



Episode 1,065: The Winners and Losers of 2017, with Michael Malice

Guest: Michael Malice

WOODS: All right, so here we are at the end of the year. I thought, you know, I'm exhausted beyond belief. I don't even know what planet I'm on at this point because of this move and all the other things I have going on. It is just absolute insanity. A normal person would have just taken this week off, right? Normal person, take the week off, you're moving – but, nope. I am doing the episodes. So I thought we'd do a bit of a review. So here's how I want to do it. Let's start off with this question. You look back on 2017 – and by the way, this is the sort of question that John McLaughlin would ask during the great end-of-year *McLaughlin Group* episodes. And the –

MALICE: "Wrong!"

WOODS: Exactly. Right, they say it's an unrehearsed program, but I have a feeling that at least the award categories were given to the panelists in advance so that they could choose people –

MALICE: They were.

WOODS: Yeah. But I haven't done this in this case because I know you are really quick on your feet, and plus, I haven't really thought of any categories of these two. Who would you say were the winners in 2017, and who would you say are the losers? I mean, isn't that a fun question?

MALICE: Let's do the winners first, right?

WOODS: Sure.

MALICE: So the big winner – politically, we're talking?

WOODS: Sure. Might as well.

MALICE: I would say gun owners are a big winner of 2017, because after that shooting in Texas where that church got shot up and the left, understandably, just like everybody was very upset. And the next day or the next week, the Republican majority in the Congress started passing a bill for concealed carry reciprocity between states, meaning, if you have a concealed carry license in, let's suppose, Iowa, and you have that license in Nevada, the license will be valid. You can – you know, however

that works in practice. And the gun control people were aghast and saying, *I can't believe on the heels of this tragedy this is your first priority*. And now it's not even like — we understand you're aghast, we understand your thoughts and prayers. This is not a conversation. Guns are a right, and if you don't like it, we're not even going to discuss it with you. So that's a very big change in the conversation since not that long ago. So that's a big one.

I think the other big winner by far is Trump, because the fact that he's still in office and the fact that he has — you know, no one had any idea what a Trump presidency would look like, and the fact that he's still there and plugging away at all is an accomplishment.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. In fact, that was going to be my follow-up question, was obviously the big story of 2017 is the beginning of the Trump administration, and I wanted to get your assessment of this first year.

MALICE: And I'll give a third one. Constitutionalism, because I think with Gorsuch on the Supreme Court, and I'm sure he's going to have one or two more, that really is a radically different approach to Supreme Court jurisdiction and interpretation than we've had maybe for 80 years or something crazy.

WOODS: And that is one way that, even if Trump were to fizzle out on a lot of things and be a disappointment on a lot of things, that is one way that he can definitively leave a legacy —

MALICE: Oh, yes.

WOODS: — is the Supreme Court. And that's something. We'll get back to Trump in a minute, because I want to stick to this winner/loser category. I know it hurts you very much to label anyone a loser, because I know in your heart, Michael, that you believe that we're all winners.

MALICE: Oh, yes.

WOODS: But who would be the losers of 2017?

MALICE: I think the losers are the press, I would say are the biggest losers because there is an enormous sense on their part of their impotence. I think they are rapidly losing credibility, which is something I think is almost impossible to get back with the populous. I think social media and now the anti-press scene on social media is correcting them and attacking them in real time.

And here's the thing. It is easy, I think, to make the case that Trump is a terrible person, terrible president, so on and so forth. That has nothing to do with how much ice cream he eats, how he drinks water, how he feeds koi fish at a Japanese koi pond. So if you are giving stories about him firing a lot of people, which shows he's a bad staffer, and him drinking water with both of his hands, if these are getting equal headlines, you are not in a position to be an effective critic because there's quite literally in that case no sense of perspective.

WOODS: Right, and so — and I've said in the past that I think, given that you or I could come up with ten things off the top of our heads that we're unhappy about with Trump, we could do that. And they would be very fundamental things. But with the exception of immigration, where even there — I mean, he has done some — he's done more than people think he's done but not as much as they expected him to do, I think.

MALICE: And not as much as he said.

