Hi guys, it's Barry with a really exciting announcement for you.

As listeners of the show will know, one of the reasons that this exists in the first place

is to embody and promote honest, frank conversations and good faith debates,

both of which feel increasingly rare in our polarized country.

That is why I'm so excited to announce that the Free Press, along with FIRE,

the nation's leading defender of free speech rights, are hosting a live debate

on a very sexy and contentious subject on Wednesday, September 13th at 7 p.m.

at the historic Ace Theatre in downtown Los Angeles.

The proposition? The sexual revolution has failed.

Arguing for the proposition is co-host of the podcast Redscare,

Anacachian, and author of the case against the sexual revolution, Louise Perry.

They're going to be facing off against musician and producer Grimes,

and writer and co-host of the podcast A Special Place in Hell, Sarah Hader.

I'm going to be the moderator and I couldn't be more excited.

This is going to be an amazing night.

It's a chance to meet other people in the real world

who also like thinking for themselves and who listen to this show.

You can get your tickets now by going to thefp.com backslash debates.

Again, that's thefp.com slash debates.

I can't wait to meet some of you guys in person.

And now here's the show.

I'm Barry Weiss, and this is Honestly.

In 2016, former New Jersey governor Chris Christie was one of 17 Republicans in a crowded field trying to beat Donald Trump.

If you're listening to this, you're alive,

which means you know exactly how that movie ended.

One of the hard-won lessons of that primary, especially among Republicans, was this.

It was foolish not to unite right away behind the strongest horse.

If they had done that, perhaps Trump wouldn't have been the nominee and then the president.

Yet here we are in 2023, and we seem to be watching the same story play out in real time.

with 13 Republican candidates trying once again to outperform Trump.

And that's why I came back to New Hampshire to tell all of you

that I intend to seek the Republican nomination for president of the United States

in 2024, and I want your support.

And one of those people, once again, is Chris Christie.

But this time he says, trust me, I can write a new ending.

Christie not only believes that he can win the nomination,

but he believes he can win the nomination by going toe-to-toe with Donald Trump.

It's not amusing anymore, it's not entertaining anymore.

It is the last throes of a bitter, angry man who wants power back for himself.

Not for you.

Lonely, self-consumed, self-serving mirrorhog.

Christie's brand is the brash, straight-talking Jersey guy,

and he's more than living up to his reputation.

He's been absolutely brutal in his attacks on the former president.

If you believe what about them, what he said at the beginning, the great stuff,

then this guy is the worst manager in the history of the American presidency.

Either way, Republicans should listen to what he says.

He's a petulant child when someone disagrees with him.

But a lot of people hear him and think too little, too late.

And there is no one who is better prepared to provide America with the strong leadership

that it needs, both at home and around the world than Donald Trump.

The thing about Christie, you might remember, is that for a long time, he was very much a Trump cheerleader.

He'll provide strong, unequivocal leadership.

He will do what needs to be done to protect the American people, first and foremost,

both in the homeland and in creating jobs for this country.

And Donald Trump is someone who, when he makes a promise, he keeps it.

I've experienced that over my long friendship with him

and with the American people and our allies around the world.

In fact, a lot of people criticize Christie for making Trump happen in the first place.

Back in 2016, after Christie dropped out of the race,

he was the first establishment Republican and the first of any of the Republican governors or senators to endorse Donald Trump, which a lot of people say helped launch Trump to the nomination.

So on today's show, I asked Governor Christie to explain himself.

I asked him why he supported Trump in 2016 and again in 2020,

and what finally led him to break ranks.

I also asked him about whether this kind of rejection of Trump

resonates with the Republican base who doesn't seem to have moved on from Trump or Trumpism.

And last, why he wants to be President of the United States.

We'll be right back.

Hi, honestly, listeners. I'm here to tell you about an alternative investing platform called Masterworks.

I know investing in finance can be overwhelming, especially given our economic climate.

But there's one thing that will never go in the red,

and that is a painting from Picasso's Blue Period.

Masterworks is an exclusive community that invests in blue chip art.

They buy a piece of art, and then they file that work with the SEC.

It's almost like filing for an IPO.

You buy a share representing an investment in the art.

Then Masterworks holds the piece for three to 10 years.

and then when they sell it, you get a prorated portion of the profit's minus fees.

Masterworks has sold \$45 million worth of art to date from artists like Andy Warhol, Banksy, and Monet.

Over 700,000 investors are using Masterworks to get in on the art market.

So go to masterworks.com slash honestly for priority access.

That's masterworks.com slash honestly.

You can also find important Regulation A disclosures at masterworks.com slash cd.

Chris Christie, welcome to Honestly.

I'm happy to be on Honestly, Barry. Thanks for having me.

Really happy to have you.

Okay, three weeks ago, you announced that you were running for president,

making you one of 13 Republican candidates vying for the nomination.

And it's still very early, but Trump is polling far and ahead of everyone else at 50%.

DeSantis is next in line at something like 20%,

and then everyone else you included are pulling in the single digits right now.

So it looks like the race is going to be a contest, kind of like it was in 2016,

of who can successfully challenge Trump.

You are positioning yourself as the man for that job.

Why do you think you singularly, uniquely are that person?

Well, I think the first reason is who I am and the way I have governed and campaigned before.

I'm known for being very direct, very straightforward.

I say exactly what I think. I don't mince words.

And I governed in a very blue state as a Republican for eight years and got a lot of things done.

And so I think that's what the American people I think are hoping for,

is to have somebody who can actually go to Washington and get something done,

rather than have all the tumult and drama and incompetence that we've had over the last six and a half years.

So I think that's why I'm uniquely positioned to be the right person.

And I seem to be the only person on the Republican side

who's willing to take on Donald Trump directly.

And I got to tell you, Barry,

I don't know how you beat somebody if you're not willing to take them on.

And I think all these other people are waiting for some divine intervention.

Off from New Jersey, we don't wait for divine intervention.

You know, we make things happen.

Well, to give them sort of the strongest possible argument,

I think people like Nikki Haley, Tim Scott, Mike Pence,

they would probably argue, we're playing this smarter than you.

In other words, why alienate the base?

The smart politics is to sort of sidestep the issue.

And you are Chris Christie.

You are plain spoken.

You are not doing that.

