

00:00 So, here's my situation. Yeah, I guess I'll explain it for people who don't know. While I was at TIFF, within the first 24 hours of me showing up—oh, no problem, BC, thank you—a hit-piece video was released about me. Uh, and essentially, the entire thing is just like a copy-and-paste from Kiwi Farms, right? It's like somebody read my Kiwi Farms thread with zero skepticism and accepted it all as fact. Meanwhile, they have things like "Top 10 Sam Hyde Moments" on their channel, and their Instagram has a picture of them posing with him. And it's like, okay, well, if you're going to take Kiwi Farms at face value, then don't they have a thread accusing him of being a pedophile? Isn't there a bunch of stuff about that? Anyway, so that's already kind of weird.

01:07 Um, so they released this video about me while I'm at TIFF. I don't even know about it until like three days in, and the only reason I find out is because I'm getting messages on my phone saying things like, "You're a pedophile," posted to my Facebook. I'm like, "What?" I'm noticing other comment notifications that are very unhinged. Like, legit, it seemed like they were minors, just from the way they were talking. Um, generally, the type of people who go on a weird tirade and show up on someone's page to start something like that tend to be minors. And so I'm like, "Okay, what's going on?" I ask my editors, "Is there something going around?" because I don't even know what this is. They were like, "Okay, yeah, this video has been going around." I look at it. It's got at least 50,000 views by this point, and it's from a channel that has almost 100K subs. So, you know, videos like this have been made about me for my entire time on the internet—not when I was starting out, but as soon as I was big enough for it to be a thing. But this one was getting a good amount of traction, as in, I knew about it because of the comments I was getting.

03:09 Um, people were saying that I should, you know, answer for, I guess, my thought crimes. But my thought crimes aren't even the accusations; they're not even... Okay, I'll just explain from the beginning. I'm the type of person who has always valued the concept of free speech and open expression. Right? My core audience knows this. Uh, my core audience knows that I'm a person who finds a lot of value in philosophy, right, and in a lot of moral, ethical, and philosophical discussions. They know that I'm the type of person that promotes the idea that, in most cases, it's not black and white. You know, there's nuance to most things; there are gray areas to most things, right? And so if somebody has the position of, "Oh, no, it's 100% this," then I'm the type of person to go, "Well, you know, there might be a scenario—it's possible, right?—that it's not 100%. Here's an example of something fitting into that one percent," or whatever. Right? And so I've been asked to give my positions on various subjects, uh, in Twitch chat or whatever, you know, while live-streaming and playing games. Uh, these subjects include abortion, right, assisted suicide, drug legalization... At the time, the audience, you know, the number of people watching my Twitch stream was like 30 concurrent viewers, which, you know, not that different from today, I guess. Um, it was a great movie. Thank you, Daniel. Yeah, I mean... well, I get distracted if TTS is on. Whatever, I'll keep going.

05:34 People would feel comfortable asking me about many controversial subjects, right, and I was comfortable just speaking my mind. So one of these controversial subjects is animal welfare, specifically like human-animal sexual interactions. Even though I would like it not to happen, have no interest in it, and would prefer if other people didn't do it... if you gave me a choice between a world where no one is doing that versus a world where people are doing that, I would choose the world where no one is doing it. That's always been my position.

06:26 I do find it stupid that many of our legal policies regarding this issue are not based on the welfare of the animal, right? And so, if you look at the things that we consider to be acceptable, ignoring the meat industry—right, so literally just animal breeders—you can do that for fun. Right? You don't have to be a licensed animal breeder; you can just be someone who's like, "I would like to play God. I would like to combine these two animals into another one." Right? That's legal and socially acceptable. In order to do that, they sexually interact with the animal, right? Um, this is not a debatable fact. This is real life; it's happening right now.

07:22 Um, there are podcasts of doctors talking about the different ways they do it. They opt to do it usually by masturbating the animal because it is less harmful for the animal than letting them do it themselves. Like, this is true, right? This is verified, scientific, not debatable, right? Um, and so that same action, right...

07:53 If somebody is doing it but has a different thought in their head, right? If their thought isn't, "Oh, I'm going to take this semen and force another animal to be pregnant because I think it's funny or I'd just like to play God," but their thought is instead, "Oh, this is hot," or whatever... people believe that person should be in jail. If you believe that, that's fine, right? But just admit that you want them to be in jail for a thought crime. You want them to be in jail because of what was happening in their brain, not because of the welfare of the animal, right? If it were about the welfare of the animal, then you would also believe that other people should be in jail for doing the same thing—again, not even considering the meat industry. So, you know, that's been my argument.

08:52 And then the second argument regarding animal welfare is, um, more of a philosophical one. People have asked me, "How is it possible for an animal to consent to a human being?" Right? And my answer was, "The same way it consents to another animal." Now, people have interpreted that as me saying animals want to have sex with human beings and therefore it's all good, or whatever. People have interpreted that as me saying all sexual actions towards animals are permissible because of that. That is not my position. My position is that, sure, it's possible. Right? When someone presents me with, "This is 1000% not possible," I go, "Okay, well, it's probably possible," based on... I don't know.

09:52 Look on any Reddit thread about dolphins. Right? One of the most upvoted comments will be, "Dolphins rape people." I don't know, like, that's not informed consent, but they're clearly doing a thing, right? They're initiating a sexual interaction with a human being. Otherwise, we wouldn't be saying dolphins are raping people; we would say the humans are raping a dolphin, right? If you look up anything about ostrich farmers and the relationships they have with ostriches, right? There are species of animals where they literally won't reproduce unless a human being is around, and that might be a result of domestication. Obviously, in the wild, that doesn't happen with ostriches. It appears to be something where they see the human as the alpha or something. There are a bunch of different examples, right?

10:44 So I've said things from our common knowledge in pop culture, like on *America's Funniest Home Videos*, right? There will be a clip where a woman falls down a hill and then a dog just starts humping her. And so my response is: Is the dog not consenting to some sort of sexual act by performing a sexual act on the human? Right? Sure, it's not informed consent, and that doesn't mean, "Oh, a dog's humping you, therefore, you can do something else to it." I never said that. I'm saying that the act in and of itself that the animal is doing is one that it is consenting to, by *their* version of consent, not by *my* version of consent, which is informed consent. So my standard for the people I have sex with is informed consent—not just informed consent, actually, but enthusiastic consent. Right? Like, I'm a fucking sub; I literally can't get off on people who don't want me.

11:54 I find it unattractive for people to be stupid by human standards, right? So, yeah, people twist this. Just because I have a belief that, yeah, it's probably possible—based on not informed consent, but whatever version of consent animals have, which I would assume they have to be able to have unless we're to say that every instance of an animal having sex with another is rape... Like, two animals having sex with each other, that's not rape, right? Maybe we'd say it's rape if it's ducks or whatever, but we're not saying that every instance of an animal having sex with another is rape, right? No one has that position, correct? Therefore, they have some version, their own version, of consent that they are capable of. So, again, it's not informed consent. It's not the human standard of consent.