WOODS: Right. But with the exception of immigration, believe it or not, behind all his oddball behavior, he's not as different from the establishment. His style is different. His instincts in some ways are different. His cultural affinities are different. But some of his political moves and political instincts are not that radically different from some of the instincts of the establishment. And so when that's the case, when you're a member of the establishment media and you've got to go after this guy, the only thing you can really — they have to fall back on he's rude and he speaks in an annoying way and he tweets in an objectionable manner and he drinks too much diet soda. I mean, that's what you have to fall back on, because otherwise, whether it's the welfare state or foreign policy or whatever, he's not a million miles removed from these people. So they're reduced to this.

MALICE: I think foreign policy is very different. I can't remember the last time we had a president — maybe George H.W. Bush — who has attacked foreign leaders in such blatantly insulting and boorish language.

WOODS: Okay, that's true. Yeah, that definitely is true.

MALICE: And that's a big deal in the world of diplomacy. I mean, the term "diplomacy" really means like kind of this passive aggression at worst.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. That is true. And of course, in particular, you being especially knowledgeable about North Korea, that's where it's been at its worst. There's no world leader he's spoken of more disparagingly, right?

MALICE: Oh, correct. I mean, right, there's no — than of Kim Jong-un of North Korea. And again, the fact that he goes after our allies. I mean, he went after Theresa May on Twitter, the British prime minister. And there were some others that he really kind of let them have it. So they don't really know what to do with — I mean, the other precedent I could think of is Berlusconi in Italy, who referred to Angela Merkel in language that's so coarse I can't even say it on this show. And Margaret Thatcher certainly had her sharp tongue. Maybe it wasn't per se at individual politicians, but at nations and organizations, but she could get very vitriolic. But I mean, he — I mean, this Twitter thing is something that's unprecedented. And this might be a permanent thing in terms of how presidents interact with other countries.

WOODS: Now, on the classification of Trump as a winner, I mean, I get the metric you're using, but you do have to reckon with the fact that his poll numbers have not been good.

MALICE: Right, and at the same time, though, his poll numbers are bad, but he got that huge — I mean, they repealed the individual mandate, the penalty for it. I mean, that was like a Republican fantasy since it was first mentioned in '08. The fact that that happened when you had — he's got, what? 51 seats in the Senate? And you had some real wavering Republicans like Jeff Flake, McCain, Murkowski, Susan Collins. John McCain would love any opportunity, in my opinion, to deny Trump a win. And frankly, I wouldn't blame him. I mean, he's proudest of his military record. Trump as a candidate who's never been in the military attacks him for that personally. Yeah, I'd be a little spiteful on my way out, especially having such a serious illness. I would absolutely be trying to mess with this guy. So the fact that they got it through is I think — especially a bill that's unpopular and a bill that looks by all accounts to be kind of a mess.

WOODS: Well, how about *The New York Times*? We're talking about the media as being losers. The tweets that come out of Trump are things like — whenever he's referring to *The New York Times*, he always calls it "the failing *New York Times*." It's like Little Marco and Lyin' Ted, the failing *New York Times*. But they're always at pains to point out that, contrary to his wishful thinking, we're not actually failing; we're actually booming since Trump took office. So is it really right to say the press is a loser?

MALICE: As a class? Yes. *The New York Times* absolutely still has their cred. I think they should have their cred. No matter what you think about *The New York Times*, they certainly have some of the best reporters in the world. That's not really in dispute by anyone. It's no coincidence that Ayn Rand's favorite newspaper was *The New York Times*. She read it from cover to cover all the time.

But I'm thinking more of things like CNN. And I made this point on Twitter. If you look at who right-wingers hate, it's not MSNBC; it's CNN. Because Fox is, you know, right of center; MSNBC is left of center, openly and brazenly. And they have a right to their opinion. I don't think Rachel — Rachel Maddow often — she did a — I mentioned this to you on the show before. She did this segment on Phyllis Schlafly's career that you could have written. I mean, sure, her opinion of Schlafly was probably the opposite, but it was fair and honest and a perfect time capsule of Phyllis Schlafly's life and influence.

But CNN, which tries to project itself as objective and middle of the road, I mean, their biggest Republican, Ana Navarro, might be the most anti-Trump person ever other than Jennifer Rubin of *The Washington Post*. And the vitriol from that network is couched in deception, so I think it's a very — it's a good example of the press being treated with disdain and contempt.