You're going on places like CNN calling Trump a petulant child,

a lonely, self-consumed, self-serving mirror hog,

a bitter and angry man, and a disappointment.

Just the other day you added to that,

he is the cheapest SOB I've ever met in my life.

Now, these things have made you a darling among a lot of people I know,

a lot of liberals, a lot of Democrats.

Some of them are saying you're kind of like the Liz Cheney of the race,

but Liz Cheney lost recently.

So talk to me about why this is smart politics,

why you're seeing something that the other people in your lane,

like Haley, like Scott, like Pence, don't see.

Well, first off, it's the truth.

So let's start there.

And by the way, all of them will say these things in whispers

off the record and behind the scenes.

And I'm sure that some of them have even said that to you.

Of course.

So that's the first thing.

How about we tell the truth and reestablish in our politics in this country

that the truth matters?

Secondly, as a piece of strategy, I just go back to eight years ago.

Everyone took the same position that Haley and Scott and Pence are taking now,

and to Santa's to a large extent, which was we'll fight it out amongst ourselves

and then one of us will emerge and we'll be the one on one,

and then we'll take on Trump.

And by the time me, Marco Rubio, Jeb Bush, and John Kasich got done fighting with each other,

Trump had already won the nomination.

There is not multiple lanes to the Republican nomination.

There's one lane, and Donald Trump's at the head of that lane.

And you either go through him or he runs over you.

And so I don't think this is very complicated at all,

based upon recent experience that you've got to go right at him.

And are there risks associated with that?

Of course, but there are risks associated with any strategy that you pursue politically.

All right, let's talk a little bit about the criticism you're going to get.

And that you're already getting.

And the word for it is hypocrisy or maybe political opportunism.

And that's because you famously endorsed Trump in 2016,

well before a lot of leaders in your party.

I want to read back to you some of the things you said about Trump in 2016.

We have a man who is unafraid.

We have a man who wants to lead us.

We have a man who understands the frustrations and the aspirations of our fellow citizens.

You said he's rewriting the playbook of American politics

because he's providing strong leadership that isn't dependent on the status quo.

You said Donald Trump is someone who when he makes a promise.

Donald Trump is someone who when he makes a promise, he keeps it.

He keeps it.

I've experienced that over mine.

You called him not only a strong leader, but a caring, genuine and decent person.

We have a man who judges people based on their performance,

regardless of your gender, your race, your ethnic or religious background.

I could go on, but it honestly makes me uncomfortable.

Looking back, how do you explain comments like those?

Well, first off, because I had concluded, Barry, that he was going to be the nominee after the South Carolina primary, no matter what.

And I didn't want Hillary Clinton to be president.

And so my view was, given the relationship I had had with him over 15 years, which those comments reflect the nature of our relationship during those years,

I felt like I could make him a better candidate and a better president.

I was wrong about that, but that's what I felt at the time.

That's why I said what I said.

And I don't have any regrets about it.

And I just turned out to be wrong.

So you decide to endorse Trump, and then we live through the first term,

a term that was more than enough for many Republicans to say, I'm out.

But then comes 2020.

And again, you endorse Trump.

Not only that, you helped him prep for the debate.

I believe you played Joe Biden.

I did. I played Hillary Clinton in 16 too.

Why? I'm sure you were an excellent Hillary.

Well, it's one I'd probably keep you up at night, Barry, but yeah, it was pretty good.

Look, because again, American politics isn't about voting for who you want to vote for.

It's about voting for who's left.

And I felt like Joe Biden was too old to be president.

I didn't agree with his policies.

And I didn't think he'd be a good president.

So I stayed with Donald Trump.

And I stayed with him until election night 2020,

when he came out and said the election was stolen.

And it was that night on ABC.

This kind of thing, all it does, is in flame without informing.

And we cannot permit inflammation without information.

Then I broke from him and we haven't really had a relationship since.

Why was that the breaking point for you?

Because to me, that was the president of the United States

using the trappings that had been given to him by the people of this country

to create doubt for them on the fairness of our democracy.

And to me, that just went beyond anything that he had done or said before.

If you're the president and you undercut our democracy with no basis in fact, that was when he jumped a shark for me.

And I was done.

Chris, during a CNN town hall earlier this month, you said this about Trump.

You said he has shown himself, particularly in his post presidency,

to be completely self-centered, completely self-consumed,

and doesn't give a damn about the American people.

And I heard you say that.

And I think like many Americans, I thought to myself,

duh, the self-centeredness, the narcissism,

the fact that he feels this is about him,

and clearly not about some higher moral or political calling or patriotic duty.

That has been obvious to anyone with eyes from the beginning with this guy.

And you have eyes.

You have very sharp ones.

You knew all of this about his character because anyone that cared to look could see it.

Convince me that you only came to see that about this man

after he was trying to deny the election in 2020.

It's not that I didn't know that Donald was self-consumed before,

but look, everybody who's in politics has an ego.

My view on it, Barry, was that at that point,

it now was enormously damaging to the country.

And when that type of self-consumption, that type of self-absorption,

now leads to the country being really damaged,

which is what I feel like he did on election night,

and in all the conduct he's engaged in in the post-election period,

that to me was the moment when I could no longer support him.

It wasn't that I didn't recognize some of those things about him before,

but what I didn't see starkly until that night was how that was going to manifest itself in undercutting people's confidence in our democracy.

And he only did it because his ego wouldn't permit him to admit that he had lost.

To me, that's when the line was jumped for me.

I recognize, Barry, that everybody has a different moment.

They have different sensibilities.

They have different ways that they make these decisions.

So I'm not saying my decision was the right one for everybody,

but I'm being honest about when it happened for me.

And that's when and why.

Okay, here's how I would see it.

I'm obviously not a psychologist,

but if I had to put you on the couch, I would say this.

Okay, here we go.

Here we go.

You have real regrets about supporting him,

and some would say kind of making a deal with the devil.

And you simply cannot abide living in a country in which this man becomes president of the United States again.

And so you are the guy willing to throw yourself on top of the grenade.

Even though you're currently pulling in the single digits,

it doesn't matter to you because you're going to do everything possible.

Pick your metaphor, throwing yourself on the grenade,

being a kamikaze pilot, to try and undo what I think you deeply regret.

