



**Episode 1,040: Why We Should Cheer Political Fragmentation All Over the West,
with Michael Malice**

Guest: Michael Malice

WOODS: I don't remember when the last time was, but for some reason, it always seems too long to me. I want to talk about one of your *Observer* columns that I'm linking to on the show notes page – not alongside any eBook. On its own – at TomWoods.com/1040. It's called "In Western World, Fragmentation Is the New Normal." And let me let you summarize what the gist of it is, because I think this is good food for thought.

MALICE: So one of the things we always get asked, you and I and many other people, is are things getting better or are things getting worse. And a lot of times, people just have a visceral reaction. And things are certainly complicated. So there's much evidence on both sides to answer that question, and things are getting better in some ways and things are getting worse in other ways.

And I think one of the things that as Americans we tend to do is we tend to understandably focus on American politics and not pay much attention to politics in other countries. We'll pay attention to what other countries are doing – you know, the Chinese president, maybe Brexit, things like that – but in terms of actual elections, that's something that most of us don't have that background or information to be able to study and process. And I am one of those people. I am not extremely well-informed on politics in other countries, but I have been carefully watching the parliamentary elections in the last year or two in many European countries. And to me, this is the best evidence that things are getting better, both in terms of practical applications of freedom, such as technology and let's say off the top of my head Bitcoin, but also in terms of limiting the power of various governments.

WOODS: Well, in particular in your piece, you point out that, although in all kinds of other aspects of life we see what we might call fragmentation or a wide variety of possible experiences, it's only in politics where we're still stuck in a binary mode. We're still stuck in the '50s. Just like we have three television channels again, we have two political parties. We have two ways of looking at the world. But the rest of our lives – and not only the rest of our non-political lives, but even the political lives of much of the Western world is undergoing a seismic shift in the sense that we now have many, many different options. And instead of what we had for a long time, which was at least the facade of agreement – I mean, like in the '50s, yeah, you had Eisenhower versus Adlai Stevenson –

MALICE: Or even in the '80s. In the '80s, you had George H.W. Bush, we had consensus about the Iraq War and consensus against the Iraq War. We had consensus about TARP. It was the wrong consensus, but there was a consensus.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. I think the consensus was even more complete in the '50s, because then there were certain topics that people didn't discuss, and today there are topics that they don't discuss but – eh, I don't know. I think there's something kind of different. But so anyway, the point is that today, all of a sudden we don't even have the veneer of civility that we used to have about, well, I disagree with so and so but I respect him because of X, Y, or Z. It really is it's me versus the devil, a lot of folks think.

MALICE: Well, you make a couple of interesting points. First of all, there's a great book by Jerome Tuccille – I think I'm pronouncing it right – called *It Usually Begins with Ayn Rand*. And he says – and you're going to pardon my French. I'm going to censor it for the family-friendly audience – what Ayn Rand did with *Atlas Shrugged* is she said, "F you to Dwight Eisenhower." That's how he puts it. And his point is there was this consensus, this very pro-government consensus, and she came in and said all these things that everyone has agreed upon are not only things I disagree with, but are wrong and evil. So that's one major point.

The other point I would make is I often have arguments with friends of mine who are conservatives or on the left or something like that, or even libertarians, and they bemoan the lack of civility. And I look at it in the same way as you look at, let's suppose you have a family with an alcoholic father, and he comes home and he's violent, physically violent, verbally abusive, and all these things.

And it's precisely this veneer of civility, that the family keeps this a secret, that allows him to get away with this and doesn't force him to get help. And the same way in politics. If you pretend, *Oh, Tom, you're for war. I'm against war. Let's discuss this in the same way we're discussing splitting a check at a restaurant*, this veneer of civility that like, oh, it's a civilized thing to go murder people overseas or it's a civilized thing to go put people in jail because they want to smoke a plant, it's a very useful mechanism for the state to further its oppression over the population. So I am very much in favor – and I'm sure you are, even though you're much more polite than I am and much more reserved and well-mannered, you certainly do not think that these people in Washington should be treated with any sort of civility and respect, because they are monsters.

WOODS: Yeah, and that is by the way the Hans Hoppe advice. He says these people should be laughed at and ridiculed constantly, not welcomed and have a red carpet rolled out for them at your event.

MALICE: They should have a red carpet rolled around them.

