

Transcript for Episode 669 - Scott Adams | Win Bigly
Full show notes found here: <https://theartofcharm.com/669/>

JORDAN: One to ten -- on a scale of one to ten -- how much flack have you gotten since Trump got elected? Because before, when you were predicting the Trump thing, it was a dumpster fire, your Twitter feed. And then afterwards, I would imagine there's some sense of, "Okay you were right," but most of that is probably more like, "Eff you, I don't care that you were right."

SCOTT: Well, a tremendous amount of the Twitter traffic, were apparently professional trolls, because the moment he got elected, they just all went away. It seems like they would have stayed around a little bit if they were just normal people to say, "Well, see what you've done?" and that sort of thing. But yeah, I would say it went down 80 percent after election, at least on Twitter. But, in terms of the effect on my life, I would say my number of friends is probably down 75 percent --

JORDAN: That's a lot.

SCOTT: -- since I started writing about it.

JORDAN: So that you're down to one friend now.

SCOTT: Just the one friend.

JORDAN: Damn.

SCOTT: And he's on a watch list right now.

JORDAN: Yeah, right. I've noticed that a lot of people have mentioned that they lost friends because of the political situation. I think that's kind of a shame. I've got plenty of friends on both sides of the camp. They're probably not people I would want to have over at the same time, all of them. Some of them would be totally fine. There's only a few in each camp that I think are completely insufferable when they start talking about politics. And this has

been a particularly divisive election, particularly divisive administration in general.

One thing that your book *Win Bigly* focuses on, is the persuasion aspect of the current administration or of Donald Trump, specifically.

But, during this show, I would love if possible -- it probably isn't, but I'm going to try anyway -- to divorce the persuasion concepts from the man himself, because I don't want people to go, "This is about Trump?" Click. I want people to go, "Okay, maybe I hate Trump or maybe I love him, but in the meantime, I'm going to learn something about persuasion. I learned a lot from the book, devoured it in one plane ride, and went away thinking, "Okay, I'm not really qualified to say whether this is all accurate or not, but it's certainly interesting." You did mention your career and your income took a huge nosedive, maybe.

SCOTT: Took a hit.

JORDAN: Yeah, a severe hit. What now? I guess now you write a book and you try to make up for the little stop laws here.

SCOTT: Yeah, I don't think the book will make up for the annihilation of my speaking career; I lost a big corporate license deal, and I probably will never get another licensing deal for Dilbert going forward, because of writing about the election, yes.

JORDAN: Poor Dilbert. He's an innocent cartoon.

SCOTT: So far, the comic itself is fine, because newspapers are a little bit immune to the Left/Right battle. They try to serve both. So I'm fine in newspapers, but that's the only solid place.

JORDAN: Really? It seems strange to me that someone would go, "Hey, we were going to put your cartoon on a mug but now we just can't do it because it reminds of too much of the president."

SCOTT: Yeah, there's some people who just can't shake that association.

JORDAN: Wow. If you had to do it all over again, what would you do? Would you do it exactly as you had, or would you maybe sell the Dilbert stuff to a trust or something like that, or move some IP around or maybe you would be Adam Scott on Twitter instead of Scott Adams?

SCOTT: You know, I think I'm actually attracted to trouble. That's sort of a lifetime problem with me. I think, "Well what's the most dangerous thing I could do?" and then I think, "Well, that sounds good." Usually I talk myself out of it. In this case I probably would have talked myself into it again. I did enjoy the fight of it, the intellectual fight of it. But, there was something bigger I thought happening during the election. I thought that it would change how people thought about their place in the world. To me it seemed like a far bigger thing than just one person's persuasion.

JORDAN: Sure, because when I think 'dangerous,' I think cartoonist.

SCOTT: Well, you know, cartoonists do get killed.

JORDAN: Oh actually, you know what? That's very true, especially in the last few years.

SCOTT: Yeah the Charlie Hebdo guys.

JORDAN: Yeah, and the -- what was the other one the draw Mohammed contest? Was that a film maker?

SCOTT: Filmmaker, yeah.

JORDAN: Yeah. Adjacent. Artists in general. Now it's not as safe as it was before. You say that you're in no political camp and you're more of an observer. It's hard to say that when you read the book because it is about the president's persuasive power. So, a lot of folks might really not believe that, but to those folks, I kind of

want to say, it doesn't really matter whether or not that's true, in my opinion.

Looking at persuasion as a skill set, it kind of doesn't matter who we're learning from if that person is effective. There's probably no persuasion class anywhere, rhetoric class especially, anywhere on the planet that doesn't say, "All right, we don't condone this, but here's a bunch of Hitler speech and these were undoubtedly effective, for negative results." And I think to omit that kind of case study is to just kind of plug our ears and sing, "La la la," and hope that it goes away.

SCOTT: Yeah, unfortunately there are effective people that we don't like and if you're just looking at the tools and you can hold your nose and say, "What can I learn," then you can learn.

JORDAN: You mentioned that when you're a member of a group, you'll find their views more sympathetic. So of course, I have to ask you, is the book then a reflection of, "Well, you know, secretly I am a Trump supporter so of course all of these things look like persuasion because they worked on me.

SCOTT: Well, I describe myself as left of Bernie, except for a preference for things that might actually work. In other words, philosophically I want free education, free health care, and all those things. I don't know how to get there but I think maybe America could at least have a plan to get there eventually. So, politically I'm not on the Republican side, but in terms of the first word you used was "In their camp," but as soon as you said that I thought to myself, "Well, I am sort of in their camp, because I do represent a point of view which they like." I do appreciate that group because they're the ones who supported for me for two years, whereas the other group attacked me viciously for two years. So, I have a strong preference for the people, which is different than the policies or the politicians.

JORDAN: I think that it is interesting that we find that when someone strongly disagrees with a certain side's perspectives, people then go, "I don't like that you're even saying that this is a

possibility, therefore I'm going to attack you." Because it seemed to me, always a little bit nonsensical to come after somebody who says, "I'm predicting a Trump win, for better or for worse," or somebody who's maybe in Silicon Valley would say things like, "Don't keep talking about Trump, you're going to get him elected." Nobody went to that guy and said, "You shut up, we'll talk about whatever we want." They all went, "Oh okay, that's a good idea."

And, I had the same problem on this show. When I interviewed Roger Stone, people went, "I'm unsubscribing because he shouldn't be allowed to talk," and I thought, "Who made these decisions about who I'm allowed to talk to or about?" and I think that's a weird problem that you have faced more than anybody.

