

# Rogan Interview: Why Late-Night Hosts Hate Trump

By Roger L Simon

No wonder Stephen Colbert, Jimmy Kimmel, Trevor Noah and assorted comic/hosts, pick almost any, late night or not, hate Donald Trump



As evidenced in his Joe Rogan interview, he's a lot funnier than any of them, spontaneously—and he gets to be president, not just a television personality, though there is, arguably no greater TV personality today than Trump.

He also brought down the house at the Al Smith Dinner.

Having done my time in Hollywood, I can say show business is the world's capital of jealousy and the above-mentioned semi-talents have plenty to be jealous about.

We can add whiners like Bil Maher and John Oliver into the bargain who pretend to have intellectual depth. It almost makes it worse. The paleo-narcissistic Maher let the cat out of the bag by informing us he wants Kamala to win because *he* "predicted" she would. How public spirited.

But enough about boring entertainment industry riff-raff.

The [Joe Rogan interview](#) itself was more than worth the hype, It was far more interesting and more revealing of the candidate—in thought process, policy and personality— than any presidential debate I have ever seen.. (I obviously wasn't

here for Lincoln-Douglas).

This is, of course, a low bar because presidential debates never really tell you much of substance, other than what you already know—the MSM is despicable.. The debates themselves are remembered at their best largely for the one-liners, that aren't all that memorable in the first place, certainly not of the level of Groucho Marx in his heyday or even Henny Youngman.

Yes, Ronald Reagan had a good one about Walter Mondale. "I will not make age an issue of this campaign. I am not going to exploit, for political purposes, my opponent's youth and inexperience,"

And Senator Lloyd Bentsen jabbed Dan Quayle successfully with "Senator, you're no Jack Kennedy."

But what do these mots tell us? Not much. In fact hardly anything at all compared to the three hours of Trump on Rogan.

Patty McMurray on The Gateway Pundit described the event this way:

*"At times, during their interview, Rogan, a former UFC color commentator and professional stand-up comedian, sincerely appeared to enjoy his conversation with President Trump.*

*"The conversation between Rogan and President Trump was so well-executed that even the leftist UK Telegraph had to admit it was all over for Kamala after Rogan's fans watched an unscripted Trump discuss topics from eliminating the federal income tax to Kamala blaming sleep deprivation on her decision to pick Tim Walz as her running mate, to Trump's explanation of why he can say China's Xi Jinping is 'brilliant,' while still strongly opposing his iron-fisted rule over China's citizens."*

I think McMurray mischaracterizes the Telegraph which tilts

right, but otherwise I agree with the description.

Another bastion of British journalism, The Daily Mail, opined:

*“Liberals have grown despondent after it emerged that [Donald Trump’s interview](#) with [Joe Rogan](#) amassed a staggering 17 million [YouTube](#) views in less than 24 hours.*

*“The three-hour sit down [covered a wide range of topics](#) including [UFOs](#), the John F. Kennedy assassination files, the border and healthy food in the US.*

*“As soon as [the episode](#) was released just after 10pm Eastern Time on Friday night, viewing figures skyrocketed with 300,000 in the first 30 minutes.*

*“By comparison, [Kamala Harris’](#) appearance on the [Call her Daddy](#) podcast with Alex Cooper has clocked just 685,000 views in the [two weeks since it went live](#).*

*“The Vice President was also due to be [interviewed by Rogan](#), but had to pull out due to scheduling conflicts, a spokesman said.”*

It’s those old “scheduling conflicts” again. As I recall Ms. Harris had a similar “scheduling” problem when Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu came to speak in front of Congress. Then it was a reunion at her sorority. How inconvenient.

This time I think it’s straight out fear coupled with her being shielded by those around her who, having seen her make a complete fool of herself in the most softball of environments naturally have trepidation about throwing her in the ring with the freewheeling Rogan.

But there’s an interesting larger question. How did the once-august Democratic Party end up with someone arguably the worst presidential candidate in modern times?

I think the root of the problem is in the first word used by

the Daily Mail above-liberal.

What is a liberal nowadays and what does it mean? Whatever James Carville says it is this week? The liberal Democrats are no longer the party of the working class, so what are they? They're not even the party of Tesla drivers since Elon Musk went over to Trump. Progressive is equally, if not more, meaningless and I'm not even sure what conservative means given a good number of Republicans in Congress. As for libertarian, everybody seems to have his or her definition.

In fact most political terminology is seeming increasingly retrograde. I suggested during my weekly stint on the Michael Patrick Leahy radio show that, should Trump win, it might be time to abandon the terms "right" and "left" themselves altogether that go back to the French Revolution anyway and start over fresh. Michael is known as a staunch conservative but immediately agreed.

Maybe that's hoping for too much, an age of common sense, but things are definitely up for grabs. The redoubtable Michael Shellenberger put it this way on Substack's Notes:

*"Just a few weeks ago, a Kamala Harris victory seemed near-inevitable. Today, it appears unlikely. Whatever happens Nov. 5, toxic femininity and Wokeism are driving men, Jews, Billionaires, and Muslims away from the Democrats. We're on the cusp of an epoch political realignment."*

Another way to look at this is what was once cool is no longer cool. Actually, it hasn't been for a long time.

MEA CULPA

Speaking of "liberalism," you may have noticed two liberal lion newspapers—the LA Times and the Washington Post—have declined for the first times since the early Paleolithic Age to endorse an (always Democratic) presidential candidate.

From the American Spectator:

*"Public statements from leading Post personalities have been aghast. Columnist Karen Attiah tweeted, 'Jesus Christ.' Then, an hour later, '...' Then an hour later still, 'What an absolute stab in the back. What an insult to those of us who have literally put our careers and lives on the line, to call out threats to human rights and democracy.'*

*"Of most interest to Cockburn, however, were the remarks of fellow [Washington Post] columnist and MSNBC mainstay **Jennifer Rubin** to the LA Times resignations earlier in the week. In response to Sewell Chan's resignation from the Times, she wrote, 'Bravo. All respect.' Followed by, 'and where are the rest of them?'*

*"The implication is clear: now that her paper, too, is refusing to endorse the sainted Kamala Harris, Rubin must be set to join the charge of resignations in disgust, along with [Robert Kagan](#), as a sort-of Potomac Joan of Arc. The prospect brings a tear to Cockburn's eye. Such bravery.*

*"Rubin, who bills herself on X as a 'NeverTrump, pro-democracy opinion writer' is yet to tweet regarding the Post's announcement. Presumably she is in the process of redrafting the most devastating open resignation letter to ever be published – [Bari Weiss be damned](#)."*

So why the mea culpa? Well, when I was CEO of Pajamas Media in the early days of this century, I was the first to employ Jennifer Rubin as a journalist. I'm responsible. At that time she was a center right attorney and seemed intelligent. I hired her to write for our fledgling media company. Little did I know that she would turn into one of the most obdurate Never Trumpers extant approaching the highest "He's Hitler" level. I have no idea if she will follow in the "noble footsteps" the LAT's Sewell Chan and quit the WaPo, but I hope so.

*First published in [American Refugees](#)*