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah, there you go. Indeed, indeed. Now, the thing is most of your piece for *The Observer* had to do with the way politics is fragmenting around the world and there is the rise of different parties or there are more extreme views than we've seen in the past. In the U.S., that doesn't seem to be as much the case. We still have the Democrats and the Republicans, even in this extremely polarized world

where Democrat and Republican can't possibly encompass the diversity of differences that Americans have, yet we're still wed to that. So we're not really seeing this replicated in American politics – or are we?

MALICE: Well, we are and we aren't. So let me break it down a little bit, and this is very basic – this is politics 101. In Europe, I think the vast majority of European countries, they have a parliamentary system. So sometimes it's two houses, but usually it's one parliament, one house. And whoever becomes the leader of the majority party overwhelmingly becomes prime minister. And he or she picks different members to be his cabinet. So effectively, it's as if the House of Representatives in America were the entirety of the government, and therefore, Paul Ryan would be our head of state. And he would pick the different chairmen and chairwomen of the congressional committees. Those would be his cabinet. So it's a different system than our own.

However, we can talk about that in one second, but let's talk about how that works in America. Yes, we have two parties. But these two parties have many sub-parties within them that really don't have that much in common. For example, you have the Rick Santorum wing of the Republican Party, and you have the Rudy Giuliani wing of the Republican Party, and Ron Paul was in the Republican Party and Rand, and yes, the three of them might have some small overlaps in terms of a Venn diagram, but the idea that they're effectively partisans in the same sense and in the same party is a little bit inaccurate, because –

WOODS: And that's not to mention Trump.

MALICE: I mean, of course. So if you looked at that Republican primary, you had – I mean, maybe it wasn't 17 parties represented because many of those politicians agreed completely on most of the issues, but there were certainly extreme and very real subdivisions in the primaries. And we're seeing it now, because even though the Republicans have a 52-seat majority in the Senate and a fairly significant majority in the House, they are not able to get a majority vote on anything that matters other than getting the Supreme Court approved.

WOODS: That Republicans, it's true it's fun and interesting to break them down and see who's who, because for a long time, they managed to marry competing strains of thought. Largely because of the Cold War, they were able to come to an agreement that, *We're anti-communist, and you have your reasons for being anti-communist and we have our reasons. The Democrats are soft on communism. The Republican Party is where we need to be.* A lot of people thought that way.

But the Democrats we I think a lot of times, even myself included, we're inclined to think the Democrats are more or less monolithic. I mean, yes, you get the occasional so-called conservative Democrat, but he's extremely rare. But yet in recent months, we are definitely seeing something brewing in the Democratic Party, because on the one hand, you have the establishment that really doesn't see anything wrong with a Hillary Clinton-like candidate, a candidate who might have exactly the same views and approach as Hillary Clinton, but would just be a little bit more likable.

And on the other hand, you have insurgents who feel like I might as well vote for Jeb Bush if I'm going to vote for that candidate and they want to back Bernie. But then the

Bernie people, there's a complicated aspect of that, because there are a lot of people who think he's not sensitive enough to so-called people of color and he talks about – he doesn't use the expression "white working class" all that much, but we all know that's what he secretly means when he says we need to appeal to them. So I don't know, maybe the Democrats are fragmenting, or is that an illusion?

MALICE: No, I think it's real and there's a couple of reasons. First of all, I think when you're on one side, it's very easy to see the other side as a group because you hate everything about every aspect of them. But I was talking to a friend of mine who's a prominent Democratic activist during the primaries. I go, "Help me out. How do you guys think of Hillary. Is it like how the Republicans think of Romney?" And her point is it's much worse. She goes, "Young college people are one of the main groups that make up the Democratic Party." That's not in dispute. And she goes, "If they're voting 80% for Bernie" – I mean, it was some astronomical number – "that will tell you exactly what they think of Hillary Clinton." That's number one.

And number two is this happened in the Republican Party as well. When you have the base or the – they can call them the extremists, you could call them the people with principles, whatever. The people who have a very firm point of view. When the base holds their nose and votes for somebody and then they are not given a victory in return – the whole point of this fairy tale of selling your soul to the devil is yeah, you sell your soul, but you get to be rich. But in this case, they're selling their soul and they're still losing to Obama twice. So there is an enormous sense of resentment from the base towards McCain, towards Obama. I remember I was at Fox the day that Trump said of McCain, "I like the ones who don't get captured." And you would think within a Republican primary, if you're going to have derision in any sense towards someone in the military, they'd probably shoot you on sight. And it had no negative effect.