SCOTT:

Let me bail you out. Let's talk about Colin Kaepernick's persuasion, because I'm a big Kaepernick fan. So, when I say fan, it has nothing to do with football, it doesn't even have anything to do with the specific policies he's pushing, although that topic is important, of course. But persuasion-wise, Colin Kaepernick nailed it. He raised consciousness. The entire country is talking about the thing that he started. He stayed within the law. He didn't break any laws. He offended our sensibilities in exactly the right way for the protest.

My image of the America that I want to live in, is that I don't want a flag that I'm not allowed to burn. That's not a flag that has the same value to me. I'm offended when somebody burns it, because it's just an emotional reaction. But I don't want to live in a country that has a flag I can't burn. Colin Kaepernick, I think, persuasion-wise, is like the Nobel Prize of persuasion. The entire country is talking his thing, he broke no law, he hurt no people, and he had skin in the game. That's as good as it gets.

JORDAN:

Yeah, that's true, right? He's not in jail, he doesn't have any -- well, I don't know if he got a fine from the owners, it's hard to say. But if he did, it's going to be a drop in the bucket compared to whatever next contract he's going to end up with or the one he already has.

SCOTT: Well, he doesn't have a contract now.

JORDAN: Oh does he? Oh well, I guess I don't know. That shows you one, how much I follow sports versus other items on the agenda. What do you think is going to happen in this situation?

SCOTT: I think he suffered quite a bit. The huge portion of the country will never forgive him.

JORDAN: Oh, that's true.

SCOTT: And that just will never go away. I don't think there's anything he can do to fix that. Well, he's good. I've just gave him big props for persuasion, so maybe he has more game than we know, but at this moment, I'd say he put his skin in the game for something he cared about and it's going to cost him.

JORDAN: Yeah.

SCOTT: Forever probably.

JORDAN: Do you think that it's politically -- and I mean that in the broadest sense of the word -- beneficial to then alienate certain people like he has done, while then, of course, using that same platform to draw many, many people that much closer to him? For example, I didn't care about this at all. He was a name on a jersey and nothing more. Now he's been elevated a few tiers up as somebody who's an influencer in a way that actually matters. There are plenty of people say, "I'm not watching football anymore," and, "Screw this guy." It's almost a worthwhile tradeoff, in my opinion, but I'm wondering what you think about that?

SCOTT: Well, it's certainly worthwhile in the sense that you raise the issue that you wanted to raise and he took the bullet. He knew that this was going to cost him and he did it anyway. So that, I have to respect.

JORDAN: Is that where you kind of fell in the Trump prediction scale, as well? It sounds easy to say, "And that's why I wrote about Trump on my blog," and it's like, people are going to go, "This guy wrote about Trump on a blog, the other guy took a knee in front of the whole country."

SCOTT: Well, no. I certainly wouldn't compare myself to any of those individuals. I took some risk with what I was doing, but I did think and I still think that if you look at the way people talk about the election, the word persuasion is now common. You didn't see that in other elections. You see people referring to a phrase that I'm credited online for being the first to say, which is this 3D/4D chess analogy. So, it's become common to think that the way the president operates is through a persuasion filter, and he's got some technique there, and it's not just all random. And, that's what I wanted people to know. I wanted to sort of -- it wasn't about Trump so much as opening a hole in the universe to look through to a deeper truth.

The main thing I always talk about is the two movies on one screen. The number of times we're looking at exactly the same information, there's no data difference. We're smart, we're looking at it, and we just come to different conclusions. I was just reading Scientific American on the plane the other day, and they had a fascinating study where they were trying to figure out what's up with these science deniers? So, number one, I don't believe there's any such thing as a science denier. I've never met anybody who thought science was a bad idea.

There are people who looked at the same stuff and came to different conclusions, and if you don't like the conclusion that they came to, it doesn't agree with the majority, you've got a problem. Here's a study in Scientific America that tells you the two movies on one screen vividly. They wanted to find out if denying science had something to do with simply not understanding science.

The first thing you would test is, "Well, is it just the dumb people?" and sure enough they would find that there were

plenty of dumb people who'd disagree with the scientists, but they also found that across the entire knowledge scale to the most knowledgeable about science, no facts change their minds. In other words, the data was never a part of the decision to begin with. The fact that some people are saying no and some people are saying yes, is almost certainly because they align with the political side, at least in most cases. There have some independent minds there somewhere. But, in general, people just vote their side, and then they figure out why they did it after the fact.

JORDAN: I could not agree more. When we had Shaquille O'Neal on the show, he mentioned that he was just joking when he said that the earth was flat, and I got a lot of email -- mostly tweets, because you know how they go on Twitter -- saying, "No, no, no. The earth really is flat. This is the Freemasons that are forcing him to say that he was joking because this, that and the other thing," and every single person that I engaged with.

Because I was genuinely curious, "There are really flat-earthers out there? I want to know what these people are about," -- universally they were religious and they were part of a certain church that said the earth was flat and there's the firmament and that's what the -- the angels live above that. All of the other -- and I throw this in air quotes -- science, then somehow has to be squeezed into that sort of perspective, and that sort of perspective says, "No. Above the sky is the firmament, and above the firmament is heaven. Everything else has to fall into that."

SCOTT: Well, I think I found my new religion, because I like to keep it simple.

JORDAN: Yeah, there you go.

SCOTT: Earth is flat, the angels are up there, done.

JORDAN: Yeah. Angels up there, bad stuff down there, just don't dig too far and we're good to go. Yeah. Let's talk about the types of

persuader. You go through that early in the book [Win Bigly](#). What are the different types of persuaders? What are we dealing with on a daily basis?

SCOTT: So, I try to help people figure out the different powers that different persuaders have. And so, it seemed to me that I'm what I call a commercial persuader, and by that I mean I use persuasion for my job, it's part of how I write, it's part of how I make cartoons, it's part of how I write books, and so I'm a commercial grade persuader. Above me would be cognitive scientists, people who actually study this for a living. As I say in [Win Bigly](#), if a cognitive scientist says, "Hey, this chapter is wrong," believe the scientist, not me. I'm commercial grade, they're science grade.

And then above that, I put what I call the master persuaders. These are people who have all the tools of persuasion, but they bring something else. They either a high risk appetite, or there's something about their personality that's just gigantic, in this case Trump has both. So, there are people like Steve Jobs, for example, where there's something about his willpower, his, again, appetite for risk and other things that just normal people don't have, but they're above and beyond the tools of persuasion, but you put them together and they're insanely powerful.