13:00 I was only ever talking about the perspective of the animal, which people who get really fucking emotional about this just forget or don't have the ability to wrap their heads around. Right? So, yeah, my whole position on the animal welfare shit is that the laws are contradictory. That doesn't mean I want it to happen and it doesn't mean it should happen. Just that they appear to be based on disgust for what's happening in someone's brain rather than actual concern for the animal. And I would like it if people were honest with themselves. And then, regarding consent, like, sure, it's possible. Right? It's not informed consent, it's not my standard for consent, but it seems possible. It seems like they have their own version.

14:02 I don't see why it's such a big deal that I said that. Anyway, third thing, I guess. Second thing—there were two parts to the animal one—but the third thing that's now floating around as of, I guess, the past year, is something that I haven't talked about for over a decade. And I honestly forgot I even said this because the clip is so old, um, like over 10 years. I don't even know how long it was. It has to have been like 10 years ago.

14:41 Anyway, someone asked me my position on the ethics of "loli" and whether or not it should be illegal. Right? And I said, "Yeah, loli should be legal." What I should have said is "at least decriminalized." Right? I don't know, I was in my early 20s, but I essentially have the same position where, if there are only consenting adults involved in an action—even if that action is someone drawing something that is disgusting, that I think is disgusting, that most of us think is disgusting and offensive, right?

15:24 If the action only involves consenting adults, I don't think people should go to jail for it. That doesn't mean I think it should be celebrated or that I would like more of it to exist. That doesn't mean I would like it to be out in public and available, like on a fucking grocery store shelf. That just means I, as a principled person with strong feelings about harm reduction... when you put people in jail for the rest of their lives, that's causing harm. Right? If someone is doing something that only involves other consenting adults, they should not go to jail.

16:08 Now, if you come up with a scenario and say, "Well, what about this?" and your example involves someone who is not a consenting adult, then obviously that's not what I'm talking about. Right? As soon as you come up with a scenario that involves someone who is not a consenting adult, then they should go to jail or face

some sort of consequences. It's clearly not a black-and-white issue, right? You know, some people say they don't believe there's a single person on the planet that's attracted to anime characters who isn't also attracted to children or whatever. I don't know if I believe that. I don't believe that everybody that wants to fuck Twilight Sparkle wants to fuck a real horse. I want to fuck Scar from *The Lion King*; I don't want to fuck a real lion.

17:11 So it's really easy for me to imagine what it would be like to be another person who's not me and be like, "Oh, okay, there are probably people out there who might be attracted to... I don't know, *Doki Doki Literature Club!*?" No, that's not what... What was I even talking about? *Lucky Star*? I don't know, some anime where... I don't even know. It really depends on the person's mind, right? And so, you know, guaranteed, there are people out there who are attracted to Twilight Sparkle and real horses. Guaranteed, those people exist. Does that mean everyone attracted to Twilight Sparkle is attracted to real horses? No, right? You can make Venn diagrams, and there are people outside, and there are people that fit in the middle. Not everyone's the same.

18:15 So, as a thinking person who doesn't want people to have their lives ruined for consensual activities between adults, I have to extend that logic to people other than myself. I have to be like, "Okay, well, I know that I don't want to fuck a real lion because they're fucking stupid and unhygienic." There are qualities about real lions that I find so unattractive that the only reason I can get off to cartoon half-animal, half-humans is because those features don't exist there, right? So it's so fucking weird because I made this argument in the comments section of that video. I tried to come up with a thought experiment, because, you know, as a furry, it's not that difficult to understand.

19:35 Because I know that about myself, right? I know how that works in my own brain when it comes to lions. I'm attracted to Scar for the combination of human and animal features. I am not attracted to a real lion, so it's very easy for my brain to understand how this works. Um, but I understand that, you know, for "normies"—people who get off to, let's say, Scarlett Johansson, right? Let's say Scarlett Johansson is how you get off to. My thought experiment is, okay...

20:22 If you're attracted to Scarlett Johansson or whatever you're attracted to, think about this in your head. Be honest with yourself, be super critical, like genuinely give this a shot. Are you still attracted to Scarlett Johansson if you remove the features of intelligence, hygiene, and communication? So, she can't communicate with you. She literally has the brain of a child or an animal, walking around with a fucking helmet on, shitting herself, and not knowing how to shower. Are you still attracted to that person? The correct answer is no. And if that's the case, if you are not attracted to that person, then you should understand what it's like to be someone who is attracted to a fictional halfway point that doesn't exist in real life. All you have to do is swap the real-life Scarlett Johansson with the fake, "baby-brained" Scarlett Johansson. Hi. Thank you so much, Krell.

21:30 Right? It's a thought experiment that I was hoping people would be able to look at and be like, "Oh, you're right. If you do remove those features, it makes it unattractive." There might be, I don't know, a certain small percentage of guys who are like, "Yeah, I would still bang," and then they might think everybody else thinks that way. That might just be them telling on themselves, right? If people seriously believe that attraction is not a combination of features, where some existing features can make you unattracted and some can make you more attracted... if people don't believe that and they just go, "No, base silhouette and species is the extent of attraction," if they believe that, then they're telling on themselves. What they're admitting is they would fuck Scarlett Johansson with a child's brain. That's what they're admitting if they believe the world works that way. Um, anyway, so those are my positions.

22:42 Someone made a video where they took all the clips from Kiwi Farms and Reddit posts or whatever. Um, they compiled them together, and it would be one thing if it was just like, "Oh, here's all the stuff he said. Here's all the stuff he said on this subject. Shame him for his opinions." You know, like, "He thinks this." That's what all the people accusing me... it always starts with "He thinks," right? Not, "He's done," because I haven't done anything. This is all just about thought-policing. And my thought crime isn't even, "Oh, loli," or blah, blah, blah. I'm not into that. My thought crime is doing well despite it all. Oh, thank you, Mr. B Natural. My thought crime is believing that other people shouldn't be imprisoned and have their lives ruined for thought crimes. That's my "thought-thought crime," right? Anyway, thank you, Inverted Arrow. This person creates this video, and it's released within 24 hours of me arriving at TIFF.

23:54 I made a lengthy comment on their video. I also DMed them. They've ignored me everywhere. I DMed them on Instagram and on Twitter, and they're still posting, right? They're posting on these accounts, they're checking other DMs, they're responding to other creators and other drama people. They're in the comment section of other drama people's streams.

24:11 Completely ignoring me. Okay, all right, completely ignoring me. You need to rewind the video for my position on that. Completely ignoring me, I can only assume, is for the purpose of being able to dehumanize me. Because it's easier to create this type of content if you don't actually have any personal interaction with the person, you know? Um, anyway. So the fact that there was no way to even get any kind of acknowledgment from them irritated me. Uh, the fact that it was posted within 24 hours of me going to TIFF—which, for 11 years in a row, has been the biggest and only work trip that I do consistently every single year. I pointed this out in their comment section, and the response from their audience and from other people in the commentary community, like Nicholas Dilorio, who streamed about this last night...

25:33 Their response is basically, "What do you expect? That they would know your entire work schedule? You must have main character syndrome." I'm not expecting any random person to know. I'm expecting someone who made a mini-documentary about me to know. That would be like if I did an edit—by the way, this is an edited, produced video, not a live-stream—where they compiled things together, added their own commentary, decided what to keep and what not to keep, and ordered things around. They created a narrative. They made a little mini propaganda documentary video. If I was making that about anybody, I would know. That would be like if I was making a video about Daddy Derek and I released it right when he was at the 420 Awards. Right? So me saying that I believe that's malicious is the more charitable interpretation because the less charitable interpretation is that he just didn't do any fucking research, which genuinely might be the case. So it's either maliciously intentional or maliciously ignorant because there's no person...