So I always argue with friends of mine who think the left are a monolith. You have the evangelical left, who really are very have to have their worldview imposed worldwide. Then you have the blue-collar people. So there's very many groups within the left, and although they often come together because if the bill is more government they'll be for it, they do not get along anywhere near as easily as people think.

WOODS: You're saying in this piece that, in every other aspect of our lives we're totally at peace with and familiar with the process whereby you might all of a sudden be using Netflix instead of going to Blockbuster Video, or you have many different options. I can watch this, I can watch that; I can do this, I can do that. Whereas in politics, we've had this binary thing. There are two ways to think and there's winning and losing. Whereas on the market, we vote with our dollar, and even if we lose, even if a lot of people do want to buy stupid things, there's usually still a market for things that we like. But in politics, not so much. But you're saying that in the world today, particularly in the Western world, that's beginning to collapse. We're seeing fragmentation there too. So what you even say at one point is that there is no – I can't remember which of the countries. But you're saying, look, this clearly, this fragmented political system they now have with all these different approaches and ideologies does not amount to a governing consensus.

MALICE: I'll get into those. There's a few countries and I want to go through them one by one. But let me talk about something else that you pointed out, which is politics is perverse in this sense. If you look at Netflix, Hulu, cable network TV, there's all these different shows that everyone gets excited about and people talk about on Facebook and social media. *Stranger Things* is the one people are liking now, which I'm enjoying. And you know, people hated *DOA*, which I watched, and *Lost* was a big one. You know, there's all these shows. *Kimmy Schmidt* was a thing for a minute. The more people are excited about these Netflix shows and these HBO shows – you know, *Game of Thrones*, Showtime – the more these shows percolate. The more they're produced. And they're like, *Lost* was great, so now here's four other shows like *Lost*.

Politics during the primaries, the more people get excited, the fewer choices you get. You go from 17 to 1. It's the exact opposite. You would think, okay, we're excited about the political process now. Let's give us 30 candidates to choose from for the general. And it's no, the whole process is weeding people out. It's the exact opposite. And therefore, you're going to have a lot of people who are disappointed. They're like, hey, I'm into this. Why don't I get to have my guy? Because other people don't like him? That doesn't make sense. Whereas with television, it's increasingly niche, and in food and in every other field. It's increasingly niche. It's increasingly targeted toward the individual. When you and I were kids, if we had these weird hobbies, we were considered freaks and kind of pariahs. I mean, many such cases in high school and junior high school. Now you go on the Internet, you find that one weird guy or girl in another country, and you guys are all into this kind of subculture, and these subcultures, instead of being the focus of derision online and in social media, are something that's valorized and celebrated. So having this democracy is basically a landline technology in a cell phone world.

WOODS: Oh, that's a good one. All right, more great stuff like that after we thank our sponsor.

[Sponsored content]

All right, there are a few countries you mentioned by name in your column. One of them is Iceland. Let's start there. Then we'll get to a place like Germany. Let's start with Iceland because people might be less – might not follow the news from Iceland all that closely.

MALICE: So one of the points you made during our Hamilton debate and that you believe in very strongly is this Jeffersonian idea that if we had 13 states, they would be kind of experiments and each could go in different ways and look at each other and draw from one another. So a lot of times people ask me, "Why do you care about Iceland?" I mean, the population of Iceland is tiny. It's not a world power to say the least. However, what you find in politics is ideas kind of travel across borders and certain trends may start in other countries and then carry over here.

And Iceland is very, very interesting because if you look at all of these countries in Europe, they used to have, especially right after World War II, you had effectively the Democrats and the Republicans, right? You had two major parties, broadly left and broadly right. And then you'd have little parties at the wings. Maybe some kind of

classical liberal party up to the right and then some kind of post-communist or green party for the far left. But you had two major ones and two fringe ones.