JORDAN: So, the things that we see master persuaders do are maybe not yet explained by science, then? Is that what you're saying, or they're things that scientists have not studied, since they're a rung above on the ladder?

SCOTT: So, no I don't think it's so much the case that science hasn't discovered what master persuaders can do. An example would be a master persuader says something they know is not true, and they're going to take a lot of flack for it. But in the meantime, they're going to get attention for something that they want attention for. Ordinary people can't do that, because they say, "I'm not going to go in public and say something that I know isn't true," but a master persuader, sometimes they say,

"Well, you know, it is for a greater good. Perhaps, we hope. So, I'll shade this. I'll use a little hyperbole. It doesn't really matter in the long run. What matters is where we're heading, and I think that's a good place to go." There's something about the personality that's able to do what other people say, "I just can't do that."

JORDAN: Right, so it's almost, like you said, a high appetite for risk and/or something that makes them almost immune to the social consequences or ignorant in a way that makes them just not care at all.

SCOTT: Yeah, immune to shame.

JORDAN: Yes.

SCOTT: It's a big deal.

JORDAN: Yeah.

SCOTT: So if you look at my arc, transitioning from cartoonist to guy who's writing about persuasion and stuff, that was a risky transition, and we see the risk in all the friction it caused, the cost to my main business, the attacks that I got online and everything. But, I'm at a point in my life where I like the risk and I'm almost immune to shame. It is a learned skill to be immune to other people's opinions and just sort of brush it off and move on.

JORDAN: Well, let's talk about that. How do we learn that skill? Because there are plenty of people that have nothing to be ashamed of but to have unpopular views that would love to know how they make that happen.

SCOTT: Number one way is to be embarrassed a whole bunch of times and then look back a month later and say, "Oh, my day today is exactly like it would have been if that had never happened."

JORDAN: Right, the real life consequences were I was embarrassed temporarily and nothing more.

SCOTT: Yeah, I took the Dale Carnegie course, I may have mentioned that last time we talked. A small part of the course is they actually have you embarrass yourself intentionally in front of the class. But, I found that really, really helpful. It even helps with things like public speaking because you're thinking, "Oh, what's everybody thinking of me?" The Dale Carnegie course just lets you just let go and just act natural. And that's the safest thing you can do. So, it's the worrying that causes the problem. You think, "Well I've got to worry about this because this is a potential problem," but the only problem was the worrying. Once you get rid of that, it solves itself.

JORDAN: So essentially we can go back and maybe journal some times where we felt really embarrassed and then examined the lasting consequences thereof.

SCOTT: Well yeah, it's an ongoing process and one of the things I've got going for me is that I'm old, right? So, I'm 60.

JORDAN: I didn't notice.

SCOTT: So, the number of times that you've been embarrassed, presumably is far fewer than the number of times I have.

JORDAN: Especially recently you've been racking them up, I see online, I think. Whether you've done so intentionally or not, and I think a lot of people have it out for you and this is probably not going to help. What do you think?

SCOTT: Oh yeah, I think my popularity will plunge to a new low. But, with books, people buy books to hear their own opinion expressed better, at least political books. Now, this particular book -- my book -- has information in it about persuasions. But still, people are going to say, "Well, you're talking about this topic and I'm on the other side, so I'm not even going to listen to the persuasion." So what I expect is it will be a polarizing book

but it may not be bad for sales because you're better off exciting a small group of people who actually act than to be pretty good to a bunch of people. That's the Hollywood model. The Hollywood model is if you're testing a pilot for a show and everybody who's in the test audience says, "Yeah, that's good. I'd watch that show, it's pretty good," that means nothing.

You want 10 percent of those people to walk out and say, "Good lord, this is the best show I've ever seen. Tell me when this is on. Can I get a copy of the tape?" So, you need excitement from a small number that predicts success than a lot of people saying, "Yeah, that's pretty good."

JORDAN:

And I can back you up on this. This will certainly polarize a lot of people. I think people who support the current administration are going to go, "Yeah this is amazing. I never noticed all this stuff. It's so enlightening. Now I've got to go rewatch all this video. I'm going to be looking at him differently." I will say that even now, having read this and not necessarily by any stretch falling into one of the mainstream political camps, that it's become at least -- I'll give you this -- it's become a lot more interesting to watch the president speak because now I can look for the persuasion things instead of just saying, "Oh what fresh hell is this now with the climate thing," or whatever.

And I wish that we had a book about this for pretty much anybody that we had to watch that we didn't necessarily like for the next three or several years. And I will say also that, the examples in the book, they're going to ruffle some feathers, and I can see your review -- I think some of your best media that's going to sell a lot of this book are going to be people that just skewer the crap out of it, whether they do a good job at that or not. I think you're going to have a lot of rebuttal pieces from some of those reviews online, and you should just warm up that keyboard and have a replacement ready, because you're going to be doing a lot of typing, I think.

SCOTT: It's going to be really challenging for the reviewers, I think. I think they're going to have a tough time for it, for the same reason the public will. They're going to try to separate the politics and the review of things from the actual book. I'm going on The Morning Joe Show, when I do my tour.

JORDAN: They're starting it at the expert level.

SCOTT: I'm going into the lion's den. I can't wait. That'll be fun.

JORDAN: Yeah, that should be interesting. I often wonder though, how many journalists that interview read the stuff that you put out before they do the interview, or if they just get five bullet points from an intern and then try to wing it.

SCOTT: Well, in the case of a book, it's actually rare for somebody to read the book. So, you're actually in a rare territory, having consumed it before I got here. I would say no more than 1 in 8 or 10 maybe.

JORDAN: It seems like that would be a huge advantage if you want to debate somebody about a book that they've written, that you might want to go ahead and read it first, or at least part of it.

SCOTT: Well, it certainly gives me some freedom.

JORDAN: Yeah.

SCOTT: It's like, as I said in the book -- well, you would know that.

JORDAN: Yeah, exactly. All right, people don't use facts to make decisions, that was one of the major points in the book. Tell us why that's true because a lot of people go, "Nope all my decisions are fact-based and I am empirical and that's what's good about my decisions is they're all based on facts."

SCOTT: Yeah, everybody thinks that. I think there's a recent study, I wish I could quote it but something like 98 percent of people just won't change, no matter what facts you give them, on

politics. People will change on things they don't care about. So, if you were to imagine this on a graph, the more they cared about it, the less likely they're going to change, which seems backwards, right? The more emotion, the more likely their mental processes are short circuited.