I mean, when you're watching Fox News, for example, you know they're going to try to be entertaining and have a right-of-center point of view. I mean, no one is surprised by this. They're not pretending to be anything else.

WOODS: Right. Right, right, that's the difference. All right, we've got some more juicy stuff to talk about. We'll do that after we thank our sponsor.

[Sponsored content]

All right, back to Trump for a minute here. On the whole Russia situation, now, I haven't followed it as closely as other people have, but I've followed it a little. And it's interesting to see people like Sheldon Richman and people like Robert Perry and others who are — they're certainly not partisans of Trump.

MALICE: Sure.

WOODS: Or even Alan — I was going to say Alan Greenspan. Alan Dershowitz. You know, Dershowitz has his right-leaning views here and there, but he's not really a man of the right. And yet a number of people like him have —

MALICE: Dershowitz is a leftist. He's an unambiguous leftist.

WOODS: But he can be hawkish on foreign policy.

MALICE: Sure, but so can Woodrow Wilson and FDR.

WOODS: Yeah, well, true, true.

MALICE: [laughing] Tom, you of all people.

WOODS: I don't know. Lately the way I think about what constitutes the right wing is kind of in flux. But my point is that these people are coming to his defense over the Russia situation and the accusations surrounding that simply because — it's not because they like him, but because they think there's nothing to it and that, as you just said, if we want to criticize him, it's not like you have a shortage of grounds on which to do it, so why are you doing this?

So what I've been wondering is, if it really is the case that he has nothing to hide, and if it really is the case that this is crazy exaggeration by the media or they're always misrepresenting what's actually happening or they're exaggerating it or inventing stuff or whatever, why in heaven's name has he not gone to the American public — He's the president. He can speak to the American public any time he wants to. Why hasn't he had a speech written by somebody like a Pat Buchanan, who can write a speech that would be very successful for him — it would be right in his tone. It would be perfect for him — that lays it out, that says, *Look, folks. Here are the forces arrayed against me. It's pretty rough right now. I've got pretty much everybody, every major force arrayed against me. All I have is you folks out there.* I mean, if I were Trump, I would be giving that speech. And he's not. He's tweeting here and there. He's giving an off-the-cuff remark here and there. Why isn't he doing this? Why doesn't he stand up for himself?

MALICE: Well, I think he's had quite a few rallies, actually. And let me just say one more thing. One of the big winners of 2017 —

WOODS: No, I mean like from the Oval Office. I want to speak to the American people.

MALICE: Well, I think one of the other big winners of 2017 was McCarthy, because just this week, Jill Stein, who was the Green Party nominee, she was asked by I think

Mueller or whoever is the investigator for some documents about the 2016 campaign relating to Russia — you know, because she went there on a trip or something —

WOODS: Yeah, I saw that.

MALICE: And one of Hillary Clinton's campaign people tweeted out — I think he wrote it seven times in a row — "Jill Stein is a Russian agent. Jill Stein is a Russian agent. Jill Stein is a Russian agent." And the idea that you can blithely accuse someone of treason, even though we're taught in high school that the McCarthy era was the worst thing that ever happened to America and that a group of people who were secretly taking orders from Moscow in order to violently overthrow the American government and install a dictatorship here ruled from Europe are just expressing their political opinion, it's amazing to watch.

Now, if you're asking why Trump isn't doing these things from the Oval Office, I don't know. I think he probably — frankly, actually I do know. I think he gets off on the crowds. Wouldn't you? Like, you're in the Oval Office, you have your yes men, but these are the people and you say your lines and everyone cheers, that's got to be exhilarating.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. It is exhilarating, but I would do both. I would say, "My fellow Americans," and the cameras would be rolling and they would be hating every minute of it because all the networks would have to carry the remarks of the president from the Oval Office.

MALICE: No, sometimes they don't. They've done that where they haven't. And you know what else is going to happen? Just you wait for that State of the Union address, that first one. That is going to be epic, I think.

WOODS: Yeah, you know, I think —

MALICE: Because if the Democrats sit on their hands, as the Republicans sat on their hands when Obama made his points, he can literally point at them and mock them to their faces, their sourpusses.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, I suppose so. That will be interesting to see. I just feel like chances are his State of the Union will be written by whoever wrote his — I don't know, the inauguration speech was actually pretty combative, now that I think back on it.