Iceland now has gone from that to like eight or nine parties in their parliament. And to form a majority, they have to have — Last year, they had an election. They had to form a coalition between four different parties. Even between those four parties, they had a one-seat majority in their parliament, which is not stable at all. And that government lasted for less than a year. Now they just recently had an election. They tried again to have a four-party coalition, and the woman who's the head of the green party returned the mandate. She said between this, *I only have a one-party majority. It's not something that is feasible.*

So now the green party, which there's never been a green-led government anywhere on earth, she was in talks with basically their Republicans to form a coalition with another party — two others, still four — and now all of the members of her party are resigning in protest because they're like, *We're the greens. We're not going to coalition with the establishment equivalent of the Republicans. This makes no sense.* So it's becoming increasingly hard. If you can't even get a cabinet together, how the heck are you going to pass any sort of strong legislation?

WOODS: We can talk about other countries in just a minute, but doesn't that frustrate people? There are people who really, really do care a lot about politics and they really, really do want to see what they want done implemented. And if they're just stymied at every turn, is that not a recipe for the strong man who comes in and says I'm going to stand above all of these squabbling groups and rise above the inaction and do something that's best for the people as I see it?

MALICE: Well, there's two answers for that. First of all, a lot of the frustration will always be the other side. Remember, it's the Republicans who are too intransigent or it's the Democrats who are too crazy, right? It's never your team. It's always the other team. So that is very, very healthy.

And number two, we have seen an example of exactly what you said happening in the Czech Republic. There's this guy whose last name I can't pronounce. He's the second richest man in the Czech Republic. He's a billionaire. He's under indictment — or I don't know if he's under indictment, but he's under investigation at the very least. He formed his own party, ANO, in the Czech Republic. They came in first place by far. They had double the amount of seats of the second-place party. And what was fascinating is, so his party — you know, he's compared as the Czech Trump, but he's far more like the Czech Michael Bloomberg. His platform's all about "let's make government work efficient, let's make it work for everybody." It's not some kind of blustery whatever.

Second place was the Republicans. Third was the Pirate Party. So the biggest even in any sense left-wing party is the Pirate Party in Czech Republic, a party that many of your listeners would have a lot in common with. Fourth are the populists. Fifth were the commies, and the Democrats, the Social Democrats came in sixth. And historically, they've been a governing party. So this has been a complete upheaval.

But here's what's funny. So he has a huge number of seats. He has like 70 seats. He needs 100. No one is coalitioning with him. So even though he is in a sense this strong man – not in a Hitler sense, but in this kind of Mike Bloomberg, "I'm the guy who doesn't care about politics. I'm going to come in here and clean up because all these partisans are dopes" – he can't form a government. Even from the top six, no one's coalitioning with him. This is unprecedented. He's trying to set out to form a minority government, and they're not having it. So again, you have this complete stalemate.

Now, is this going to go in a good direction or a bad direction? Certainly in Czech Republic, I have no idea. But in terms of those of us hopeful to bind the hands of government and make politics something that even politicians hate, I think this is a very hopeful step in a good direction. Now, I talked to you a little bit earlier. I would think this is exactly the Rothbardian strategy. Now, I haven't read much of Rothbard, but I would love to hear you expound on that.

WOODS: Well, certainly he would feel like anybody who's complaining about so-called gridlock is an idiot and instead delighting in it, being thrilled by it. Of course we want this. If you can't get somebody who's somehow going to repeal everything, the next best thing is they can't get anything done. And this may not be the most, I don't know, elegant way of having that happen, but if they can't get anything done, you've got to be happy about that.

Now, at the same time, it's true you may say if they can't get anything done, that also means they can't repeal anything. But were they really implying to repeal anything? On balance, when you think about 100 things the government might do in a month, how many of them are going to benefit you? Even if there are two – let's be generous – on the other hand, 98 were prevented. So on balance, we're probably okay.

And then you wait until – I mean, I think what's going to happen – I don't know the situation in other countries as well, but I do think that in the U.S., there is eventually going to be some kind of fiscal reckoning because of the entitlements. And then at some point, something does have to happen. Just reality is going to bump up against it. But until then, probably the best thing we can hope for is that you get a president who can't get anything done. I wonder if, if the Democrats win, will the Republicans really stop that person from getting anything done? Will that happen? I mean, Obama did get Obamacare through.

MALICE: And then nothing else for six years. Anything he got through was through executive order.

WOODS: That is true.

MALICE: They stopped him from the Supreme Court. John Boehner told him, hey, if you do these shenanigans with these immigrants, it's going to be like a red flag. Obama did anyway, and it was struck down, I believe. But the point is, other than Obamacare where all these Democrats walked the plank for him, he had nothing to show for it for six years that I can even remember. And if he had his druthers, he would have had a lot more done than that.