JORDAN:

Right, because of all the fallacies, confirmation bias, on cost fallacy. There's a lot of emotional investment in anything that you feel strongly about by definitio, you're investing more and more emotion in that, which would make you more and more wrong in the past, if you change your mind going forward. Which is why we see as remarkable, people who do things like leave the Amish and join the rest of the world. We find that amazing. Or somebody that shakes off severe issues growing up in the middle of rural Africa or something like that, and becomes some sort of tech entrepreneur. Those stories are amazing because of the amount of investment that somebody has in a certain way of life or a certain set of thoughts, religion, or otherwise.

SCOTT:

Let me give you a little example that's a current one. So, after the Vegas shooting, there was lots of talk about this security guard, Jesus Campos and, "Where was he?" And a lot of people came up with conspiracy theories. And they were so sure their conspiracy theory was right that this security guard must have been somehow connected with the shooter, that when they produced the actual picture of him, and then people compared it to I guess an older picture which they knew was actually him, and they said -- they put them side by side on Twitter and they said, "Clearly not the same guy. They've replaced him with a body double."

And I looked at the pictures. I don't buy into the conspiracy theories, and therefore I have no emotional investment. I simply didn't think that was the thing. I look at those pictures and I think, "That's exactly the same guy. It could not be more obvious. I'm looking at them. Two pictures next to each other. Clearly the same guy." But other people -- honest, smart, completely normal people who can hold jobs -- looked at those

pictures and said, "Oh my God, the one on the left is a whole different person."

And when you see it that starkly, you're actually standing in the room with somebody who's looking at the same simple thing and they're seeing it differently, it's amazing. It just tells you how powerful this is. And that was only with just a little bit of mental investment in their prior opinion, and they still couldn't shake it. With a photograph! It could not have been clearer in my opinion.

JORDAN:

Do you think we're evolved to see that way? We actually had a brain scientist on the show earlier, and I can't remember which brain scientist it was, but she was saying that one of the things they're studying right now are a lot of these police shootings. And they're thinking that the police are actually seeing dangerous weapons because their brain is painting a completely different picture, and she thinks that with more advanced brain imaging in the next 10-20 years, we're going to be able to see that people who make grave mistakes like that, based on negative stereotypes maybe of the race or ethnicity of the person that they're involved with, they're actually seeing something completely different than we're seeing on a video, which is why it looks so bad on the video.

Because we look and we say, "How did you think that guy was armed and running towards you when he was unarmed and running away from you?" If we one day get to the day where we can replay what they saw on their brain -- somehow -- we'll see exactly what they said, which is, "He was running towards me and he had a gun in his hand."

SCOTT:

You've probably seen the famous video of the people passing the ball around and then the monkey joins the circle.

JORDAN:

Yeah, this guy in a gorilla suit or something, walks by slowly?

SCOTT:

He actually joins the circle for a moment.

JORDAN: Oh, really?

SCOTT: And because you've been asked to count the number of passes that they pass back and forth, people don't see a man in a gorilla suit joining a small group of, I don't know, five people in a circle. After they tell you and then you watch it, you think, "I was blind to a giant monkey on screen and I didn't even see it."

JORDAN: I thought it was fake video where it played twice and one had the bear or the monkey or the gorilla, whatever it was, and one didn't. So, I actually rewound it and rewatched it and then I reloaded it from an incognito tab in Chrome, thinking, "Oh it knows that I'm back, because there's no way that I missed this." And we can link to that video in the show notes, for people that haven't run this test on themselves. Well, I guess we ruined it now, right? But, show a friend who's not looking for that, because now of course you'll say, "How did you miss this, you knuckle heads?" If you show it to somebody who's not aware of what the test is testing, you will find that they miss it, almost 100 percent of the time.

SCOTT: I was once a bank teller, here in San Francisco, and I got robbed at gunpoint.

JORDAN: During the middle of the day?

SCOTT: During the middle of the day.

JORDAN: So it was a bank robbery?

SCOTT: Bank robbery, which actually is very common. Most of the local branches get robbed on a regular basis, but you don't even know it if you were in the lobby of the bank. It's usually just a quiet transaction. You know, "Give me your money," they do, the guy leaves. Of course the FBI and police or whoever it is, comes by and they say, "Give us the description." So, I described him. And keep in mind, he was right in front of me. He was at my window -- the bank teller window -- and I had a good look at him, right?

And I said, "Oh yeah he's about my size, he was about 5'8", he had salt and pepper hair and he was sort of bald. He hadn't shaved in a while and he had a long trench coat," and I had a really good image. In fact, I still have it in my head, a perfect image of that guy. I get a call from my boss and he goes, "They're wondering if you really pulled the secret alarm." It tells you where the camera is supposed to be looking, at what point they're supposed to be looking," and they said, "They can't find that guy on the video when they play it back."

So, I actually went to the top secret FBI headquarters, the place that they look at the tapes, and they said, "Is this guy in the tape the guy who robbed you?" and I said, "No, that's not even close." They guy in the tape, he looked like 35, like a young Clint Eastwood with his big bushy brown moustache, full head of hair, and a sports jacket. Could not have been further from the guy that I clearly saw. Then they played it backwards in slow motion and I watched that complete stranger rob me. So, there's no ambiguity when you saw it on tape. He actually was robbing me. But my memory was an entirely different person. And the FBI said, "Don't even worry about it. That's actually kind of normal."

JORDAN: Who did you think that robbed you? Did you pick that guy out of a movie? Was it just somewhere stored in the memory banks from a TV show you saw as a kid?

SCOTT: Who knows because you're under duress and then your brain just doesn't act normally. You convince yourself you saw something you didn't see.

JORDAN: Right, when you're trying to theoretically fight or flight, your brain is not saying, "It's going to be important for you to remember exactly what this person looks like for later." Your brain is thinking, "How do I get out of here without getting shot in the head by this crazy person?"

SCOTT: And then there was the second one. Second time I got robbed, he actually put the gun up to my nose. So, actually took out a

gun and held it right up to my face and said he would shoot me if I didn't give him money, which is really scary, because you're pulling the silent alarm while you're looking down the barrel of the gun.

JORDAN: Right.