26:50 Right? There's no person who would be creating a little mini-documentary about somebody, pretending to have done research, that wouldn't know about this. It was on my subreddit. It was in my videos. It was on my streams. Any of the most recent things I was doing... like, I literally live-streamed myself going through my TIFF schedule, going through all the fucking movies I was gonna watch. The guy says he used to watch my channel. There's literally one thing I've done consistently every year, other than, I guess, the Oscars stream, right? But it's the one thing that involves me being out of town. So, yeah, it's either maliciously intentional or maliciously ignorant.

27:31 My big issue with the video when it came out was not just the fact that, oh, conveniently, this is at the beginning of my two-week trip where I'm not at my computer and I can't respond on stream. It's that plus... uh, sorry, I lost my train of thought. This is really annoying. It is really annoying. It's that, along with the fact that he did no fucking research. He takes Kiwi Farms at face value. A third of the video is literally just factually incorrect information because he either made assumptions or just read a post on Kiwi Farms. The reason why I know that he's literally just copy-pasting from the thread is because they're the exact same screenshots, the exact same images of Reddit comments that I made that are found there.

28:49 I would expect, from the standard of quality that I try to put out to the world for edited videos—especially serious ones, where the ramifications are that people in your audience are going to go on their Facebook page and call them a pedophile... you should understand that there's a seriousness associated with the content you produce. You should look up primary sources. You shouldn't just take it at face value and copy-paste from one fucking drama thread. That's irresponsible. That is irresponsible content creation. So I know that not everybody in the commentary community is like this.

29:39 I know that, regardless of what you think of Turkey Tom, the dude actually tries to make sure that a certain level of quality is met for his videos. He has multiple different people working on them and editing, and you know, different writers, and he's not micromanaging everything. Um, but he takes it seriously and he understands that there's a level of seriousness that should be taken with that, regardless of what you think of his political beliefs or how charitably he is towards some groups and not others or whatever. There is a standard of quality there. There is not with this guy who made this video. That's what pisses me off.

30:29 And now fucking Nicholas Dilorio is responding on his stream—which I've archived, by the way, so don't pretend you didn't say this stuff—where he's saying like, "Oh, Rob's not a journalist, I'm not a journalist." For things that, ethically, I was saying should have been done to prevent the spread of misinformation, Nicholas is just like, "Oh, we're not journalists, who cares?" And their opinion is just that it doesn't matter. There's no seriousness taken with this, there's no standard to try and meet. I don't agree with that. My fucking *Kimba* video—could you imagine if I just copy-pasted from forums what other people were saying and didn't look things up myself? Right? No, that would be a bad video. That's bad content.

31:34 And so within this video, the reason why I call it propaganda is because it's not just, "Oh, here are the things that he said." It's, "Here are the things that he said," packaged with a huge chunk—like, literally maybe a third of the video—saying, "Here are other people who aren't him, who have said similar things and have had

controversies where they've done something predatory." And he says in the video, "Oh, you should connect the dots." Over a third of the video is just that. "Oh, you should connect the dots." I'm pretty sure over a third of it is literally just shaming me for being a furry, right?

32:13 There's a section time-stamped in his video called "Furry Degeneracy." There's a section time-stamped in his video literally just about me liking Scar from *The Lion King*. Sexually? Yes. Romantically? Yes. It's a fictional character, a combination of human and animal features. He takes streams where I've talked about being attracted to his face, his voice, his smile, his personality, his body language, and his editorializing of those comments is him saying that I claimed I'm not attracted to any animal features at all. "Oh, look, he just thinks it's a coincidence. He's trying to claim it's a coincidence that it's a lion." No, it's a combination of human and animal features. I've never said anything else. I've never said I'm not attracted to any of the animal features on this human-animal hybrid character.

33:06 I am not attracted to animal features on an animal in the same way that, hopefully, you wouldn't look at Scarlett Johansson's pussy if she were attached to a mental patient and think, "Oh, that's hot." Hopefully, you wouldn't think that; otherwise, you're telling on yourself. This is how human brains work. These are... I don't consider them to be complicated conversations, but I keep having to remind myself that to many people, they are. Because, you know, Nick, I'm sorry, but in your stream, going over this stuff, there are some genuine comprehension issues. Like when I was talking about that analogy of human and animal features and trying to relate it to someone who's not a furry, his takeaway was, "That's the same excuse that people would use to fuck children."

34:06 And then he plays a clip of someone saying something along the lines of, "Oh, it's fine to fuck a child or masturbate to a child, as long as it's for different reasons other than it being a child." That's not the analogy. That's not what I was saying. I didn't say it's fine to fuck a lion if you think that the lion has human features that it doesn't. We're talking about fiction. What I'm attracted to only exists with the human features. There's no other version of that that exists. That's what it is. That's the package, right? So anyway, um, let's see if I can formulate my thoughts, because I don't want to miss anything.

34:57 But at the same time, as much as I'm tempted to go over the entire fucking video point by point, I literally don't have time. Because it would not just include that; it would include Nick's stream. Um, you know, I have to watch my podcast movies. Today we're recording episode 199. Tomorrow I have to do lab work. Uh, I'm going on a fucking camping trip—the first trip I've ever been on with my partners—for a few days right after that. So I also have to pack on Thursday. When I'm back on Sunday, we've got a friend who I haven't seen in six months helping me install some lights in my room. He's going to be over for a couple of days doing that. And then during that time, while he's over, I'm getting my second PRP injection in my wrist. My arm's gonna be fucking literally useless for like another month or whatever.

35:57 Um, I've got to record my TIFF audio. Right after that, I'm gonna have only, I guess, like a week before VIFF starts on October 2nd. Um, oh, I guess I'll get to that, Speeders. VIFF starts on October 2nd. Uh, during VIFF, Alex is coming to visit to record episode 200 of the podcast. Jake's gonna come over.

36:23 It's a live stream. I'm super fucking swamped until mid-October right now. So as much as I would like to go over the entire fucking thing, I realize that I can't. And so for right now, this live stream is gonna have to suffice. If there are individual things that they try to fucking, I don't know, dig up or whatever, then I might have to record a quick thing and post it on the clips channel or something. I don't know.

36:55 Um, I'm kind of fucking disappointed because I'm friends enough with some of the people in this drama/YouTube commentary community, and you know, I've followed a bunch of them on Twitter and they follow me back. There's a mutual thing there with a good number of them. Um, and so I was hoping for a little bit of charity. But essentially, what has happened is because I responded in that comment... And also, yeah, first I responded in the comment. I pointed out—oh yeah, this was the thing I almost lost my train of thought on. This is my other really big issue. I pointed out that in the fucking video, this guy insisted on sharing a page with the username unblurred, showing exactly where to go for pornographic images of myself and consenting adults. And it's not just saying, "Hey, this exists." It's not even just saying the name of the website where this exists. It was describing pornographic images of me and describing the race of the person I was having sex with as if it's relevant for it to be a black guy.