MALICE: Yeah. Remember, they were clutching at pearls.

WOODS: That's right. Yeah, that's right.

MALICE: And he never gets more combative than when his enemy's in front of him physically. You remember during the debates, there was one debate when he was with Jeb and this was an audience full of Republican donors who were very establishment, very old-school conservative in the maybe neocon sense. And they would boo him all the time, and he'd just point and say, "Look, it's all Jeb's donors. This is the problem."

And it was amazing to watch. It was almost like a wrestling villain getting off on the boos.

WOODS: Yeah, absolutely. All right, I had James O'Keefe on the show some time ago from Project Veritas.

MALICE: Oh, boy. Okay.

WOODS: What's been your impression of that?

MALICE: Um —

WOODS: This was before the Roy Moore fiasco.

MALICE: I don't really know that I have an opinion on James O'Keefe. I have a lot of friends in common with him. Laura Loomer, who got her start at Project Veritas, was a guest on my show a few weeks ago. I mean, that last thing that they did with *The Washington Post*, in my ignorant opinion because I haven't looked into it very heavily, it seemed to have backfired on them pretty hard — as opposed to, say, Wikileaks, which is not edited, you know what I mean? It's like, these are the emails. You can interpret them how you want. A lot of what James O'Keefe does is edited, and even if it's edited fairly and accurately, a person who's a critic can have that mental idea of skepticism and say, *You know what? I don't want to believe this because there must be more footage*, you know?

WOODS: Right. Yeah, so I've heard that criticism. It's just it seems like the snippets that he shows, though, yeah, maybe they could be taken out of context, but some of them I can't imagine a context in which these things that these people have said wouldn't be incriminating. I mean, I think he's —

MALICE: But that's a dangerous game, because at the same time, look — You and I are talking. So there are many things that you and I have said about government or the U.S. government specifically that could be taken out of context that would sound completely insane.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. That's true. But yet, I think even if they put them back in context, to a lot of the American public, they'd still sound pretty crazy [laughing] —

MALICE: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely.

WOODS: — when I look back on some of the topics I've covered this year. All right, so how about, in 2017, biggest surprise? I'm just making up categories. Was there a big surprise politically or culturally? Something you didn't expect?

MALICE: I think the biggest surprise was how unable the left — there's two, I would say — unable the left has been to change their tactics. The Democratic Party is the oldest political party on earth. That is not an accident. You do not stay as a cohesive political party and have — I mean, they're still very powerful in America — unless you're doing something right. I know all your listeners hate the Democratic Party, and that's fine,

but this is not an accident that they've figured something out. So the fact that they are still — Elizabeth Warren is a good example. The fact that she's still barking the same things at Trump — *You're not going to shut me up!* — as she did in June of 2016, it's like, he's not trying to shut you up, He wants you to talk and make an idiot of yourself. So the fact that they haven't changed their strategy and it hasn't been working for them, I'm surprised, because I think there's a lot of very, very bright Machiavellian people on the left. That's one.

The other surprise is I can't believe they got the mandate penalty repealed. I can't wrap my head around it. It's amazing.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. I definitely agree, especially when we all kind of felt like health care was over because we've already talked about the health care bill.

MALICE: Right.

WOODS: So certainly when they were talking about tax reform, it just never occurred to me that that would come up — and that they'd be successful, at least getting it through the House.

MALICE: And I'm surprised that there aren't more spiteful Republican senators, because a lot of — I mean, these are elite people, very rich, very powerful, very influential. At the very least, they're going to think Trump is a buffoon, right? Even though he's the president. So for them to fall in line and kind of follow his lead, I'm shocked that there aren't more who are — Jeff Flake gave his speech about how Trump's the devil and all this other stuff, but he fell in line. I'm surprised there isn't more grandstanding and being like, *I'm the one saving conservatism from this clown in the White House*, you know what I mean? There's such an opportunity for anyone in the Republican Party to do that, so I'm shocked that there isn't someone who's declared himself the leader of the loyal opposition within the GOP.