SCOTT: And he knows it. It's a really scary situation. I was dumb to have even pulled the alarm. I should have just given him my own wallet and said, "Hey, take what you get." But, I gave him the money and eventually I asked to be part of a lineup -- picking a guy out of a lineup -- and I recognized him immediately, but he was also the only one smiling. And the other people in the room -- because he'd robbed several banks.

JORDAN: Right.

SCOTT: Several witnesses and we all picked the same guy. And I always wondered, after that day, was it because he was the only one smiling? He was going out of his way to look like he wasn't worried. The others were actors, so they were trying to act like a guilty guy and he's the only one who wasn't. So, I always wondered, "Did I really recognize him or did that cue me that he must be the guy?"

JORDAN: So, if you're in a line up, try to just look like everybody else in the line up. Don't try to look like you're relaxed.

SCOTT: I'm hoping to avoid that line up situation.

JORDAN: Yeah, right. So why is this concept important that humans use emotion instead of facts to make decisions? What impact does this have on us? This is a concept that we teach at our boot camps and our live programs quite a bit, but I'm curious as to what you would say about this.

SCOTT: So, I call this the hypnotist point of view. So, I'm a trained hypnotist. One of the things that you sort of have to believe, in order to even do hypnosis and understand it and work with it, is

that people are irrational about 90 percent of the time. Ten percent of the time, on the little stuff they don't care about, they can do fine.

But the common view of the world is exactly the opposite of that. The common view is that we are rational 90 percent of the time and about 10 percent of the time we get emotional and things go crazy. If you use those two filters on life and say, "Okay which one is explaining things better?" the irrational filter just wins every time. That doesn't mean it's true, because we may live in a universe where we're just fooled about everything, who knows? But, certainly as a filter to predict things, it's very true. Just look at the fact that two people can look at the same data with the same IQs, same backgrounds, and just see different things. Actually, literally see different things, like we were just talking. That's completely irrational behavior and it's the norm, it's not the exception.

JORDAN: One of the concepts in [Win Bigly](#) is that things we think about all the time, rise a couple of rungs up on the ladder of importance in our minds. You gave a lot of really interesting examples of this and the way that Trump uses these examples to persuade. Can we explain and give some examples of this? Because that explains a lot of why these facts and assertions and things like that, come out of his mouth, seemingly for no reason, and a lot of us just smack our foreheads and think, "You didn't Google this before you got up on a podium in front of the media?"

SCOTT: So, I'll quote Doctor Carmen Simon expert on memory.

JORDAN: She's been on the show, yeah.

SCOTT: She teaches and writes about the fact that if you don't have a little bit of wrongness, people won't remember it. So, if everything looks the same, your brain just falls asleep and says, "Eh, blah, blah, blah and more of that," because your brain can't remember everything, right? It's very selective.

And so, there's something about President Trump's natural style, which I think he has intentionally elevated for these purposes, that everything seems to violate something that you didn't think should have been violated. He either acts in a way that you say, "No president should act that way," or he states something that you think, "That couldn't possibly be true. He uses a word that shouldn't be used in the context." There's just something about it that's not normal and he does that so consistently, it would be hard to think that that's completely accidental. Although I do imagine that there are plenty of times where there's a small error of he just doesn't care. And so some of it is not caring to make it exactly as people expect, but the net effect of it is, you can't turn away. If he tweets something, you just say, "Oh that's more interesting than whatever else I was doing. Let's talk about that," and then it becomes part of your brain's architecture.

JORDAN: How can we use this concept in our own lives, if we're not the president of the free world here? What do we do in our daily lives to maybe capitalize on the fact that, "Look, I want people to think this is important. How do I get it wrong but not so wrong I lose credibility?"

SCOTT: There must be infinite ways to do something slightly wrong.

JORDAN: Sure.

SCOTT: So, I guess it would depend on the specific situation. If you're using hyperbole, let's say if he used the classic, let's say -- well, for example, in this interview, I'm happy to see that at least 50 or 60 people have shown up in the audience, to watch us. I'm really happy about that.

JORDAN: A million, million and a half, yeah.

SCOTT: If that ever gets fact checked and we find out that it's two --

JORDAN: And they're both my parents, that would be -- it's a little too far fetched.

SCOTT: -- who's going to believe that anyway?

JORDAN: Yeah.

SCOTT: But by the time somebody finds out that that fact was an exaggeration, they still have it in their head and they've lived with, "Well, I guess there were a lot of people at that thing," and even the corrected information just doesn't have as much impact as the original thought. We don't like to change our mind that much.

JORDAN: People think, "Why would he say that? Of course he's going to get caught on that," and what you're saying is, "Yeah, but it doesn't matter if he gets caught on that, because the effect happens in the moment. It doesn't matter that later on down the line, it doesn't look accurate."

SCOTT: Well, he also uses the trick where he makes you think past the sale quite a bit. So, there was a recent tweet where he said something like, "I can't imagine the Democrats. If they voted against us, how would they live with themselves in the future?" And it makes you think about, "Well, could they live with themselves? Would that be hard in the future? What would be like if he didn't vote for this? That seems like an exaggeration. I think those Democrats would be fine, because it's the way voted. I'm sure they liked it." So, you're talking to yourself about this future where they've got a problem and you've already thought past, "Did they make that vote?" So, he's making them think about their bad future, which is strong persuasion.

JORDAN: What types of things can we learn from cognitive dissonance? This is one of the things that you start the book with. It's a concept we discuss a lot on the show. Can we define it and then talk about why it makes us irrational?

SCOTT: The Scott's definition of cognitive dissonance, without all the science in it, is that if there's something that violates your

expectations or your self-image or just the way you think the world is supposed to be, especially if it involves you -- that's the biggest trigger. Is there something about you that you'd have to change. For example, if you found yourself doing something stupid but you believe you're a very smart person, instead of saying, "Well, I guess I was wrong. I must be stupid after all," it's far more likely you'd say, "Well, I had a good reason in this particular case. I didn't get sleep," or whatever it was. Well, in that case, that might actually be the reason. So, terrible example. But, the point is that we spontaneously come up with a reason why everything was fine and our original opinion was just great.

JORDAN: So essentially, we rationalize past opinions or behaviors in order to make them line up with pre-existing beliefs.

SCOTT: Yeah, but rationalizing is almost too weak, because cognitive dissonance can give you a full-blown hallucination in which you're seeing stuff you don't. The example I gave, of the people who saw the two photographs of the security guard, the people who were deeply invested in how brilliant they were, because they had figured out this conspiracy that somehow the government had not told the people and they're way ahead of it. If their self image is, "I could not be wrong about this. I get this sort of stuff right all the time," and then they are clearly wrong, there's a photograph right in front of them, that might cause them to hallucinate that they see the photo differently.