WOODS: Oh yeah.

MALICE: I mean, this is not someone who's content like, let's say, George H.W. Bush to be this kind of placeholder president who doesn't rock the boat. He had a lot that, if he had his votes, he would have gotten through. So they very – and also George W. Bush. The last two years of his presidency, when Bush was reelected in 2004, he gave a speech in Congress and he said we should think about privatizing part of Social Security. *I've earned political capital and I intend to spend it.* And the Democrats openly laughed at him to his face as he gave the speech. And they were right. Absolutely nothing came of it.

WOODS: Now, one thing I read about – of course there were a couple of elections recently where the Democrats won and this is being – these people are supposed to be the canaries in the coal mine, talking about what's likely to happen with the Republicans in 2018. Apparently, one of the key issues that really hurt the Republicans was health care and the prospect that people feel that one bad health emergency occurs and they're just wiped out. That's all the emergency fund, so-called, that they have.

MALICE: Right.

WOODS: So the Republicans it seems to me are bound to weaken on health care. So given that, given that there are weak-kneed Republicans on health care because they've seen the numbers and the Democrats by and large want at least Obamacare, if not more, can't they break through this gridlock to at least bring about more government involvement in health care?

MALICE: Oh, sure. I mean, we don't have as much political fragmentation here as we can and should. What I am looking at, which I don't think anyone else has registered or have not talked about, by far – you know, Trump is regarded as – they call him literally Hitler. You look at the right-wing Republicans in the House and the left-wing Democrats in the House, and both sides look at the other as complete, literal lunatics.

By far the most radical branch of government is the Supreme Court. The fact that Citizens United, the restrictions on political speech, which wasn't even being argued at first during the suit – this was like a hundred-year-old decision that was being overturned. The fact that that was overturned is really a sign of how far the Supreme Court is sometimes willing to go. And if Trump gets one or two more Supreme Court justices who think in the way that an Alito did, these constitutionalist originalist kind of things, this is going to have profound and devastating consequences for the state.

WOODS: All right, let's talk about Germany now, which I think I would know a little bit more about, most people would know more about than we do about, I'm sorry to say, Iceland or the Czech Republic – which are lovely places. But how do you see this manifesting itself there, especially with all of the controversy about the migrant issue?

MALICE: Yeah, so Angela Merkel – and I won't repeat what Berlusconi said about her, but I encourage you to look it up because it's too foul-mouthed to repeat on this family

show. Angela Merkel just got reelected, everyone's like, *Oh my God, Germany's dead. Germany's dead.*

Here's how the German parliament works. You have the Republicans and the Democrats, ostensibly. Then to the left of the Democrats, you have two left-wing parties. So you have the Greens and you have the Communists. So effectively, the voters would be able to fine tune which kind of leftism you would like. And the same thing on the right. You have Merkel's Republicans. Then you have basically the libertarian or the classical liberal Free Democrats. And now you have the Alternative for Germany, the quasi-Nazi kind of party. And before people jump down my throat for saying quasi-Nazi, one of the leaders of the party who left the party right after the elections because she said, You guys are being way too amenable to post-fascist elements.

The point is, ostensibly, that would give the German population the ability to fine tune what kind of right-wingism they want Merkel to go into. And the Alternative for Germany came in third place with 10% of the vote. Merkel's victory, she lost a huge percentage of the vote, and her victory even though she's in first place was the lowest first-place victory ever since post-World War II.

And now she said, I'm not going to coalition with Alternative for Germany. She can't coalition with the Democrats. She's not coalitioning with the Communists. So she's trying to put together a group with herself, the Libertarians, and the Greens. They're calling it the Jamaica coalition because the three party colors are black, yellow, and green. Now, I can't even imagine what that's going to look like. It's like trying to get Jill Stein, Rand Paul, and Mitt Romney to form a government. Where are they going to go with this? And this is not the choice. There has never been since World War II a three-party coalition government in Germany, and she has no other options. So when you have politicians to kind of work together when these groups don't really have anything in common, they're just going to kind of grind their teeth, hopefully, and produce just milquetoast, just rubber-stamp legislation.

WOODS: Yeah, so that really is – I don't know why this didn't – as with so many things in the world, a lot of times things don't really coalesce in my mind until I read something by Michael Malice about them, and then I see it. So first of all, people should read your column. And by the way, how often do you publish in *The Observer*?