WOODS: Now, what about the fact that we're living through this moment in which it seems like every other day some very, very well-known person in media or entertainment is being accused of sexual harassment or worse?

MALICE: No, it's not — yeah.

WOODS: It's just one after the other after the other. I mean, what about that as a phenomenon?

MALICE: So I tweeted this out and you can comment all you want about how awful I am as a person, and I mean it. I think this is something where you have to give feminism credit for. I remember I was sitting with a bunch of anarchists, and I was talking about Andrea Dworkin, who is one of the worst of the feminists. She was the one who thinks pornography is akin to assault and all this other stuff. However, she was the one who, at face value, knew Juanita Broddrick was telling the truth. She had nothing but — You know, a lot of these far-lefties often have a very good perspective on how things really work, because they're obsessed with like power structures and so on and so forth. So a lot of these things that these men are being held accountable for

— it's been almost exclusively men — back in the day probably wasn't that big of a deal. And it took a lot of these people who you and I might not like or agree with to say this really isn't acceptable and it is a problem.

And the point I made is people like to use a term "conspiracy theory" to be dismissive and be like, oh, this is for kooks. There was a conspiracy to protect Harvey Weinstein. There was a conspiracy to protect Kevin Spacey. There was an organized movement. And it didn't even have to be organized. It was like spontaneous order. Everyone knew their role. Everyone knew to keep their eyes down and their mouths shut. Everyone knew they would be punished if they spoke up. And as a result, you had decades of predation. And here's the thing. All of these allegations for the most part, it's not like, oh, he smacked my butt or he glanced at my boobs or he called me on the phone and was saying offensive things. These are not gray areas. These are assault. These are physical, violent assault. These are things that are completely egregious. And I think there's a lot more coming,

And I think it speaks to something you and I understand as people who are anarchists, that people in power, just because they smile at you on TV and have really white teeth doesn't mean that they're great people. They are often quite depraved.

WOODS: Yeah, and in a way, it's almost like the default position has to be to assume they're depraved until proven otherwise.

MALICE: Yes, absolutely. And again, maybe this is coming from the Soviet Union, but the idea that like someone in power isn't going to be — not everyone, but isn't going to — you really messed up things that you would never hear about as an average citizen? Why is that — when you put it in those terms, no one would disagree. But then they also think, well, it wouldn't be this one. I like him. I see him smiling on the red carpet. And it's just shocking. And I'm glad this is happening. I'm glad it's happening at a quicker and quicker rate. As you and I speak, there's like apparently 30 or 40 cases where Congress paid off accusers and these accusations have been sealed. I have no doubt they will somehow become unsealed, and we might be looking at mass resignations from Congress, which has been unprecedented. I don't think there's been mass resignations from Congress since the Civil War — correct me if I'm wrong, doctor.

WOODS: Yeah, certainly not. And the interesting thing about the — Now, unless I missed the whole Al Franken story, isn't it the case — No, I guess no. I guess there started to be accusations that were more recent.

MALICE: Yes.

WOODS: But at first, he was dealing with accusations of before he was in the Senate, and then he called for an investigation of himself. But I don't think typically you have an ethics investigation of a senator for things that happened before he was in the Senate, so I thought that's a little bit over the top. But then now that I think about it, it was the case that more people came forward and said we were at a campaign rally and he's sticking his hand down my shirt or whatever.

MALICE: Yeah.

WOODS: Yeah.

MALICE: Yeah, and again, with all these accusations, it's almost never he-said-she-said. It is almost — I can't think of one counterexample, other than Kevin Spacy where it's males, where it's multiple people who don't know each other. And that to me is very, very telling. And I think it's — I'm glad this is happening, and I'm glad people are having more of a sense of cynicism towards their so-called leaders.

WOODS: All right, now it's your turn. Invent a category that might be interesting to think about. So we've done winners and losers. We've done surprises.

MALICE: Okay, I've got one for you.

WOODS: Okay.

MALICE: Villain of the year.

WOODS: Oh, boy.

MALICE: Is that a good one?

WOODS: That is a good one. Geez. You have a candidate for this?

MALICE: Oh, this is obvious. It's Bannon.

WOODS: Okay, now you've got to make that case for me. I'm interested. How do you make that case?