JORDAN: So this -- essentially the rationalization or the hallucination gets us kind of back to zero. If we could have some evidence in our face that says, "You're so wrong about this," we have to kind of reset our expectations. We either have to change our entire identity or the way that we see ourselves, or we have to go, "What? Those photos? That's ridiculous. That's not the same guy," and that's just an easier calculation for our brains to make. Is that what you're saying?

SCOTT: It's the easiest thing your brain can do is to say, "I was right all along," instead of rework your entire history and your

self-image and everything else. Let me tie this to something fun. I know I've talked about the idea that we're a simulated universe and that some creatures built us to believe we're real. The idea here -- and by the way, there are credible people, for your listeners, who believe this.

JORDAN: Yeah, I think Elon Musk is one of them. Am I wrong about that?

SCOTT: I believe I heard that, yeah.

JORDAN: Yeah.

SCOTT: There are scientists and philosophers who think, "This is worth a look." And the idea is that as soon as one species is smart enough to create simulation that also thinks it's real, they'll probably make more than one. And they might make thousands of them. Maybe it's a game that kids can do. They could all make their own civilizations. So, the odds are that it's very unlikely that we're an original species when there will be so many copies.

So, if we're a copy, then we're programmed, meaning that there's somebody who's trying to conserve resources, as all programmers do. It is unlikely that they would build a universe that had everything in it, just in case somebody somebody sought. That would not be any way to program anything. You would only do it as needed. But here is the fun part. You would also want to make sure that every person's experience was as easy to program as possible.

So, if you believed that we had had lunch yesterday, and I believe we didn't, and we get together and we realize we have different beliefs about this, one of us has to change. And it's much easier, instead of having us rewrite our history of all that and all the things it was connected to, for one of us to say, "Oh, now suddenly I'm spontaneously hallucinating that it was somebody who looked like you and yeah, I got that confused." But none of that might be true. In a simulated universe, the

programmer is just trying to reconcile the problems without creating a permanent history that's objective.

JORDAN: So, this is kind of like all eight levels or eight worlds of Mario Brothers do not exist inside the TV at one time, the only thing that exists is the frames that you're looking at on the screen while you're playing. And if somebody else is playing Mario Brothers at the exact same time, they're playing their own game. It doesn't have to reconcile with whatever you're doing at home in your living room with whatever they're doing at home in their living room.

SCOTT: Bringing that to the human example, there are people who believe they're living in a country where a Hitler-like person has taken over and everything is going to go to hell soon, and they're people who think, "Oh, we're on a cusp of a golden age. Stock market is up." Those are completely different movies. The fascinating thing is, that until something violates one of them, until somebody sees something that you just can't explain away, the program doesn't need to reconcile them. We can just both live and procreate and there was never any reason that we needed to reconcile them.

JORDAN: How do we spot cognitive dissonance and then maybe short-circuit it? Is it possible?

SCOTT: I think the best you can do is to figure out who got triggered, at least more likely got triggered. If you'll allow me to use the election example, people who supported Trump were optimistic he would get elected, they knew lots of people who voted for him, so when he got elected, there was nothing necessarily, that I can see, that would have triggered any kind of cognitive dissonance.

But, if you were positive this monster could never be elected, and then he was, you have to rewrite your whole idea of the world you're living in. If members of those two groups disagree, it's more likely that the one who has an obvious trigger for cognitive dissonance is the one it, that doesn't guarantee it,

because I suppose you can also be invisible to your own trigger, right? The whole point of cognitive dissonance is that when you're in it, you can't see it. But maybe -- and this is really speculation on my part -- maybe you can find the trigger and say, "Well, in this case I had a trigger or the other person had a trigger," and that might give you a hint.

JORDAN: Yeah, maybe. I thought for sure, this is going to be trouncing of the Nth degree, and then when that didn't happen, I remember waking up and going, "I clearly live in a bubble where I only see people who have similar opinions to me. I need to fix that because this was so wildly wrong." I really thought it was going to be over before I even felt the whole long evening. I thought, "I'm going to be in bed as soon as I'm done with dinner because it's not even going to be close and we're going to wake up with what we all thought was going to happen."

SCOTT: Now, based on your earlier comment, the fact that you were not strongly aligned with any particular group allowed you to reinterpret your situation fairly rationally. What you just said sounds totally rational to me. It's like, "Oh, I just realized I was in a bubble."

JORDAN: Yeah, I just went, "Holy California, I've got to travel more or something."

SCOTT: But you realize that 40 percent of the country said, "Russia. It had to be Russia." Or, there are way more racists that we ever imagined. Yeah, so everybody came up with their own story about why they were wrong.

JORDAN: Yeah, the racism thing made me quite sad. There were a lot of people who said, "Anybody who voted for this person is racist," and I just thought, "I don't know if we want to run headlong down that track just yet." That seems -- maybe I'm delusional again, but I really don't want to think those types of negative things about the country that we live in. I don't want to bury my head in the sand if those things are true, but I also don't want to assume that people with different political beliefs are, "Stupid,"

or, "Racists," or, "Really want to see the world burn," although some of my friends who voted for either party, were certainly in that camp too. I don't want to always assume the worse about somebody who disagrees with me because I think that is a toxic mindset to have.

SCOTT: And both sides do, in fact, assume the worst. I think Republicans think that the people on the Left are just crazy or selfish and the Left thinks they're a bunch of racists and science deniers. I'm sure that's true of the extremes on both groups, but it certainly misses 85 percent of both groups.

JORDAN: In [Win Bigly](#), you have some tells that you talk about with rationalizations. Things like, looking at cognitive dissonance and saying, "All right, if we have a certain rationalization that is just beyond absurd, that's a tell," and there was also different tells. The variety of tells that people have were also goto indicators. Can you flesh that out for us?

SCOTT: My favorite one is on Twitter, you'll see somebody start the sentence with, "So," and then they'll misinterpret what you said as what I call a "crazy absolute." It's an absurd absolute. So, if you say, for example, "I'm in favor of guns," then somebody will say, "So, you're in favor of giving a toddler a loaded gun and a grip. Great, you idiot," and you think to yourself, "How could anybody have interpreted that as giving that extreme absurd absolute?" But the person -- I used to think that the person who would say such a thing is just a bad debater.