In general, would you say that that's right?

You know, I think there are parts of it that are right, Barry.

I think I came to the conclusion during his post-presidency

that he could never be president again.

And I was hoping that there would be others who were willing to take the case right to him.

Because I'd run for president before I was not pining to run for president again.

I had, you know, been involved in politics and in public life for 20 years,

and I wasn't thrilled at this point to have to like change my life all over again

to get into the presidential race.

But the race started to come together,

and I could see nobody was willing to take him on directly.

I thought that was bad for the country and bad for my party.

And I thought it was dumb politically.

Now, the one thing I'll disagree with you on,

or one of the things I'll disagree with you on is like,

look, Donald Trump eight years ago was in single digits right now.

He's at 4% at the end of June of 2015.

So there's a long way to go here, and I think I'm going to beat him.

This is not just a mission for me to stop Donald Trump.

It's to stop Donald Trump in order to be president of the United States.

because I think I'm the best person in this race to be president.

So yes, I'm intent on stopping him,

but that is not my goal solely and exclusively.

It is also to win the Republican nomination and then beat Joe Biden in November 24.

Okay, let's talk about the path to victory then.

We've established that your strategy is taking it to Trump,

going against him as hard as possible.

This week, you said,

crybabies and losers say life isn't fair and Trump is both,

which I thought I particularly liked that one of your various barbs.

That sounds a lot like Christie, the presidential candidate in 2016,

before you dropped out of the race and endorsed Trump.

And your strategy in that primary was very similar.

Back then, you called him a carnival barker.

You said he wasn't suited to be president and on and on.

Tell us why it's going to work this time around when it didn't work in 2016.

Because in 2016, nobody really knew him, right?

I mean, no one knew what kind of president he would be,

how he would manage a White House and a federal government.

He had no record.

So any of the promises he made,

you couldn't really objectively judge whether they were going to happen.

I knew that he was not going to finish the wall and have Mexico pay for it.

And I said that, but try to prove that he couldn't

when he had never been in office before.

So I think what's different this time is,

people have now seen seven years of this puppet show.

And they know what it's all about.

There's not a lot of mystery anymore about Donald Trump.

And I think now making the case against him becomes much easier for that reason than it was eight years ago.

I think the hard thing is that Trump thrives when he's attacked.

He seems to get stronger when people go after him.

Mar-a-Lago is raided by the FBI.

Trump's numbers go up.

He's indicted in New York.

Numbers go up again.

Stormy Daniels sheds light on the scandal in 60 minutes.

Numbers among male voters go up.

I could go on and on and on.

According to this poll released in April from NPR,

63% of Republicans say they want Trump to serve another term as president even if he's found guilty of a crime.

So why do you believe that you can win over his voter base with criticism

when criticizing him somehow always seems to strengthen him?

That's criticism from people that Republicans view as natural enemies of theirs,

like the media, like the punditry world.

That's what they see that as.

Donald Trump's never run in a primary where someone relentlessly and like a prosecutor laying out the facts have gone after him.

And by the way, as you pointed out in the first part of this interview,

not someone who was a never-trumper, but somebody who had actually worked for him and helped him are now making these criticisms.

I think that makes it a lot different.

Now look, Barry, I could turn out being wrong, but I don't think I am.

And I tell you this much, not going after him.

We've already tried that.

That hasn't worked either.

So it may be that nothing works,

but the only way you find that out is in the midst of a campaign.

And that's what I'm going to do.

Fair enough.

But earlier in this conversation, you mentioned that one of the lessons of 2016

was that there were all these people sort of duking it out.

Trump pulled ahead.

And I think looking back, a lot of Republicans would say,

we should have united very quickly behind a Trump alternative

in order to have the best chance of beating him.

People are looking at a field now of 13 people

and worried, I think, that they're watching the same movie with a very bad ending again.

And that anyone that's not pulling, at least in the double digits,

should pull out and unify behind whoever the strongest horse is.

What do you say to that argument?

Well, first of all, I don't think we've determined who the strongest horse is yet.

The campaign just has barely started.

I've been in it for three weeks.

Secondly, I think there are going to be some moments here

where people are naturally going to fall away.

So for instance, first debate in August,

if you don't qualify for the debate stage,

it's very hard to continue in the race.

So I think you'll have some of those 13 fall away,

then who don't make the stage.

Then after a few debates,

if you don't really catch fire in one of those debates,

I think your fundraising is going to become very difficult and going to dry up,

and you may have to get out then.

So I don't think we'll have anywhere near 13 people

when we get to Iowa, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Nevada, the first four.

And things will consolidate naturally then.

Also what may happen is someone may emerge

who really catches people's imagination and attention

that we do want to consolidate behind.

And if that happens, then I think the other candidates will look at that really strongly

and see that perhaps it's the right way to go.

But there's certainly nobody at this point who has shown themselves

in these early parts to be a good enough strong enough candidate that,

oh boy, I got to get out because I have to get behind filling the black.

Okay, let's talk a little bit about your strange present reality.

And the way I think about it with you is there's kind of a split screen,

Chris Christie life, right?

On the one hand, you have the legacy press,

which is having a love affair with you.

There have been four columns in the New York Times alone,

just about your campaign launch.

And then you go, as you did last week,

and speak at an evangelical conference in D.C.

Why am I running for president of the United States?

I'm running because he's let us down.

Definitely Republicans and conservative voters there.

Any of the faults that he has and any of the things that he's done,

and that is not leadership, everybody.

That is a failure of leadership.

And I, you could boo all you want.

But here's the thing, our faith teaches us.

And the crowd booze you when you criticize Donald Trump from the stage.

You know, I would say in general,

a good litmus test for a winning Republican candidate is the New York Times hating you, not the New York Times loving you.

So what do you make of that reality?

I think everybody responds well to the truth, Barry.

And if you listen to the speech to faith and freedom last Friday,

you should conclude two things, I think.

One is that I'm going to say what I want to say to whatever group I'm in front of,

and I'm not going to mold my answers to try to pander to that group.

And secondly, there was a good amount of applause in that group, too.

If you go back and watch the video, there was a good amount of applause.

At the same time, some people were booing.

So I expected to get booed by people who are completely enamored with Donald Trump.

If I said anything negative to them, but what they heard was the truth.