MALICE: It's supposed to be every other week, but I've been so lazy.

WOODS: Okay, that's what I thought. That was kind of why I was asking. Okay.

MALICE: Yeah. I'm busy being a talk show host, Tom.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. It takes a lot out of you, doesn't it?

MALICE: It does, yeah. I mean, one day a week? It's Herculean.

WOODS: Talk about *Your Welcome*, your show over on Compound Media.

MALICE: Oh my goodness, I had Laura Loomer on on Wednesday, yesterday, and that was a hoot and a half. But there's a free episode on YouTube, which you will link to on the show notes page –

WOODS: I will.

MALICE: And it's with David Pietrusza, who's an amazing political historian, which I really, really enjoy. He's written books about the 1932, 1948, 1968, and 1920 elections, which are all phenomenal and read like novels. And what's great about him is he really shows these politicians to be not very kind people, and just there's no hero worship in them at all, how petty and vindictive and hateful they are. So it's very gossipy in the best sense.

WOODS: Excellent, all right. Well, first of all, what I'll also link to – of course, it'll naturally be linked to because we always link to all previous episodes I've done with a guest. So I actually got to be the first guest on your show –

MALICE: That's true.

WOODS: – so I'll link to that, because I at least have the audio of that that you can listen to. But I subscribe to Compound Media, and really, the only thing I consume on it is *Your Welcome* with Michael Malice. That's the only thing. And it's well worth the – how many smackers is it?

MALICE: I think it's 9 bucks a month. I don't remember.

WOODS: Yeah, something like that. It's less than 10. And I mean, to get Michael Malice four times in a month? Are you crazy? You're telling me you're not going to do this? And to hear him interview – Anyway, it's a fantastic show. It is worth watching. It is worth getting. So we'll link to that. CompoundMedia.com is the website where you can go over there and sign up and just – all you need to do is Michael Malice. Anything else is gravy over there, but Michael Malice's show is what you want.

MALICE: And by the way, there's a lot of foul language on that network. Let's warn people.

WOODS: Yeah, that's right. Michael's show is like *Mr. Rogers* compared to the other ones.

MALICE: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. Anthony Cumia and Artie Lange have a daily show and it's very foul-mouthed but extremely funny. I just tell one joke. They had Chris Hansen, who was the guy who catches these child predators. *To Catch a Predator* is his show.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah.

MALICE: And he had Artie Lange sitting next to him, and Chris is very straight-laced and Artie has the quickest mind like anywhere on earth, and they're talking about September 11th, and Chris Hansen's like, "Oh, you know, I was in Canada. I wasn't here

when it happened." And Artie just goes, "Oh, were you the, 'Let's roll,' guy?" And Chris Hansen, the poor guy, didn't know what to say. And Artie just kept hitting him and hitting him and hitting him. It was just amazing to watch.

WOODS: See, there you go. I mean, I can't say I've watched anything other than your show, though. Yours is the only one I watch over there. But I have reaped many benefits from watching. And the people you have on, to me half the fun is finding out the person you're going to be talking to each week. Which person who's going to make my head explode is it going to be this week? That's half the show to me, is my gosh, you're talking to this person and this person and this person. Really great. Now, of course, is you really want the full Michael Malice experience, yeah, sure, you can watch his show, which I'm telling you you should do. But why are you not following him on Twitter? That's just a definite.

MALICE: Oh, I'm having so much fun.

WOODS: And remember in the old days, initially you were not as much into Twitter? In fact, you even wrote the Dear Writer can more often be found on Facebook than on Twitter. But then you realized, hold on a minute. There's real potential here. So you should be following – it's easy to follow him. He's @MichaelMalice. How much easier could that be? MichaelMalice.com is the website. I think that's about all we can say about you if anybody's still listening.

MALICE: I think that's about all they can stomach.

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah, that is – that'll do it. Well, listen, I appreciate this talk and we've got to get you on again soon. I'm backed up, by the way. I think I've got like five episodes of yours I need to watch, and now I think I'm going to go do that while I'm doing other stuff.

MALICE: Awesome.

WOODS: Is that allowed?

MALICE: Absolutely.

WOODS: [laughing] All right, thanks, Michael.

MALICE: Thank you, Tom.