38:26 I don't know why these people think that that's... if you're curious about what his channel is like, that's a good idea, I guess. Um, yeah, no, it's not basically kink-shaming; it's absolutely kink-shaming. Because when I pointed this out in the comment section, being like, "Hey, this is against YouTube's TOS. Also, why is this video not set to 18+? If you're not going to set it to 18+, just blur the username. Why is it important for you to have the video set to 'all ages,' where minors could access it?" And you know at least some are, because you make fucking YouTube drama videos. Come on, hello. That's a way lower age demographic than fucking talking about *Synecdoche, New York* and Nuri Bilge Ceylan films, right? You know that you have minors in your audience. Why not just blur the username if it's important for you to say, "Oh, let's shame him for having sex with a black guy and doing it in a weird way and not hiding it and not being afraid of that being accessible to adults"?

39:38 Like, yeah, I have adult accounts on websites that allow adult content. And I pointed out in the comment section the settings that I have enabled on these websites ensure that if there are minors on the website, they don't have the ability to access it. And I tested this yesterday, by the way. I created a fake account with like a 13-year-old birthday or whatever just to test this out because I take this very seriously. I created an account on this website just to test it out. You cannot see any of the media displayed on my page, and in the search, it doesn't auto-fill. If you try typing the username, which I'm not going to share here because I make a conscious effort to keep that stuff separate from my work stuff and from stuff that's not age-gated... YouTube doesn't allow porn on it. I have accounts on websites that do allow porn. What's the big fucking deal? But they're trying to act as though this is a moral issue that needs to be brought to everyone's attention, not only to say that it exists but to ensure that traffic is directed to my account, describing the images and the sexually explicit material to guaranteed minors in their audience.

41:30 And Nicholas Dilorio's response to this was showing a clip of one of my videos. In my *Prey* review, where I'm watching the movie with the webcam on me, I say, "I'm so bored, I'm going to look at Predator porn." I don't describe any of it; it's not on screen. And then one of my editors who made this edited version of the video decided, "Okay, we're going to make this into a little joke." They put the words "e621," which is not a specific page that leads to these images. It's a vague term, like saying, "Oh, Pornhub exists," right? I don't even know if the images there were from e621; they could have been from Rule 34. You're allowed to say "Rule 34" in a video, right?

42:20 I didn't describe any of these images beyond saying, "Oh, a Demogorgon's in one, haha, that's funny." I didn't say what sex acts were taking place in the images. I didn't say who was penetrating who. I didn't say which race was fucking topping or what hole was being inserted by what thing. And also, it's not in the context of, "Let's shame this person." It's in the context of, "Haha, this movie is so boring that I'm going to look up porn."

42:53 And then, some images were displayed on screen that I made sure the editor sent me, and everything was censored to such a degree where you couldn't even tell if it was porn. You know, it's not like two characters on top of each other and then a censor bar where their hips are. No, the only images shown were censored to the point where it's just like, "Oh, you can see the face of a Predator and you can see the face of a Demogorgon," or whatever. They're not even in the same spot. And then the editor also put in... I don't know, I guess there was like a longer story video. I don't even know if it was the same images I looked at because the editor just did their own thing. But they showed a clip as part of a joke that may or may not have been from porn, but there was no porn in the clip. And so, yeah, I don't think that the same amount of factors have been met when I'm referencing that a website exists, just saying, "Haha, funny porn."

44:27 And then there are some images that are so censored that I don't even know if they're porn. Like, legit, I don't even know because they're censored to the degree where you can't tell, and that's the point. There were no sex acts in the images, anyway. The context of that image would have been, "Oh, they're just posing." There weren't even any sex acts in the images that were heavily censored. Um, but yeah, doing that for the context of a joke... where I'm not, by the way...

45:04 The guy literally said, "Go to this website if you want to see these images." He described these images in detail and said, "Go to this website if you want to see them." That's so many steps beyond what I did. If you want to call me a hypocrite, fine. There's nothing about what I did that's malicious. The reason why I believe what he did is malicious is because when confronted about this in comments that, yes, he read, he didn't do anything about it.

45:45 He knows that he was creating content where there are guaranteed minors in his audience that are being described in detail—literally saying what's going into what hole and with what race. That's what's in his video. Describing the content, showing the page with the username uncensored, saying, "This is what the page looks like, this is what the fucking profile picture looks like, this is the username, and here's where you go to find these images." If he wanted to create the exact same video and his argument is, "I don't want to censor this because it's something people need to know about," if it's that important for him to let more people know, minors included, that I have adult accounts on websites that allow adult content, why not just censor the username? Because, of course, people can find it for themselves if they try.

46:49 The conversation about minors finding porn on the internet is not, "Oh, we can make it so that zero minors find porn." No, you have to try. You have to put in a good effort. You have to take reasonable steps, if only for your own liability. Like, even if you don't care about whether or not minors are seeing porn, just for your own

liability. This comment of mine existed for two days. Both him and his friend, who re-uploaded the same video with minimal commentary but kept the exact same footage, I alerted them in their comment section. I didn't go anywhere else about it. They did fucking nothing about it, and his friend argued with me as if this was something worth defending.

47:39 Literally, not just, "Hey, he has an adult account somewhere," but, "Here's the username, here are detailed descriptions of what's on it, and go access it if you would like to see it." Those are so many steps above anything I've ever done. And again, this is in the context of not, "Haha, it's funny that this porn exists," but, "We are shaming him for being weird. We are shaming him for being a furry. We're shaming him for being queer." And the entire video is propaganda because it's packaging the completely harmless, queer, furry shit that I do with consenting adults—incredibly ethically, incredibly responsibly, because I've enabled all of the settings that prevent minors from accessing it on those websites. I have ensured that none of my safe-for-work accounts lead back to that. That is incredibly ethical. And he goes, "Oh no, I don't actually care. Everybody go to this website. Everybody go to this exact page." I'm not going to pretend like it's revenge porn or that you took private images. No, they're public images—public to adults.

49:02 Any fucking minor can create an account and just lie about their age, depending on what country they're in. I guess some places need ID. Why do you want to increase the number of minors doing that by showing them this on a website that doesn't allow adult content and on your video that is set to "all ages"? That's insane. I don't know why you're defending that. I don't know why your friend is defending that. I don't know why Nicholas Dilorio is defending that. That is clearly a line that is crossed that I don't understand how it's not against the TOS. I think it is against the TOS.

49:47 Maybe we can pull up the fucking document, right? Maybe, I don't know, is there someone from YouTube that can inform us on whether or not this is against the TOS? Me saying that it's against the TOS is me inherently calling for people to strike down and remove the video. Which, if you read my comment, I said it's against the TOS, and adults should go to the video and upvote my comment. I said to upvote my comment because he refused to pin it. The guy who made the video refused to pin my comment for transparency. And, yes, in that comment, I say this is grooming behavior and I call them out in all caps and I do a little schizo shit, right? I was mad as hell because I was typing this while I was at TIFF.

50:47 In between running around watching four movies a day... yeah, when you are so irresponsible that you publish something that demands my attention, that you know is demanding my attention, that you're creating because you know that people are going to ask me to answer for my thought crimes... when you're creating that content and you do so little research that you maybe accidentally do that within the first 24 hours of me being on the one work trip that I do consistently every year... it's a one-in-365 chance that that was by accident. And it could be, but it's malicious either way. It's malicious because you, as a person creating this type of content, should responsibly understand that you have a responsibility to be diligent, to fact-check, to check primary sources, and not just say random shit and be like, "Oh, this person on whatever drama website—I don't even know if it was Kiwi Farms or something else at this point—said it. I'm going to repeat it. Adam said this." It's probably untrue.