And for many of them, not all of them, but for many of them, it's going to make them think.

And that's all you can expect to do as a candidate when you go into any room,

is to hope that you say some things that make people think.

If you go into a room where everybody's already for you, what's the use?

They're already for you.

It's a waste of time.

But are you saying the New York Times is having a love affair with you right now

because they love the truth?

No, I'm saying the New York Times is having a love affair with me right now

because they don't like Donald Trump.

And they think that someone needs to go after him and I am.

But that's not why I'm doing it.

I'm doing it because it's the truth.

Now, why they're writing nice things about me is totally, you know, you have to ask them.

But I suspect it's because I'm going after Trump and they don't like Trump.

Chris, I want to read something that Michelle Goldberg wrote about you this month, progressive columnist at the Times.

She said this,

Christie's problem is that he's running for the nomination of a party that no longer exists.

That Republican party is dead.

By backing Trump in 2016, Christie helped kill it.

So it's hard to figure out what he thinks he's up to,

even if his Kamikaze attacks on the ex-president are fun to watch.

Harsh.

But, you know, according to a recent CNN poll, 60% of respondents say they wouldn't support your nomination under any circumstances.

So how do you win the nomination?

Sorry to repeat the question, but I really want to get a convincing answer to this.

How do you win the nomination?

Well, not just rejecting Trump, but also kind of pitching

a wholesale rejection of Trumpism to the base.

It's not a wholesale rejection of what Trump did.

I favor the tax cuts he passed.

I favor the regulation reforms he put in place.

I favor the Abraham Accords and what he did in terms of negotiating those agreements in the Middle East.

You know, it's not a wholesale rejection of everything that he did.

In fact, there's lots of things that he didn't do that should be done,

but he couldn't accomplish them.

And look, with all due respect to Michelle Goldberg, you know,

I didn't destroy the existing Republican Party.

This is a liberal misunderstanding of it.

Donald Trump is a compelling figure.

Whether you like him or not, he is a compelling figure.

And people in the party are following at the moment this compelling figure.

I do not think there has been a fundamental change to the Republican Party.

I think if Donald Trump were to lose this primary, he would no longer be a major influence on the party or on the country.

He is because he hasn't been defeated inside his own party as of yet.

He's only been defeated by Joe Biden.

So I don't believe that we destroyed that party and it's gone.

I think Michelle would like to think that because I think she hopes that what that means is that there really is no Republican Party worth competing with anymore.

And Democrats will be completely in control.

So we disagree fundamentally on her premise of what she said.

And as for the rest of it, I'll take a compliment from anybody.

I don't care.

But people will know what's behind them, what motivates those compliments.

And hers are motivated by a dislike for Donald Trump.

Kind of the enemy of my enemy is my friend approach.

How can you say, though, that this isn't a transformed Republican Party?

I mean, I think about-

No, no, no.

It is different now.

She's saying the other elements of the party are gone and they've been destroyed.

And that's what I disagree with.

Of course, a party is going to change every time they have a new leader.

George W. Bush presided over a very different Republican Party

than his father or Bob Dole did.

It doesn't mean that those people went away.

It's just that people are singing out of a different hymnal because the leader is different.

So my argument is not saying that the party is not different today than it was eight years ago.

My point, though, is that that always is an evolving and changing standard

based upon who they wind up ultimately picking to be their leader.

If they pick Donald Trump to be the leader of the party again,

well, then the party will not be transformed at this time.

But I don't think there's a comparable figure to Donald Trump that would inherit that mantle.

Well, a lot of people at the beginning of this race

assumed that that person was going to be Ron DeSantis.

A few months ago, he was the name on everyone's lips.

He was the guy that everyone said was going to unseat Trump.

And yet, here's how I see it.

He's spent the past few months in this doom loop

in a kind of endless, unwinnable culture war with Disney.

And his favorability among Republicans has dropped by 19 points in something like six months.

What lessons do you draw from his trajectory?

I think it's less important what lessons I draw

and more important what lessons he's going to draw, if any.

In the end, people are who they are.

And what the American people want more than anything in their politicians right now is authenticity and to be who they are truly in their heart and their mind.

And I think that Governor DeSantis has had some real trouble in conveying who he really is because he's put out a lot of contradictory stuff, right?

So like he says to Tucker Carlson, the Ukraine war is a territorial dispute,

minimizing it because Tucker is a fill-in-the-mote-and-pull-up-the-drawbridge kind of guy.

Then he goes and he gives an interview to Piers Morgan,

who has a very different feeling on America's role in the world.

And he says that Putin is a murderous dictator and a war criminal.

Well, it's one or the other.

You know, the person who is prosecuting a territorial dispute is not a war criminal.

And someone who's a war criminal is not prosecuting a territorial dispute.

I think that there's been some real confusion among voters who read his resume and expected one thing, but when he started to come out on the campaign trail, got something that was inconsistent with that. And the last thing I'd say is running for president is hard.

Governing a red state with a red legislature not nearly as hard.

Do you also think there's a likability issue that it's so clear when you watch certain politicians?

And I think Trump is one of them. Like Trump clearly likes pressing the flesh.

He likes meeting people. He likes being in the mix.

And you watch Ron DeSantis and you just really don't get that feeling.

How much of it is just that?

Well, that's what I've observed. I mean, I don't know him at all.

I think we've met twice, which also probably tells you something that we don't know each other.

And I've been a major figure in the Republican Governors Association now for 14 years.

And I think I know every other Republican governor better than I know Ron DeSantis.

So people are going to make their judgments about his personality and such.

I can't make a judgment up close because I don't know him all that well.

But from afar, certainly he doesn't seem to be a happy warrior.

His whole campaign has really been built around two things.

One, I was reasonable and I kept Florida open during COVID,

which I think is a hugely winning message.

And then endless culture war stuff.

And I wonder if you think that the sort of elites within your party have overplayed their hand on this topic.

And the reason I wanted to ask you that is when I look at your platform,

you're actually very moderate on many of the red meat culture war topics

that seem to be animating other candidates.

You recently said that you don't think state governments should ban gender transition surgery for minors, which is a very big departure from the majority of other candidates in the field.

Trump, for example, said he would punish doctors who provide that kind of treatment to minors.