JORDAN: Right, they just have logical fallacies they can't quite --

SCOTT: Yeah and they're just saying whatever they need to say because that's the other side. I now see that as they hit cognitive dissonance because whatever I said must have erased all of their good reasons. They had to reinterpret what I said until it didn't make sense so they could still be right. And when you watch somebody reinterpret what you say as an extreme absolute, it's like every time. So, look for words like, "Are you saying every time this happens? Are you saying that not one

single time you've ever seen this?" As soon as you see that, you know that they've accepted your argument but at least it makes sense to them, but they can't live in that world, so they've got to rewrite their personal history.

JORDAN: That sounds like me arguing with my wife. "I know she's right so I have to think of the most extreme situation in which she would be wrong and that's the one I'm going to bring up in the car on the way here." And what about having lots of different explanations for the same thing? One of the tells that someone is engaged or indulging in cognitive dissonance was that there are -- one person explains it this way and another person explains that way and there's 100 different explanations and they all kind of bleed into the one conclusion.

SCOTT: Right, so right after the election, CNN published some long list of all the different reasons that people got it wrong and Trump actually won, and they're all different. And, if you see that many different reasons for something, it means that nobody knows the reason, which means that maybe they don't want to accept the reason. That's a red flag, when you see lots of different explanations and everybody is looking at the same data. That's right -- the thing, if everybody were looking at different information, then different explanations make sense. But, if they're looking at the same stuff and they have the same brains and they've got 24 different reasons to explain it, probably none of them are right.

JORDAN: But can't there be multiple explanations for the same phenomenon or for the same result?

SCOTT: Well, there are multiple variables. So you could have a situation where lots of things were two percent of the answer, but when you're trying to sell it as the reason, it would be reasonable to say, "Okay, well, there are a whole bunch of things and maybe this was two percent, this was one percent." Had somebody said that, I would have said, "Oh, that's a reasonable person who is not in cognitive dissonance at all." When you look into to it and

there are so many different things and you say, "Well, the reason is sexism."

JORDAN: Right, Hillary ran a bad campaign and sexism and racism. Those could all be right though, right?

SCOTT: Well, they can all be one percent, two percent of the problem, and they're all complicated because it can work both ways in some cases. If anybody says the complicated version like, "Well, there are many variables, we can't suss it out," what I said was, "A persuasion would be a better predictor," and that, "It did in fact predict a number of things along the way as well, as the final result."

But, I still present that with all the humility that I can muster, as what I call a filter. That is to say, it seems to me that we don't really have a good sense of reality. Nobody does. We all have movies in our heads that are our personal reality. So, the experiment was, "If you pick this variable, does it help you predict better than other filters on the world?" So, it doesn't mean it's true, doesn't mean there's even an objective reality, necessarily. But, we can observe, because I predicted -- publicly -- and I said, "I predict this and then you can see if it was true," and they were good predictions.

JORDAN: Right, because there's a lot of folks out there that go, "All right, guy gets lucky predicting a Trump win, now I've got a freaking book in front of me? Come on, man, you're giving yourself too much credit." And it sounds like what you're saying is, "Maybe. We'll never know."

SCOTT: I always make fun of the fact that somebody becomes a millionaire and they start a company and everything goes right and then the first thing they do is write a book. It's like, "Hey, well everything I did must be the right thing to do."

Of course there's just no logic to that. Some people are going to succeed. It was a thousand variables. Every one of them had to line up to make this happen. You should be cautious of

someone who writes a book and said, "I succeeded and therefore you should do it this way." So, I try to write books that say, "Here's a process, you can try it yourself. It doesn't cost you anything. Compare it to what you were doing. Make your own decision."

JORDAN:

An example that I see all the time is when we go to these entrepreneur events. Right now we're at the NASDAQ entrepreneur center and there's a lot of events here and sometimes you'll hear someone say, "You know, I'd like to think the talks here are better," but sometimes you'll hear entrepreneurs say things like, "You know, just follow your passion," but the problem is, when Mark Cuban or somebody says something like that, he can say that and we see it because he's on Shark Tank.

There's a lot of other people who believe the same thing and they live in the basement on their mom's couch, because that's not good advice but it sounds really good and it certainly sounds better than, "Be in the right place at the right time, work really hard, here's how you manage a team of talented employees, here's how you recruit those employees, here's how you outsource manufacturing to China in a cost-effective way -- no, no no. Screw that, follow your dreams. Where's my check?"

SCOTT:

Yeah, then nobody wants to admit that luck is a gigantic factor. So, the way I dealt with luck in my own career is I tried lots and lots of stuff and I waited for something to catch on. But, in advance, you never really know which one is going to work.

JORDAN:

We had somebody on the show in the past. He talked about the role of luck and how when he was doing studies of entrepreneurs and things like that we all minimize the role that luck plays in anything that actually gives us an advantage, because as a culture, we don't look at things that are considered lucky and say, "This is a good thing to have on my side," because we don't believe in magic and things like that. It's a very western concept. Whereas, if we do look at luck and we go, "Wow, I am so lucky that I started this podcast and that I

learned good work ethic from my father and I stuck with it and then I got laid off from my law job -- that was actually lucky -- and then I kept doing this.

And now, I'm in this great place and interviewing all these great writers and things like that," that looks like luck if you really examine all these right things that fell into place, but it's much nicer for me, my ego, to say, "Actually, you know, I just had a really good vision and I stuck to it because I'm very tenacious and I'm a hard worker. And all these other things happened to me but I persevered anyway. No, luck? Of course not. I earned all this."

SCOTT: There's also a weird connection between perceived luck and your attitude. So, there actually were studies -- Dr. Richard Wiseman studied whether people had luck. He found that you can fake luck, meaning that if you say to yourself, "I'm lucky. Something good is going to happen," it turns out it changes your perceptual abilities. It sets your filter differently. So, if you expect luck, even if you're just talking yourself into it, you're more likely to notice something or maybe even do something a little bit differently. So, it's sort of a way of programming yourself to notice luck that was going to happen, no matter what. You just wouldn't have noticed before.

JORDAN: Is that called the reticular activation system?

SCOTT: Yeah, that's one of the names for it, yeah. For example, pick out your name in the crowd when everything else is just crowd noise -- once you set your focus on something, you just start noticing those things which matter to that focus and that's fairly well-documented.

JORDAN: Why do you hate analogies so much? I use analogies all the time on the show to teach and illustrate concept and I'll often get an email -- "Scott Adams says that, 'Analogies, if you use those, you've already lost.'"