52:17 The content of the video is again, not just, "Here are the things that I've said and I should be arrested by the thought police." It's, "Here are the things that he's said. Here's him being a furry degenerate and he should be shamed for this. And here are a bunch of other people who are not him, who have said similar things and have done abusive things. Therefore"—and he says in the video—"you should connect the dots. There's usefulness in connecting the dots, right? Because if you cancel someone and ruin their lives for thoughts, then you're actually preventing a real crime." Anyway, within my comments, I'm fighting back a little, in the sense that my thought process is, "Okay..."

53:05 Clearly, this guy doesn't understand the importance of doing your due diligence. He doesn't understand the importance of fact-checking. He doesn't understand... I don't know if he wanted people to harass me. He doesn't understand why it would be important to not withhold proper context and information, which he does throughout the video. Like, there's one part where he shows a screenshot of me interacting on Twitter with Shadman. A screenshot. I think there are like two of these, ever. That has been the extent of my interactions with Shadman, by the way, a decade ago. Back when—not even going to name their names, but you know who I'm talking about—the creators of everyone's favorite TV show right now were on a fucking podcast with him and hanging out with him, and he was still doing loli shit.

54:02 Clearly, the social expectations around those conversations have shifted. Um, you know, that was the climate at the time where he was a character that drew weird shit, including, by the way, adult human furry stuff which I didn't even jerk off to because I'm not a fan of his art style, and adult Elastigirl or whatever. But he also did fucking loli shit. I think that's mostly what he was known for, but there were people in his social circle that were like, "Yeah, whatever, he's fucking weird."

54:49 Shadman crossed the fucking line. He crossed the fucking line by involving someone who is not a consenting adult. As soon as he drew Keemstar's daughter, that was the situation where he was no longer doing things that involved consensual adults. He was involving people that were not consensual adults. That's a clear line that was crossed.

55:14 I don't think I ever defended that, ever. I don't think there are any interactions between me and him after that point, and if there were, I probably didn't know about that. Um, I think there are literally two interactions, and both of them were me not responding directly to him, but you can see like three other people tagged in all of these because there was a big comment thread and then I would make a joke. I made a joke like, "Haha, draw my horse persona getting nailed by Scar," or whatever. Self-deprecating. You know, part of the joke is, "Hey, I'm a fucking loser that wants to bang Scar." In this guy's video...

56:03 He frames the fact that people in my community—you guys, the people that are close, my core audience, the people on my Patreon and my subreddit—he frames the fact that I have a core audience that accepts who I am as a weirdo, a queer furry who wants to have sex with Scar from *The Lion King*. He frames that as me dodging accountability for a controversy. He opens up the video saying that it's something that I've successfully turned into a meme for my community. He says it's a controversy that I've turned into a meme. Like I intentionally went, "Uh-oh, I don't want people to find out that I actually want to have sex with Scar from *The Lion King*. Let's make it a meme so I can muddy the waters and then no one will know if it's true or not."

56:57 No, dude, I'm just fucking open about myself. I understand the absurdity of it. Come on, I grew up in fucking Alberta. Do you know how tough it was to exist? Do you know how tough it was to find out this thing about myself that, even though I knew was harmless and fantasy, I still fucking hated myself into my early 30s? I stopped hating myself for this shit at like age 31. It sucked. It was a long road, and that's part of what informs my decisions on how to treat other people and why I don't kink-shame for consensual adult activities. As long as you don't involve anyone that's not a consenting adult, I don't kink-shame for that shit. Um, that's part of what informs that. It's like, I know how fucking tough it is.

57:56 I tried to repress it for two years of my life. It wound up with me getting addicted to fucking cocaine and crystal meth. That was not fun, but I'm a strong person. That part is behind me. I have gone through a whole lot of shit in my life. And now this guy is like, "This is a controversy that he should have to answer for: being attracted to a *Lion King* character and being open about it."

58:34 By the way, Nick, in his stream, repeatedly says that I should be ashamed for being a furry. Repeatedly. I've archived it. And so, yeah, there's going to be some weird gaslighting. There are going to be people coming out saying, "Oh, it has nothing to do with you being a furry. You're crazy. It has nothing to do with any of the queer shit you did." That's half the fucking video.

59:03 If it has nothing to do with that, why is that in the video? Why did you create propaganda by packaging all of this together? You look at the guy's channel. It's "Sam Hyde is awesome" and "Here's the Kiwi Farms thread of every liberal, left-leaning content creator." He knows that he has an audience full of people that will react more uncharitably towards me if he packages it with the queer furry shit. He knows that. That's why he opened the video talking about how I didn't love *The Prince of Egypt*.

59:44 That has nothing to do with any of the shit. And then, as Nick is reading through my fucking comments, he's saying, "Oh, why is Adam talking about all this shit that doesn't matter? Just get to the important stuff." Dude, blame Rob for that. He front-loaded the video with it. I'm responding to everything. I get it. I have a problem because I think that thoroughly responding to things, especially in text form, detailed, like, "Here's every single point why this is dishonest, why this is wrong"—my problem is thinking that to these people, it's not going to just show up as, "Wow, you mad, bro? That's pretty long. That's a lot of text."

01:00:34 That's part of the reason why I think I'm autistic. Because I seem to have some kind of obsession with needing to feel like I am able to convince people or correct the record in some way, just by being honest. Because I know that I'm not an abuser, I know that I'm not attracted to children, and I know that I'm not attracted to animals. I don't even jerk it to loli. I hate that that's now a thing that people think. Uh, I know that about myself. And so I feel like, "Oh, okay, well, clearly there's some

sort of miscommunication. Clearly there's a thing where someone doesn't understand me, and if I just say more about myself, then it's fine," because I know these things about myself, so they'll figure it out. But that's not the case.

01:01:19 And after watching Nick's stream, I'm kind of fucking black-pilled on this shit because even though the commentary/YouTube drama community is pretty homogenous—I'm not saying they all have the exact same opinions, but I am saying that they think very similarly—watching his stream was a bit of a litmus test to understand how, very likely, the rest of the YouTube drama commentary community is going to be talking about this. Um, Nick has made it very clear in his live stream that he's going to be trying to get more people with larger audiences talking about this. He says he wants to try and get H3 talking about this because H3 has previously taken a very strong stance against loli or whatever. Um, so, yeah, there's gonna be more shit coming, for sure. You can guarantee that.

01:02:19 Like, especially because I fought back at all. You know, when I'm saying in all caps, "Dude, you're showing porn to minors"—is that the most charitable, most contextual version of what they did? No. That's my fucking point. My point is because, in a reality where someone has any bit of introspection, they would look at that and go, "Oh wait, it's bad to withhold information. Wait, it's bad to present things in a way that's clearly framed as propaganda," even if these things are technically true. The things I said are technically true. He did show porn to minors. He directed minors to porn.