DeSantis has made it his mission to make that kind of care close to impossible in Florida.

You've said that you believe climate change is real and at least partially manmade.

Trump has mocked climate change, saying it's a concept created by and for the Chinese in order to make US manufacturing non-competitive.

DeSantis has called it a pretext for left wing stuff.

You don't support a federal abortion ban.

I could go on and on.

Tell me how you think those kind of positions will play with the base,

or is the answer simply, hey, that's what I believe in the Chips will fall where they may?

Well, if they're presented the way you just presented them,

then they probably wouldn't do all that well.

But on the transgender issue, for instance, my view is that is a decision for parents to make

for their child, not for a governor to make for a family.

And I don't believe that the government should be making those kind of family decisions.

My view is not that it's something that I favor.

It's that I think that parents are the people best situated to make judgments for their children.

And I think every time we get government in the middle of that type of family conversation with a child, we're messing it up.

And I think we should trust parents.

So it's my distrust of government and my trust for parents.

Now, is every government worthy of mistrust?

No.

And is every parent worthy of trust?

No.

But I think the majority of parents are worthy of trust.

And when you look at most governments who get involved in those kind of issues, they get them wrong.

I'm pro-life, and I believe in exceptions for rape, incest, and life for the mother.

But as a conservative, I've been arguing for 50 years that Roe was wrongly decided and that it should be up to the people in the individual states

to make a judgment as to what the law is on abortion.

We've been arguing that as conservatives for 50 years, we get it finally a year ago in Dobs.

And now we're saying, OK, let the federal government take over.

To me, it's logically inconsistent.

What I'm for is letting each state and their people make a judgment as to what the law should be regarding abortion.

And then the federal government, when all 50 states have weighed in on this,

which I think all 50 states are going to weigh in no later than 24 or 25 at the latest,

but probably by 2024, everyone will have weighed in,

then the federal government should take a look and see if there's a consensus.

Is there a national consensus on a certain number of weeks that an abortion should be legal or when it should be illegal?

Then the federal government can step in, if they want to,

to make a unifying decision on this.

But not until the states have had an opportunity,

and most importantly, the people in those states to weigh in.

We've been arguing that for a long time.

I think a lot of voters will hear what you're saying right now and be like,

yeah, this guy seems commonsensical.

This guy sounds moderate and like he takes things issue by issue

and like he's not an ideologue.

And in a country where I'm sick of tribalism and political extremes,

I like that message.

But I think a Republican campaign manager would say,

yeah, might win in a general, can't win in a primary,

has to tack to the right in order to win over those voters.

What do you say to that?

I don't believe that because I think it's a pro-life position

that says consistently with what pro-life folks like myself have been saying for a long time, which is the state should make this decision.

There's not a federal right in the Constitution.

And so that's the way I view it.

And I think that's the way a majority of Americans view it.

And I think even Republicans look at this and say,

let's give each state an opportunity to weigh in and do what needs to be done to form a national consensus.

Because if we try to impose it in the same way that Roe was imposed on the country, it's very hard to unify a country when that happens.

I want to talk for a second about how the Republican Party is changing.

If you look at Asian Americans, and this is a group that used to lean Democrat,

shifting rightward, 34% of Asian Americans are now identifying as Republican.

Latinos are moving rightward.

Working class voters are moving to the right.

If you become the leader of your party,

how do you think about the future of the GOP and its ability to continue

to win over these groups who stereotypically were very much thought of as being Democratic shorebets?

Well, I think we're in part winning over them by the Democrats moving away from them.

And I think secondly, we need to talk about issues that affect their lives.

So for instance, one of the things I'll be spending a lot of time talking about in this campaign is educational choice for parents, regardless of their socioeconomic status.

Look, my wife and I, I went to public school, Barry K through 12.

And so I thought our kids were going to go to public school because that's what I had done.

But my wife went to Catholic school and she thought they were going to Catholic school.

Well, all four of them went to Catholic school.

So, you know, who runs things in my house.

But the point is we had the chance to make that decision.

And the basis for the decision ultimately was we wanted them to go to a school where the values that we were trying to teach them every day at home were being reinforced in the classroom.

But we had the money to do that, Barry.

We had the money to pay our property taxes, which support the education system, and to pay separate tuition to Catholic elementary schools and then Catholic high schools for our kids to go.

It shouldn't just be my choice.

And especially when you look at our inner city schools and how badly they're failing those families, those parents should not be forced to accept failure for their kids. And so I think the more we talk about that, that's going to draw African American

and Hispanic families to us as well, because they're the ones predominantly who are being shortchanged on education.

Okay, so the first Republican debate is on August 23rd.

You need 40,000 donors to get on the debate stage.

How are you going to do that and how far along are you today?

We're quite far along today.

I guess it was a week and a half ago we announced that we had already had 15,000 donors.

We are going to get beyond 40,000, and I think we're going to get there well before

August 20th, which I think is the deadline for us to submit the proof of our donors.

So that's going to be fine.

I think the way to do it, Barry, is not complicated.

It's to appear on the Honestly Podcast and say that people should go to chrischristy.com and donate a dollar or \$5 or whatever they want, up to \$3,300 if they like what they're hearing. Every media outlet that I go on, whether it's an outstanding podcast like this one or whether it's one of the network news shows or whether it's a cable news show or a radio station, you continue to pound away at that so when people hear something they like,

they can grab their phone and go to the website and donate.

And I think that's the way you do it.

I don't think it's a lot.

It's very complicated, but you have to have a message that people are motivated by.

We're going to find out if people are motivated by my message.

I think we already are.

And we're doing very, very well in terms of getting those donors.

And I have no doubt in my mind that we'll be well above \$40,000 by the time we get to August.

And what happens if Trump doesn't show up to the debate?

I will shame him into showing up.

And quite frankly, he owes it to his voters and to all the voters in the Republican Party to show up in debate.

If he wants the honor of being the Republican nominee for president,

he has an obligation to show up at those debates.

But you know, oh, it's not fair.

It's not fair to me.

I'm so far ahead.

Why should I let people talk about me?

Because you decided to run for president.

That's why.

And you have to engage in this stuff.

And the American people and the Republican Party voters have a right to hear you and to compare you side by side with the other people offering themselves.

So we'll continue to make that argument.

