even if you're an independent, everybody has a disposition on a spectrum of left to right. I think that's psychologically true. we're wired a certain way. And so you trust, even though you're not, you're not like, I don't like the way those radical conservatives are talking. But I still trust them more, to kind of kind of know the direction that I kind of want to go. And so I'm with that, and they're really mad and are really passionate. And so they've got to know what they're talking about. So this gets to another cultural problem we have, or I think we've associated passion with sophistication, a little bit too much. Like, oh, wow, they're so angry, they must have a good point. Do they know, you know, like, it's, that's not so sure. You know, it's sometimes people just wrap themselves up, or it's just faking it. But I think it's mostly telling yourself a narrative of anger over and over again, and then you sort of you actually tend to believe it. But that's what happens. And so that's what politicians end up responding to.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:17:30

And that's why, again, we only fear our voters. So that's all we actually fear. And I don't I don't think, I don't know if anybody's any different. You know, I haven't I haven't seen this sort of corrupt behavior that I think people envision a lot. I'm not saying it doesn't exist. I haven't been up there all long, long, long time. But it's, um, it's not quite what people think, oh, I don't I don't think we're complicated.

**Bret** 1:17:56

It doesn't look the way we expect it to look, you know, this. It's a banality of evil phenomenon where it doesn't look very dramatic at all right? The consequences of it are ghastly, in my opinion, but the actual way that it functions looks like business. And, you know, what, why won't Pelosi bring obviously good legislation? The answer is because obviously good legislation is not in her interest. And it's not in the interests of the DNC, and it's not in the interest of the real constituents of the party. And we can only read that indirectly, by the failure, decade after decade to do the obvious, right?

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:18:43

Yeah. So on that particular question, I actually have an answer. So this is how I see this play out on this on this on this specific bill that we're talking about. So it's pretty obvious that Pelosi won't bring that to the floor, because then Trump will sign it and he'll he'll run a victory lap, and that'll make her very mad, and it'll look good, he might get reelected. So that's that's exactly why it doesn't get put to the floor. Now now, but the question is, is like Why? If it's good for everybody, why don't they hold her accountable? That's the question. And so and so and here's the answer. And I see it play out like on Twitter, Okay, I see it play out and on the commentary, which is, Pelosi is defending us and I'll see people say this, she's defending us by by waiting for a better deal. She's looking out for us, and people believe this. So she's responding to her constituents in a sense, because they trust her. Now, I disagree with that logic, clearly. But I but I at least can observe what's what I see to be happening here.

**Bret** 1:19:39

Well, I'm more cynical than you are about this question, maybe because I'm older, but I watched the Democratic Party, sabotage, Bernie Sanders in 2016, because it preferred Trump and the whole time it also decried the possibility of the election of Trump. And then the fact of the election of Trump, as you know, the beginning of the end of civilization. And none of it made any sense. This is really about the fact that Bernie Sanders, for better or worse was a challenge, two standard operating procedure in the Democratic Party, he was not supposed to become a viable candidate in the primary. And the thing that that does not get said, is that Donald Trump was, as they viewed it, less of a threat to the things that were important to the functioning of the party than Bernie Sanders was because although I find Bernie Sanders view of what policies we should enact, to be backward looking, he did, in fact, want to change things in a way that a status quo based DNC just couldn't tolerate.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:21:00

It I always get Bernie that he's genuine. Oh, yeah,

**Bret** 1:21:02

absolutely. He's a real patriot.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:21:05

Yeah. I disagree with him on literally everything. But he's, but he's genuine. He believes what he believes that is, that has always been true about Bernie Sanders, he is flip flopped on some things, which he used to be a true socialist, which means you have to be a nationalist, this is important because like you kind of have to be in the open border policy of the new democratic left is, is not what Bernie Sanders was in favor of in 2015. He said, so he was very clear about this. Again, because if you're going to have a welfare state, then you also have to have borders and a very strong immigration system. So you can't have both. It's impossible. It's a there's no arguing with that. Sweden can do it. They're they're having trouble because they've gotten a lot of immigration. But they also have a super tight knit social fabric. It's just a very different can't even compare ourselves to Sweden or 99%. White people. It's just not the same. But anyway, I agree with you. He's always been consistent that, that. I don't know how to establish the motives of the DNC, it's very interesting. It's it's like we kind of just sit back as conservatives sort of, like laugh at it. When we see what what goes on. And like, you know, I mean, the convention has been interesting, just like, it's there's very different things happening at different times in the convention. You've got people advocating for the downfall of capitalism, one minute, you know, you've got the, you know, you've got ceiling people to they can kneel for the anthem, one minute, but then they play like a super patriotic rendition of the anthem, and other men. It's very contradictory. And also, I feel to me, it's gaslighting. It's like, Look, look, this is what we are. It's it's kind of like, like their dating profile. Ben Shapiro use this. Like, it's like, it's like, this is the this is the Bumble dating profile. But this is like who we really are. So it seems to me a little bit of that. But you know, it's, I'm sure the people I'm sure our convention will be equally susceptible to lots of interesting criticisms as well, or even know what it's gonna look like. But, you know, we'll see. Yeah, I don't know what I was even responding to, or just been rambling on. Well, I was

**Bret** 1:23:29

alleging the deep corruption of the DNC and I must say, it's not like I think the RNC is less corrupt. In fact, I could make an argument that the DNC learned its game from the RNC. But the RNC is less worthy of that discussion at the moment, because Trump actually beat it. Right? Sanders stood a chance of beating the DNC, but he failed to, but Donald Trump actually did so in some sense, you know, at least something new and different has happened in the Republican Party, that has changed the dynamic. I, you know, I'm afraid of Donald Trump's leadership style and the hazard that it creates for the nation and the world. But he did demonstrate that it was possible to, to gain the presidency in spite of opposition from the highest echelons of the party. So that was an important lesson. And, you know, it's one that I think we should learn from anyway, I can tell that you have to go because even though you're still here discussing these things, people are passing through your office. I think they're trying to send you a message.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:24:41

Or let me know what time it is. Yeah. Oh, yeah. We went way past. So. That's all right. It was a fun discussion. And, you know, happy to be in front of your audience. So now Thank you, Brett. So it's always fun. I was gonna like, it's got to get my thinking cap on when I'm when I'm discussing things with you. I was like I was I thought at first it was just gonna be you and Eric and I was like to brainiacs.

**Bret** 1:25:07

Well, I really enjoy the conversations with you to Dan. They are heartening, and they restore my faith that there are there are good people in government attempting to do the public's bidding. And I wish you luck.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:25:23

Yeah, it'd be great to have Tulsi with us next time. she's a she's a good friend. She's fun to hang out with is that she's, she's a good one for sure. We like Tulsi.

**Bret** 1:25:32

Yes, I'm very fond of Tulsi also. And I was really disappointed that we couldn't pull this off with her today. I really hope that when she's done with her obligations that she'll come back on with us. And Eric, that'd be great.

**Dan Crenshaw** 1:25:47

Thanks for having me on, Brett. All right.

**Bret** 1:25:49

Thanks, Dan. And let me just tell my audience that there is a link that they can go to if they wish to discuss this. This interaction that we've had with the democracy AI tool, what is the link for that, Zack? It's democracy dot articles of unity.org. And you can see it at the bottom of your screen. Thanks again, Dan Crenshaw, and thanks, everybody for tuning into our campfire unity 2020 marches on, be well, everyone