01:03:19 However, in my comments, unlike in Rob's video, in the exact same thread, I give the most charitable interpretation. I go, "Here's exactly what you did." And it's not a quippy soundbite; it's not a fucking meme. So anybody who's like, "Oh wait, they showed porn to minors?" in the same thread can go, "Okay, that's what he meant." Even on Twitter, it's within the same fucking thread. There's nothing that I've said that, even if it is the less charitable way to phrase it (which is the point), is untrue. Anybody can go, "Oh, what do they mean?" and it's right there. With Rob's video, it's not.

01:04:01 Rob's video only contains uncharitable bullshit with no context, no information. He doesn't give the context of the Shadman shit, obviously. Um, in Rob's video, he showcases all of the times that I've defended myself on Reddit because people will bring this up on Reddit and demand that I respond to it. And so I'll respond. Because I have a problem: thinking that me, in my own brain, knowing that I haven't done anything wrong... I have a problem thinking that I can explain that to people with words. Apparently, that's not possible for a good portion of the population. I need to figure this out at some point. Um, losing my train of thought again. Ooh, somebody remind me what I just said when I come back, because I gotta pee. Okay, remind me, and I'll continue it. Thank you. Okay, I remember what I was going to say.

01:06:27 The reason why this is going to blow up more is because, in me defending myself, I can see how Nick reacted to this, and so I have a good idea of how the general commentary community is going to react. And Nick basically saw my defense—me being like, "Hey, you shared porn with minors," in all caps, clearly making a point—as me being malicious, and he doesn't see the original video as being malicious. So he thinks that the start of the malice was my response. Unfortunately, I don't know.

01:07:05 Maybe Tom's going to grant me the benefit of the doubt, maybe other people are, maybe Nick's the outlier here, but it seems like that's what they're going to go with. They're going to say that Rob's video was not propaganda, not misleading, not malicious, not strategically edited, and not leaving out information. They'll either ignore it and not even acknowledge it, or just say, "Oh, but you can't complain about that." If you retweeted someone saying that sharing porn with minors is pedo behavior, then you can't complain about it. They're gonna forget what the fucking initial incident is because that's what Nick has already done. He's claimed that he went into the video with an open mind, trying to be charitable.

01:07:51 I don't know how much he believes that because, as he's going through it on his stream, he makes references to the DMs that I sent him. He talks about the DMs I've sent him, saying that I was frantically sending him DMs or whatever. I believe he does it with such specificity that he tells people that I told him to blur the username from my 18+ account before reacting to the video, which is true. I did request that. He did that because if you want it to be on a website that doesn't allow 18+ material in an all-ages video, that's the least that you could do to not have minors showing up. I did send him that message. But what I also sent him in that very same message—literally the same message—was that the settings on my 18+ accounts have everything enabled so that anyone with an under-18 account cannot access the explicit material.

01:09:27 And yet, in his stream, he's making a fucking joke... he doesn't mention that. He doesn't mention that I sent that DM to him. He talked about the other DMs I sent to him but doesn't mention that. In his stream, he's making jokes, being like, "Oh, yeah, yeah, as long as you put like an 18+ little emoji in your username, then that stops kids from accessing it." Ha, ha, scoffs. He insinuates that by my account existing, that is more potentially damaging, more exposing to children, than someone with an all-ages video saying, "Here's the username," and describing it, and then saying, "Here's where you should go to access it." Like, literally saying out loud, "Go here," in a video that's just kink-shaming.

01:10:32 Unless you just didn't read that part of my message—which I don't know how you could have, if you're referencing the other parts of my message—why would you not say that? Why would you withhold that information on your stream? Because I literally said in the message, "You can test this by creating another account, setting it to like 13 or whatever, and then try to access the page." If you're an adult, you can do that. Why would he withhold that information? That's information that makes me not look like a fucking abuser. That's information that confirms and reaffirms that I'm doing things ethically and responsibly, and that I've thought about potential harm and try to reduce it. Why did you withhold that information? Why didn't you mention that? That's fucked up. So the most charitable version is that you read the other messages I sent you and just not that part, even though it was in the same message. So I'm not convinced. I'm not convinced that I'm going to be given a very charitable interpretation.

01:11:52 From here on out, I think there are going to be more videos made. Also, oh my god, this is a big one. Yeah, I'm going to show you right now. Also, shouldn't forget to mention this here. Let me just get to this page. So at the end of Nick's stream, he's going through the comments on the page. And who do we see? At the end of Nick's stream, he's going through the comments on the page, opens these up, and just reads one of these comments. You know, one of the first responses anyway.

01:12:47 "Why did you commission your fursuit from a zoo sadist?" Nick reads that and goes, "Oh, didn't know that," and then just scrolls down. And then I'm wondering, "Okay, wait a minute, Nick. Why didn't you read this part where I'm responding to them?" So here's my response, which is factually true. I say, "Do your research. One, the only evidence of that is guilt by association with a person that they have obviously stopped associating with a long time ago. Two, I commissioned my suit before those nonsense accusations were made. Check the dates. It only became a thing near the end of my suit being finished. Even if I believed everything I read on the internet, which you apparently do, the fursuit was already paid for long before that. Do your research. For once. Ever grow a brain."

01:13:37 32 likes on this comment. And I was about to message Nick being like, "Okay, dude, if you're gonna make another video, you clearly scrolled past my response to this. It's not even a lengthy response." I was just gonna message him being like, "Okay, my fursuit maker doesn't deserve this. You know, they've already been put through the ringer for shit that isn't true. There's no reason to rehash this for them." I already feel bad because mentioning this in this video is inevitably going to do that to some degree. But thankfully, at least this information is here, which is true, and anybody can fact-check this. And so I was at least going to message Nick being like, "Okay, dude, if you're going to make another video on this, just at least get that fact right." And then I realized that it's not just that Nick scrolled through the comment.

01:14:33 It's that the comment doesn't show up on any account but my own. So here, I've signed into a different account. We can see the same accusation. We scroll down... my defense is not there. It's been fucking removed. It shows up on the account that I posted it on, meaning it was shadowbanned. On any other account, you cannot find that comment. So Nick didn't even scroll through it intentionally. This comment was fucking removed.

01:15:35 So there is no fucking doubt in my mind at this point that Rob is planning a Part 2, and he's probably going to have that in the video. Or he wants other people to go, "Oh, wow, he commissioned his fursuit from a zoo sadist," and not have the response. Not have the, "Oh, that's not true," because these people are fucking lazy and they just go, "Oh, someone said a thing on a drama forum. Okay, I'll make a video about this." They don't understand what fucking primary sources are. They don't understand what research is. It's lazy, fucking content. It's lazy, sad content, and I just don't know why someone like Rob, who's trying to make a living off of this, would risk his credibility by including so many fucking factually inaccurate and very, very clearly intentionally misleading things, including not wanting to fucking change the video, like not wanting to just use the YouTube editor and blur a username.

01:16:53 Come on, why was it important to you? I still don't have an answer for that. Why was it important for you to knowingly direct minors towards my 18+ accounts, within the context of kink-shaming and describing in detail who's going into what hole and what race they are, and saying, "Here is where you should go find them"? Why was that important to you? I get why it's important to not set it to 18+—because then it's demonetized, right? Then you don't make as much money. That, I

get. But you could have just used the YouTube editor and kept it at the same age rating. Why was it important for you to do that? I need an answer for this because I don't see any explanation as to why that was important to keep, other than that the point was to direct traffic there.