And guite frankly, I think he'll show up because I don't think his ego permit him not to.

After the break, I asked Governor Christie about political corruption,

whether the grift inside the Trump or Biden family is worse.

And then where he stands on some of the issues voters care most about,

the economy, education, immigration, and foreign policy,

plus his favorite Bruce Springsteen song.

We'll be right back.

All right, let's talk a little bit about corruption in politics,

which is, I think, an issue that feels very urgent to people,

whether or not they're on the right or on the left.

Your background, of course, is as a federal prosecutor.

You served as U.S. Attorney for New Jersey from 2002 to 2008,

during which you made public corruption your highest priority.

And in 2004, you famously prosecuted Charles Kushner, Jared Kushner's father,

who ended up pleading guilty to 16 counts of assisting

in the filing of false tax returns, and I could go on.

That case was full of really sordid details.

For those who don't remember,

Kushner had hired a prostitute to seduce his brother-in-law, videotaped it,

and then sent the videotape to his sister

to try and intimidate her from testifying before a grand jury.

At the time, you called Kushner's case one of the most loathsome,

disgusting crimes you had ever prosecuted.

First question is, how did that experience affect your ability

to work inside the Trump White House and with Jared specifically?

Fundamentally.

It's certainly one of the reasons why I never did.

Not because I wasn't offered jobs.

I was offered plenty.

I was offered Secretary of Labor twice.

I was offered Secretary of Homeland Security.

I was offered White House Chief of Staff.

And I was offered a few different ambassadorships.

But I just did not think it was ever tenable

for me to go inside the White House

or inside the administration to work for two reasons.

One, because of Jared Navonca's regular sniping at me inside the building.

And secondly, because I just didn't think Donald Trump was someone

that I could survive working for,

because he wanted you to agree with him all the time.

And I knew that I wouldn't, and that I wouldn't hold my tongue.

And so, you know, it was something that was bound for failure, so why do it?

You've said of the Trumps, the grift from this family is breathtaking.

What is the most egregious grift in your mind?

Is it the \$2 billion investment from the Saudi crown prince

in a deal with Jared Kushner's private equity firm?

What's the worst of all of the corruption?

Yeah, well, the \$2 billion from the Saudis is breathtaking.

That this is a guy who Donald Trump affirmatively sent to the Middle East regularly

to interact with the Saudis and other countries in the Middle East.

Allowing him to overshadow both secretaries of state

and act as a shadow secretary of state in the same way he acted as a shadow chief of staff.

And then six months after he leaves the White House,

magically he gets \$2 billion from the Saudi sovereign wealth fund.

I mean, I think we know there's no magic there.

And it certainly wasn't because he's a great real estate investor.

Remember, he's the one who bought 666 Fifth Avenue

and nearly bankrupted his entire family.

But the other grift that's really bothering me right now,

and it's been an ongoing one, is Donald Trump taking money from middle class Americans who think they're giving him the money to support his campaign for president.

And he's now taking that money and using it as a billionaire to pay his own lawyers.

It's disgusting.

But this is Donald.

As I said, he's the cheapest SOB I've ever met in my life.

He's just better at spending other people's money than he is at his own.

And frankly, this is why he went bankrupt three different times in New Jersey

in the casino business, because he would borrow other people's money,

run through it, and then not pay it back.

In this instance, he's taking money from middle class people,

working hard, sending him 25, 50, 100 bucks multiple times a year to his website.

And he has the audacity while he's sitting on billions of dollars

according to him of his own personal wealth

to not use that personal wealth to pay his personal legal fees,

but to use the money of middle class Americans too.

That's a grift.

You're, of course, referring to the reporting that came out this week

that Trump is funneling 2024 political donations into his legal defense fund.

I mean, there's so many Trump stories right now.

They're hard to follow.

Of course, the most recent is this indictment for the second time,

this time in Florida, this time much more serious for not only storing state secrets,

but lying to the government about it, lying to his lawyers about it.

I mean, it's an absolutely stunning case.

And if you read it, you think this guy is dead to rights.

And yet a lot of conservatives, a lot of Republicans,

including some smart ones, are saying, yeah, maybe it's bad,

but this is evidence of a corrupt deep state that targets people on the right.

Hillary wasn't prosecuted.

She did crimes too.

How do you respond to that argument?

Made by so many people on your side of political aisle?

In two ways.

First of all, I agree with them that Hillary should have been prosecuted.

I said that at the time in 2016.

I think the fact that she wasn't prosecuted is a stain on Loretta Lynch and on Jim Comey and the Obama Justice Department.

And it was partisan decision.

Secondly, though, it has absolutely nothing to do with Donald Trump's conduct.

He did all the things you just said that were alleged in the indictment.

And he's admitted this now to Brett Baer on a TV interview.

I'm sure his lawyers were jumping out the window when he was doing that.

But he admitted that he knowingly took these documents.

He knowingly obstructed the government from getting them back.

His excuse in front of Brett Baer was that he was too busy playing golf

to be able to go through all the boxes and separate the documents

from his golf shirts and golf pants.

Does anybody in their right mind believe that?

When you read in the indictment that when he finally did turn over some of the documents,

many of which he hid from his own lawyer, so his lawyer couldn't turn them over,

he said to his lawyer, you know, if there's any bad documents in there,

just pick them out before you give them to the government.

I mean, that has nothing to do with Hillary Clinton.

Should Hillary Clinton have been prosecuted?

Absolutely she should have been.

What she did was criminal as well.

But you don't fix a broken criminal justice system by giving someone else a pass.

You fix a broken criminal justice system by fixing it and making sure the next person

doesn't get a pass for political reasons or sympathy reasons.

You enforce the law without fear or favor or partisanship.

And I will tell you, Barry, that's why I loved being U.S. Attorney

more than any other job I've ever had.

Because all you had to do every day was figure out what the right thing to do was and do it.

And that's what should be done.

You're basically saying two wrongs don't make a right.

Yeah, I think our parents taught us that.

And I think it's very complicated.

Let's talk about the Bidens, which is just another unbelievable story.

Last week, after a five-year investigation, Hunter Biden reached a plea agreement

in which he admitted to two misdemeanor tax charges and a felony gun possession.

Kevin McCarthy said of the deal,

if you are the president's leading political opponent,

the DOJ tries to literally put you in jail and give you prison time.