SCOTT: Probably nothing is more misunderstood than my view of analogies. Let me see if I can, for the first time ever, clearly explain what I mean. Analogies for explaining a new concept, are excellent. SO, I'm not saying analogies are bad all the time, I'm saying that nobody ever won in an argument with an analogy.

So, nobody ever said, "Well, you've got a moustache, Hitler had a moustache, apparently you're going to invade Poland." So, that's the sort of way people try to win in an argument with an analogy. But, if you're trying to describe a zebra to somebody who had never seen it, you say, "Well, it's like a horse. Imagine you painted some stripes on it and it would get you there faster." So analogies, excellent way to describe a new concept, but you're never going to win in an argument with an analogy.

JORDAN: Because you're arguing about something that you've set up that isn't what you're actually arguing about?

SCOTT: Every analogy gives the opponent infinite ammunition to attack because the analogy is imperfect by its design, that's what an analogy is. It's not the thing, it's something that just has something in common with the thing. So, you know that you're opponent who is not going to be swayed at all is going to say, "Well, look at all the problems with that analogy -- a, b,c -- it's completely different because of this." You can never get to the end of that path. So, analogies are useless.

JORDAN: There's so much in [Win Bigly](#) that has to do with persuasion and things like the power of slogans, the power of color association, the power of contrast -- I'd like to wrap with the concept of strategic ambiguity because as soon as I heard that, I went, "Oh my God, I think I see this all the time and I think I use this all the time and never knew what that was called." Can we talk about why this is so effective? Well, first of all, what is it and why is it so effective?

SCOTT: So strategic ambiguity, the way I use it in this context, is when you present -- let's say a politician says, "I want to do this or

that," stated in a way that everybody gets to hear what they wanted to hear.

JORDAN: I just don't want people to go, "This is all B.S. because we're talking about somebody I don't like," because then the whole thing is lost. But, I think Trump's examples are perfect for this because he's the one using it and it's what this book is about.

SCOTT: There are people who think that he is super tough on immigration because he's a racist. In other words, they are racist themselves and they probably think, "Hey, this is great. We found one of our own," but there are people who are not racist -- just regular Republicans -- who don't see anything like that. They just say, "Um, border control is just normal business for protecting the country." Their frame is completely different but both of them can see, in the way that the president talks, their own message.

Now some are going to call that the secret racist dog whistle, but I would say that the secret whistle is present any time there's ambiguity. Any time there's any lack of clarity, people are putting their own interpretation on it. If it happens to be on a topic of racism, then people hear the magic whistle. If it's some other topic then they just get a different opinion about what the person said. But, since we're kind of locked into our previous opinions of the world, any ambiguity lets you see whatever you want to see.

JORDAN: So basically our mind fills in the blanks and if we're strategic about our ambiguity, we're saying or doing something deliberately so that other people's minds will fill in the blanks.

SCOTT: Take my example of writing about President Trump's persuasion but not backing him on policies. So, that's ambiguous because people don't expect you to say anything positive about the side you're not on, even if you're talking about a narrow part of that, right? It just doesn't fit with people's idea that you need to be on the left or the right. So, it gives people on the Left a reason to like me, because I say I'm

left of Bernie, but only with practical plans. And people say, "Oh, I'm left of Bernie too. So, I can like him. But other people can say, "Oh he wrote about this guy I don't like, so I hate him." Well I've created ambiguity. It wasn't strategic in this case.

JORDAN: Maybe a little too late.

SCOTT: But, it does allow me a little wiggle room. So, if somebody says, "My God, you've aligned with this monster," I can say, "Read everything I've said. My policy preferences are completely different. I have at least that ambiguity working for me."

JORDAN: Scott, is there anything else that you want to communicate to the AoC audience?

SCOTT: Well, all right, we talked about making people think past the sale, that's his strongest technique but it's not like the strongest. Among the strongest would be contrast, the ability to set up, "This thing is horrible and this thing is great." That's something you see the best politicians do. They don't just say, "Hey, we can improve. My idea is good." That doesn't create contrast. You want to say, "Obamacare is the worst thing and the world is falling apart and everybody is going to die. And I've got this plan that's the best thing in the world that's going to give everybody health --" If we can abstract from the politics and the facts, persuasion-wise the greater the contrast the better you can make the persuasion.

JORDAN: How is that different from just hyperbole? Because it sounds like just hyperbole, "This is the best and this is terrible." How is the power of contrast different? Of course it seems like hyperbole fits into a larger circle that is --

SCOTT: Yeah, in this case you're using hyperbole to create the contrast, yeah.

JORDAN: Is there another way that we can do this that might seem maybe a little bit less right on the nose? I think everybody knows we can just exaggerate in two different directions.

SCOTT: Let's say you wanted to attract a mate and you weren't using just online dating, which I suppose everybody would just do now. But, if you put yourself in a situation where there's something that you can do well, compared to the other people, then people are going to say, "Oh, in this narrow field of whatever we're doing here, is this sport or whatever it is, this one person is good." That kind of contrast makes you look like you're genetically advantaged in some way. At least you're good at this one thing. And that just triggers people automatically to say, "Oh, I guess I need to mate with somebody who's got good genes to do this thing."

JORDAN: Totally makes sense, right? That somebody who's really good dancing would maybe do better in a mating scenario where dancing is involved.

SCOTT: But for the contrast, you don't want that person who's a dancer to go where all the good dancers are.

JORDAN: So, you have to go to the dance club where everybody else stands on the wall and you're the one that's on the dance floor.

SCOTT: I have a friend who shall remain nameless. Well, he took up dancing, really high level of dancing, the kind where you go to the club and people form a circle because they go, "Oh, my goodness, this is somebody who's semi-professional or something." You hire dancing coaches and everything. So, when he goes to the club, the contrast between what he's doing and what everyone else is doing is so shocking that he becomes everybody's friend and it's this amazing social experience. And, he did it through entirely the power of contrast.

JORDAN: Scott, thank you so much. The book [*Win Bigly*](#), out October 31st. So, by the time you listen to this, you can go and buy it. And, you will never look at television the same way because you can look at these examples and look, if you're anti Trump or you're super pro-Trump, this will be interesting to you for different reasons, I

would imagine. But, it will cause you to look at behavior differently and I think that's the big win from the book.

SCOTT: I hope it changes how people see the universe itself.

JORDAN: Thank you very much.

SCOTT: All right, thank you.