01:17:55 How can you not just be like, "Oh, this is a thing that exists, and that's fine"? Like, yeah, people can search for it. Why do you need to show the username? I have my settings so that it doesn't fucking autofill or whatever. It's fucking insane. But anyway, you can all confirm this for yourself. If you're an adult, you can create a fake account on this website—that I'm not even going to say what it is, because I know that people can find it if they really want to, and I'm comfortable with adults finding it. I don't give a shit. I don't think people should have to be scared of their own bodies. I think that human beings' weird cultural taboo around sex and sexuality is just complete nonsense. It doesn't make any sense. Um, but yeah, you can confirm this for yourself.

01:18:50 I told Nick this. I told Nick he can do that. And yet he's on his stream going, "Uh-huh, yeah, as if just putting an emoji in your thing makes it 18+." This is a website for 13-year-olds." He's fucking deflecting to defend Rob. It's so fucking sad and it's so dishonest. And again, the most charitable interpretation is he somehow didn't read that part of the message, even though it was in the same message that he says he did read. Um, yeah, so that's what's happening. And I'm trying to think if there's anything else that's like... Oh yeah, here's another weird thing.

01:19:29 So, unfortunately, watching Nick's stream, because he's live-reacting to it, Nick doesn't acknowledge or understand the concept of using an edited video to create propaganda. I don't know if maybe he's just not that strong with editing or something, or he doesn't grasp the concept of deciding what to show, what not to show, the order, what to include... you know, things like poisoning the well. The whole premise of the video can be told through how you edit it and the information that you withhold. He just doesn't seem to have a grasp of that, because I can see as he's reacting to it, he's falling for and repeating many of the propaganda elements of the video in real time. So he's watching through it, and as it gets to the part where, in Rob's video, he's like, "YMS shows up and starts arguing with the creator of Kiwi Farms on a video about Kero the Wolf," Nick's response, as he's watching it, is just, "Yeah, dude, you shouldn't be. Why are you arguing on a video about Kero the Wolf?"

01:20:58 The context that was left out of the original video is that I'm not arguing about Kero the Wolf. I'm only in there because I was mentioned in the video, because people were comparing me. I think it was Null himself; this was a long time ago. I was only in there because people were trying to connect the dots, like Rob, and being like, "Here's a furry that's committed horrible acts"—which I agree are horrible acts, right? Torturing and raping fucking animals is horrible. I never disagreed with it. The only thing I've said is probably not harmful are the things that animal breeders do in that specific, you know, jerking off a dog or whatever, blah, blah, blah. Not anything to do with fucking Kero the Wolf.

01:21:47 And yet, the way that Rob's video is created, the way that it leaves out that context, I can see Nick reacting in real time and just believing blindly that I was in that video to argue about the ethics of Kero the Wolf. So I can see the propaganda working in real time from someone who's in the commentary community and doesn't have... like, I wish, you know, with your audience—it's not huge or anything—but you're a prominent voice in this community. How do you not see the ethical issue with withholding information like that and not giving the full context and creating your video in a way that intentionally—either maliciously or maliciously ignorant—creates a narrative specifically designed to paint me as an abuser? It intentionally leaves out why I was arguing in that comment section. It's because people were comparing me to him. They were comparing my thought crimes... saying like, "Oh, I don't think as many people should go to jail if there's not a harmful act being made or whatever." Who cares if I'm wrong about this? I'm not participating in it. I don't care. Oh, yeah, here's one other thing. So, yeah, Nick repeats that to his audience as if I'm in the video's comment section defending Kero the Wolf or something. And if he doesn't say that verbatim, he leaves it vague enough that he's doing the exact same thing that Rob is doing.

01:23:30 Oh fuck, what was I gonna say? There's so much. This is why I can't do the video frame-by-frame. It would take like fucking eight hours, and I don't have time right now. Um, one second, I'm just trying to remember where I was. What was I going to say? Olivia, edit this part out. Also, probably don't include yourself at the end. I think people are just going to shit on you. I don't think you deserve that. There are going to be a lot of people going to this video that are very angry. Yeah, sorry, shit. What was I going to say? Hold on. Yeah, okay. Well, this isn't what I was going to say, but I might as well say it.

01:24:51 All of my perspectives, every opinion that I've shared, is not coming from the kind of belief that, "Oh yeah, I want more animals or children or people to be abused." All of them are: "I want less of that." So if you disagree with me... oh yeah, I actually wound up getting to where I was going to go before. If you disagree with me on the way I view the world, as in, you just can't imagine what my perspective is... well, I can, because I know exactly what your arguments are, I think. But I don't know how to make sense of it. I don't know how to trick myself into believing that consensual activities between adults should result in imprisonment, even if they're activities that I find disgusting. You know, I don't think you should go to prison for having a scat fetish. I don't think you should go to prison for having an ABDL fetish. I don't think you should go to prison because you jerk it to fucking guro. How come that's always left out of the conversation?

01:26:00 Guro, like, if you look that shit up, those subreddits have like a hundred thousand people on them, of people that are attracted to like murder, but it's an anime or whatever. How come that's always left out of the conversation? I don't think you should go to jail for that. I don't think a hundred thousand people are actual murderers. I don't think everybody on that subreddit wants to kill someone. I should hope not. I just don't think that.

01:26:29 Anyway, the framing of both Rob's and now Nick's videos... they frame this as if me defending myself, me talking about these things online, is a form of public safety issue, because their perspective is that I'm normalizing people abusing animals, that I'm normalizing people abusing children. Somehow, their perspective is that I am normalizing these things, and therefore they need to blow it up more, which doesn't make any sense. Like, 90% of my responses have been on Reddit because that's where I've been harassed. 90% of my responses are on Reddit because people are talking about it there. So I'm not even blowing it up to other platforms. I'm responding on the platform that it's taking place on. I'm responding on YouTube right now, because you have brought it to YouTube.

01:27:44 If you believe that there is a public safety issue with my perspectives being out there, why are you promoting them? Why are you promoting them on your channel? Because if you hadn't fucking realized, sure, the bestiality ones I've been arguing about on Reddit because people bring it up every year.

01:28:08 But the loli shit, I haven't talked about it for a decade because, I guess, A) the political climate was different enough that nobody cared at the time, and then B) people forgot about it and are now bringing it up because the climate is so different that they know it's something that can be used to attack me. So if I haven't even talked about this subject for a decade, the loli shit at all, how is it that you're pretending as if there's some sort of urgency, like, "We need more people to shame this person, we need him to have his job taken away, no one should support him"?

01:28:50 "H3, blow this up." What? If you believe that these thoughts are harmful, that my perspectives are harmful, why are you promoting them? Why are you wanting more people to see them? I haven't talked about this shit unless people do this. If you truly believe what you're saying, then why do you want to blow it up? It's contradictory. So, yeah, there's a moral urgency to the fact that I answered questions honestly on a live stream 10+ years ago. There's a moral urgency towards that. "Something needs to be done about me." Fuck off. This is so stupid. You're a Karen. And don't pretend, don't respond being like, "Oh yeah, it's a Karen if I think that animals and children shouldn't be abused." Dude, you're a fucking Karen, because 90% of your video is just saying, "This guy's a furry." Yeah, you're a Karen. Come on, Jesus, holy shit. Anyway, so we're going to be dealing with this for a bit because, guaranteed, they're gonna make more, and I'm not gonna have the time or energy to respond to all of it. But at the very least, this video now exists. It's a new one. So, even though people could easily have linked the fucking one from five years ago when this happened, uh, this is the new one.