But if you're the president's son, you get a sweetheart deal.

Talk to me about how you see that case,

the level of corruption that seems endemic in the Biden family and the double standard.

Look, it's hard to argue with the fact that this is a sweetheart deal.

First off, it took five years to do two misdemeanor tax counts and to divert a gun charge.

I mean, that's ridiculous.

In my old office, I would have had a junior AUSA's working on this case,

and they would have gotten through it in a year or a year and a half.

So what that tells you is that there were other things they were investigating.

And I think we need to know what those were and why they came to the conclusions that they did.

And part of the problem is because all of this stuff has been out there in the public stream.

So people know a lot and they want to know what's true

and they want to know if this was done fairly.

It appears to me that Hunter Biden was undercharged.

It appears to me that they gave him a deal that was too sweet.

And I love Democrats, Barry, who want more and more gun laws,

but then don't want to enforce the gun laws that are on the books

if it involves a Democrat or a Democrat's son.

That's outrageous.

This guy was a drug addict who lied on his application for a gun, got the gun permit, got the gun, and then left the gun unattended and mishandled it and misused it.

That should be prosecuted and he should go to jail.

So I think people are right to be angry about it.

I think that the U.S. Attorney in Delaware, Mr. Weiss, has a lot to answer for.

And I think what these whistleblowers have brought up needs to be investigated.

And whether it's another special counsel or whether it's the Department of Justice,

another element of it investigating it, and we also need congressional oversight, all those things need to be done.

Okay. The U.S. just announced that we're sending another military aid package to Ukraine totaling, I think this one's \$500 million.

You believe that we need to continue to provide support to Ukraine because of what it represents.

You've said we're in a proxy war right now with China.

And whether we like it or not, China's support of Russia is proof of that.

And by supporting Ukraine, we're sending a clear message to the Chinese and to our own allies that America's not going to be a cut and run country.

I agree with that view strongly.

But this view sets you apart from many people in the Republican base.

There's a recent poll that suggested that a majority of registered Republicans said that they oppose funding Ukraine any further.

What do you say to a Republican base who watched the failed wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that has dramatically pivoted back to its more isolationist roots?

Make the case to them that supporting Ukraine is in the American interest.

Well, a few ways.

First, in Afghanistan and Iraq, there were American boots on the ground there.

That's not the case in Ukraine, nor would I support that.

Secondly, the Ukrainians have shown an ability, if armed appropriately,

to be able to fight back hard against the Russians.

And we should want that because we don't want a Russian dictatorship

having a greater influence in the world.

Third, America never, never gets more powerful, wealthier,

more successful by going small.

It's by going big.

And big here is making sure that you support Ukraine completely

because the thing that makes us different around the world and always has Barry,

at least in the post-World War II era, are our friendships around the world and our alliances.

And if our allies believe that they can't count on us when they're in need,

well, then they're going to go to somebody who will.

And in this instance, it's most likely to be the Communist Party of China.

And I don't believe that any of us think we'd be living in a better world,

a safer world, a freer world, a more prosperous world

that's dominated by the Communist Chinese.

So every one of these times we've had this opportunity,

it's involved sacrifice, whether it's going all the way back to the Revolution

when we could have negotiated a peace with Great Britain, but we went for independence.

The Civil War, when we could have gotten rid of the southern half of the country and avoided war.

World War II, when we could have stayed away from a European conflict,

but we decided to fight Nazism, which was the right call.

And Reagan in 1981 saying, I'm not going to accept the Soviet Empire as a fate of complete.

They're an evil empire, and we need to defeat them.

And nine years later, the Berlin Wall falls.

After each one of those risks that we took by standing up strong in the world,

we became richer, freer, more powerful, more influential in the world.

That's what we need to be doing with the Ukraine situation.

So is it just a sign of demoralization or almost a sign of nihilism,

that there are so many conservative intellectuals, pointy heads,

you know, I think about someone like Tucker Carlson, who has an enormous impact on the

Republican base, who almost seem more sympathetic to Russia than they do Ukraine,

who somehow believe that, as they might put it, you know, you don't need to share your pronouns

in Russia. How did we come to a world in which it's increasingly normative on the right

to be sympathetic to an American enemy? How did that happen?

Look, I think that part of it is you put your finger on earlier,

which is a war weariness from Afghanistan and Iraq.

I think that's where it is among the American people, that there's a weariness to that.

Chris, do you think also part of what it is is that they see a decadent America

that they're disgusted by and almost feel like we deserve what's coming to us?

Are you talking about some of the thought leaders in our country? Yes.

I don't see it that way. I just think it is both them being ill-informed and also them coming to conclusions about what makes America great.

Like, it's this, you know, America first stuff, Barry. Who's not for America first?

Like, I'm for America first. Like, I don't want to go, okay, Luxembourg number one, Netherlands number two, let's go with America number three, right?

I'm for America being first. That's not the question. The question is how, and I believe history gives us a pathway to how, and that pathway is by America being strong and leading, developing friendships that people can rely upon and setting an example for the rest of the world that they want to emulate. And I don't think we've done that necessarily in our more recent conflicts. And I think there's a way to do it with Ukraine by supporting and standing up for people who are minding their own business.

And then wound up having their country invaded for it.

Speaking of China just quickly, you said that there will be no confusion on the part of President Xi when I'm president of the United States about what American policy is toward China. What will that policy be?