01:30:42 I guess a more thorough explanation of everything I've already said: completely harmless thought crimes that I myself don't even participate in. But my thought crime is believing that other people shouldn't be in jail for thought crimes. That's my thought crime. Yeah, to reiterate, having sex with children is bad. I don't want to see people having sex with animals. I would prefer people not to. I would say in most cases, it's probably bad. There are some ways in which it's probably not that bad. I don't know. Maybe not worth throwing someone in jail over. Again, the animal breeders... literally, this is a scientific thing, shouldn't be controversial. Um, oh yeah. And then, uh, someone's going to talk about my reaction.

01:32:02 I hope that if somebody compiles the drama—because now it's drama with me responding like this—I'm hoping that at the very least, their video doesn't omit important information and is actually charitable and faithful to me, and not just, "Oh, Rob's one of our own and blood's in the water now, and we have to punish you. We have to punish you for fighting back a little." Like, "10% of what Rob does on a daily basis is unacceptable, and we're gonna... His video was charitable. His video was just asking questions and being honest. Everything he got wrong isn't his own fault. He's just a little sweet boy."

01:32:43 It's not out of ignorance; it's not out of irresponsible content making. But yeah, anyway, they make sure to say that I'm friends with Anisa and iDubbz because, obviously, again, poisoning the well. It creates more of a narrative against me when you bring in two people that are hated by a lot of people on the internet

and whose dramas I've never involved myself in, outside of their first one, which was "Anisa has an OnlyFans," or whatever. And I said, "Who cares? It's consenting adults." That was the drama that I involved myself in. Anything they've done past that point, I don't want to fucking touch because why would I? I don't support them on everything they do. I don't support them on every decision they've made.

01:33:41 I'm also friends with fucking H3. I'm also friends with, uh, you know, a billion different conservative YouTubers. I'm friends with lefties, I'm friends with conservatives. Anybody who knew anything about me would know this. So, again, either the video was done with zero research and literally just, "Let's take a drama thread of people that are only posting everything that is trying to make him look bad," or you maliciously left out information. Like, "Ooh, here are these hated people. Let's pretend like Adam supports them in every way." I'll be friends with fucking anybody that's not a dick to me. So I don't know. It's just so stupid, malicious, either intentionally malicious or maliciously irresponsible. Oh yeah, also fucking, sorry, I'm just skimming through this right now.

01:34:47 The clip of me on *The Official Podcast* saying that I'm a "furfaggot"... again, without the context of what question was being asked. Because that's a podcast where their running gag every episode was, "What's the weirdest thing you've masturbated to?" And then my answer was an honest answer, talking about, "Okay, well, I'm a furry, so it's all going to be weird." But in the video, the question is not included. So then it just appears like, "Oh, I'm just oversharing all this shit for no reason."

01:35:25 If you know anything about my content, I don't really talk about furry shit that much on my main channel. Even in my *Lion King* video, I didn't go like, "Oh yeah, I want to fuck Scar," because I know people aren't subscribed for that shit. Just because I don't hide myself on other channels, I should be ashamed. Just because I have adult content on websites that allow adult content... fucking ridiculous. Very dumb.

01:36:01 I don't know if I covered everything. I don't know if it's possible to cover everything because this is a situation where, you know, the more people that comment on this—and there are going to be more; they've made it very clear that they're trying to get more people to comment on this—the more people that comment, the more I have to address. It's like, what is the Sam Harris argument about? You know, someone's lighting a small fire every fucking 10 seconds, but it takes 10 minutes to put out the fire. Yeah, there's not much I can do. So we're just going to have to fucking weather the storm.

01:36:41 I know that my core audience already knows everything that I've said in this video. It's not a surprise to anybody. I'm an ethical, morally consistent person, and my crime, I guess, now is that I fought back a little by saying things that aren't untrue to this person but were intentionally framed in a way where they would hopefully realize that it's a bad thing to do what they've done. But again, big difference between him and me: mine is attached to the full context. His is not. His omits it entirely.

01:37:29 So, anything else I should say? Does anybody have any other ideas for stuff that people will probably ask me about that I forgot? Since we're just... Is there anything else I should include? Did I forget something or not touch on it? Is it a coincidence that this all happened right during the Charlie Kirk... Oh, yeah, speaking of Charlie Kirk. Yeah, there was another thought in my head, like the moral urgency of me responding on Reddit, as if I'm Charlie Kirk or something. Rest in peace. As if I'm Charlie Kirk.

01:38:23 Don't, by the way, be careful what you say in chat. Don't say anything fucking weird. I'm just gonna say that right now. Okay, we don't want that because of it. Right? I'm not doing fucking tours being like, "Prove me wrong, people should have sex with animals." I'm just a guy who said something honestly in my early 20s when I was naive enough to think that the internet was a place where people could have intelligent, productive conversations on controversial, moral, philosophical issues with nuance. That's my fucking crime, and I've been defending myself ever since. And I only talk about it when people demand a fucking response. I'm not going on fucking book tours, going to college campuses. I'm not hosting panels; I'm not even applying for panels talking about this shit.

01:39:21 So to pretend as though my thoughts are a crime because they're dangerous, stop fucking promoting them then. Stop fucking promoting them. Anyway, all right. Is that it? Is there anything? Oh yeah, people are misinterpreting that, but here's the thing. Even the worst-case, most uncharitable interpretation of anything I've said is still, "Cancel him because he thinks X." Right? Even if it were the most uncharitable version of what I've said, that's still it. "He thinks X." Fuck off. Literally just Karen shit. Oh my God. All right. Well, I think that's it, right? We covered everything. Oh yeah.

01:40:27 And the only reason I'm mentioning this video now is because it is set to 18+, which was not a decision they made. It's because it got fucking dinged by YouTube community guidelines. And then in his community posts, he's saying that it was dinged for a completely other reason, and Nick just kind of believes him on that. Uh, he shows that, "Oh, the timestamp's wrong on the thing that they sent," which has happened to me a billion times. Like, anybody who's been on YouTube would know, if you get any kind of strike from YouTube, or if you get anything from YouTube, more often than not, the timestamp's wrong. When I got dinged for having 9/11 footage in one of my videos as a joke way back when, uh, I had to surf around because with the timestamp they provided, I was like, "What? That just leads to a random thing. What?" Then you have to surf around and be like, "Okay, this is probably the issue."

01:41:31 Either Rob doesn't understand that or he's coping and lying. It's kind of weird. I still legit don't understand. Why is it important for the username and description of those images, with the race of the people and who's penetrating who... why is that important? The only reason I can think of is that you want traffic directed there. That's the only reason I can think of. Anyway, um, yeah, whatever. Lame shit is going to keep coming, so maybe I'll just ignore it from here on out. I guess, I don't know. We'll have to see. No promises, because I don't fucking know what they're gonna do. But hopefully, yeah, hopefully other people that cover this—if they really feel like it's really important that they need to cover it—do it in a more charitable way than Nick did because that was just kind of sad and black-pilling, honestly. But all right, thank you. All right, what time is it?