The policy will be that we want to have a relationship that is rooted in fairness between the two countries. Fair competition. I do not expect the Chinese to lay down and not compete with us. They're competitive people and they've built a large and prosperous country, but we expect that competition to be fair and transparent. Second, they're going to realize that military aggression will not be worth it. That whatever they think they can gather from being militarily aggressive, that we will make sure that it's not worth it for them. And third, I'd say that we want to have ourselves set an example for human rights in our own country that serve an example for China and other nations as well. I think the treatment of the Uyghurs in China is disgrace and genocide anywhere in the world is something that needs to be spoken about and spoken out against directly by an America that believes not that we have the answers to everything, but that there are basic human rights like avoiding being murdered by your own government that need to be acknowledged. Okay, on immigration, 69% of Republicans told Gallup last year that they wanted less immigration to the United States and 79% of Republicans want more deportations of illegal immigrants. At one point, you supported a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, and I wondered where you stood now. Look, my view on it is that we first have to secure the border. More importantly, for any other reason than the fentanyl trafficking that's coming into the country, 110,000 Americans dying of overdoses last year. You know that I've cared deeply over my career about drug abuse and how we need to change the war on drugs in this country to be one that moves towards treatment, but that doesn't mean our southern border should be an open door. I think those numbers that you see from Republicans

are reflecting the fact that they're upset about the fact that there's not fairness in all this, that there's people outside the country who are waiting in line in a system that is legal, and that folks are coming across the border illegally and being allowed to stay here. So I think we have to secure our southern border in that way, and then we need to amend our immigration

system to be one where it's a merit-based system, it's a need-based system where people who are going to help to make America better are given priority to be led into this country. And I think we need to have a conversation about all that, but that conversation is not going to happen unless we secure the border first. 48 percent of Republicans say that the economy, not surprisingly, is the top issue facing the country right now. The U.S. is likely to enter a recession. Well, we keep hearing that it is. It hasn't guite happened yet. But what is your message to Americans who are really, really worried about the future and especially the future of the economy and their ability to support their families? That the government has to stop spending as if there's no end to the money. And it's because of this outrageous spending and the rate of it, both during COVID and after COVID, that has led to the inflation that we have in this country. And inflation is the worst tax that you can put on any American family, because just to be able to survive, they lose more and more of their own money and have to make some very difficult decisions on making ends meet. So first and foremost, it's about lowering inflation so the interest rates can come down. That will encourage our businesses and entrepreneurial class to build more jobs, create more opportunity for the people of this country and better paying jobs. And I think we also need to look really hard, Barry, at the student debt issue in this country. And I believe that there has to start to be placed on colleges and universities restrictions on how much they can increase tuition. That you can't increase tuition above the rate of inflation. And that if you do, you lose your federal aid and eligibility by anybody at your school to participate in federal aid programs. I think that would get costs of education much more in line. And that's a huge issue for the American people who want their children to go to college and are having those kids come out with enormous debt. I had debt when I left college and law school

and it took me 10 years to pay it back. And that meant for 10 years we didn't buy a house after we got married because we just didn't have the money to do it because we were paying off our loans. I think we need to do something about that as well. And that's a big economic issue for a lot of families. You've claimed that you're the only candidate that can mend our polarized country. And the thing that kind of consistently blows my mind, they're people that are politically homeless, right? A large percent of people in this country, close to 40 percent, say they're moderate. So they don't feel represented by either of these parties that in my view have come to be dominated by increasingly extreme voices. If you were to become president, how would you go about mending the fractured nature of American politics? And what would you be willing to sacrifice in order to merge that division? You have to accomplish things, Barry. And accomplish things means that you have to compromise at times. And I think we've turned our politics into compromise being a dirty word that people equate compromise with capitulation. And it's not the case. Ronald Reagan used to say the guy who disagrees with me 20 percent of the time is not my 20 percent enemy, he's my 80 percent friend. And I learned this, Barry, when I was governor of New Jersey because I had a Democratic legislature for all eight years and a state that had a million more Democrats than Republicans. I could either like stand in the corner and hold my breath or work

with the other side to get things done. And I did the latter and I'll do the same thing as president. Okay, Chris Christie, you ready for a lightning round? Lightning round with Barry. Let's do it.

Let's do it. Favorite Mets player?

Favorite Mets player is Francisco Lindore.

American hero, dead or alive.

Abraham Lincoln.

Who's the greatest American villain dead or alive?

Bernie Madoff.

Who's the most interesting Republican in the Senate?

Look, in the Senate, I think the most interesting Republican is probably Tim Scott.

Who's the Democrat you most admire?

All time the Democrat I admire the most is John Kennedy.

You've talked about struggling with your weight. And as you know, people are biased against people that are overweight. I've taken Osempic. Would you consider it?

Look, I'd consider anything, Barry, because I've been on just about every diet that's known to man in the last 25 or 30 years. So I haven't done that yet, but I would consider it.

Who's the most admirable person you've worked with in your political life?

Probably Governor Tom Cain of New Jersey, one of my predecessors. Very admirable guy.

Was January 6th an insurrection, a riot? How would you describe what happened that day?

What word?

I'd call it a riot.

Does RFK Jr. have a chance?

No.

Elon Musk is, fill in the blank.

A genius.

Tucker Carlson is.

An entertainer.

Ron DeSantis.

Is the governor of Florida.

Jared Kushner.

I think I've said enough about Jared Kushner.

Tell me the last thing you've changed your mind about.

You know, I kind of asked this earlier today.

The last thing I changed my mind about was Donald Trump.

If you could undo one policy mistake you've made in the last few decades, what would it be? I vetoed a bill that would have restricted what public workers could get paid out for their sick leave to \$15,000 because I wanted it to be zero. And I turned out getting nothing.

And I should have taken the \$15,000 cap because you have public workers who are walking away with two and \$300,000 checks for not taking sick time.

And it's disgraceful.

And I could have limited it.

And I just became stubborn about it.

And vetoed the bill I should have taken.

I should have taken the compromise.

What's your favorite Bruce Springsteen song?

Thunder Road.

How many Bruce concerts have you been to?

148 and counting.

Who would you choose as your vice president if you were to become president?

I'll keep that one to myself, Barry, but I have a couple of ideas.

And last guestion, convince the listener to vote for you in one sentence.

If you want American government to work again for you and not for the people who are elected to it, you should send me there to do it.

Chris Christie, thank you so much.

Barry, it was fun and we'll do it again when you're ready to have me on again.

Thanks for listening.

If you liked this conversation, if it provoked you,

if it made you reconsider Chris Christie, all of that is great.

Share this conversation with your friends and with your family

and use it to have a conversation of your own.

And stay tuned over the next few months for more conversations with presidential hopefuls.

We've already interviewed Nikki Haley, Tim Scott, Mary Ann Williamson, RFK Jr.

and hope to have many more conversations and debates on honestly in the run-up to 2024.

Joe Biden, if you're listening, the invitation is open.

Last, if you want to support honestly, there's just one way to do it.

Go to thefp.com and become a subscriber to the free press today.

Stay tuned and we'll see you next time.