MALICE: Well, a villain is someone who relishes messing with people in furthering his goals, and Bannon, I think it's clear, loves the fight. He loves the conflict. He does not want to work well with his enemies. He thinks they're reprehensible people. I agree with him. And I think he relishes being the bad guy. He's not trying to be a boy scout. He's like Jack Nicolson in *A Few Good Men*. Wouldn't you say that's a good impression of his psychology?

WOODS: Yeah, I would, but when you said "villain," I didn't think you meant it in the sense of somebody you might kind of in some way respect, because the way you're describing him, I would respect that

MALICE: I identify as a villain, and I always say just because I'm a villain doesn't mean I'm a bad guy.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, yeah, all right, okay, then let's put it this way. Who's the bad guy of the year? I mean in the U.S. Let's not try to do international dictators.

MALICE: Okay, the U.S.? Because I would say Kim Jong-un.

WOODS: Right.

MALICE: Who's the villain in the — Oh, Linda Sarsour. Linda Sarsour is the Muslim activist; she identifies as feminist. She's really — you know, every so often, the left gets a new group that they try to integrate into society that they can hold up as a respectable caste. They're doing it now with Muslims, and I think she's their poster child. And the right has seen this coming and are cutting her off at the pass. She's a huge anti-Semite. She recently started defending someone against an assault accusation, even though the accuser was a female who's not a right-winger at all. So I think she is — because she's so quintessentially the problem. There's many other people who are bad people, but they're not I don't think as purely a problem as she is, in my opinion.

WOODS: All right, now I'm going to ask you for a prediction.

MALICE: Well, you didn't give an answer. What's your answer, Tom?

WOODS: Yeah, I'm too tired to give answers.

MALICE: Okay.

WOODS: [laughing] No, no, honestly, I can't — honestly, I don't know because I just feel like there are so many. It's hard for me to narrow things down.

MALICE: Oh, I know who you would say.

WOODS: Oh, tell me.

MALICE: Max Boot.

WOODS: But not — well —

MALICE: Or one of those types.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true. That's true. But I could have picked him any — I don't know why this particular year he'd be worse than —

MALICE: What about Bill Kristol?

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, but that's just so easy. I want to come up with fun ones. Like, yours was fun. I wouldn't have guessed.

MALICE: Okay.

WOODS: But I'm just drained of all energy and cleverness, unfortunately. Now, see, I'm sure you have a funny joke you could make at my expense when I say —

MALICE: I would never be so —

WOODS: *Yeah, how is that different from you normally?* Like, all right, yeah. But that's too dumb of a joke for you.

MALICE: Yeah, don't be a ghostwriter, Tom.

WOODS: [laughing]

MALICE: [laughing]

WOODS: Now I can't remember — There was some place I wanted to go — oh, yeah. Prediction, right. And no one's going to hold it against you if you're wrong, because who can predict the future? But earlier this year, I had David Stockman on, and he did not believe — and we have a gentleman's bet going on this. He did not believe that Trump would still be president by the end of 2018.

MALICE: Well, at this rate, he's never even going to get the nomination, right [laughing]?

WOODS: [laughing] Yeah, I know. Yeah, that's right. He's probably going to drop out, actually, before it even gets going.

MALICE: Yeah, it was a publicity stunt. He never wanted to be president.

WOODS: But I think, though — I don't remember what Stockman was saying about Candidate Trump in terms of his viability. I know he thought Trump — he never thought he was particularly smart, but that he had some interesting potential because he was an outsider.

MALICE: And savvy.

WOODS: Right. But he never thought this guy's an expert on monetary policy or something. But Stockman just feels like he's going to run out of allies, and when the jackals come for him, the Republicans are going to decide he's a liability and we hate him, so we're not going to stand up for him.

MALICE: Well, I'm going to say a counter to that —

WOODS: All right.

MALICE: — which is Trump's president, and they realize, look, if we throw him overboard, we're going to lose the presidency and that's a cost. And the example we can think of is Roy Moore. I think Roy Moore, even forgetting all this trying-to-hit-on-teenagers stuff, is really a reprehensible person in every possible way. And on top of that, even though — let's suppose these accusations are false — you're throwing the word "pedophile" around loosely. As a politician, there are probably few terms you would rather have associated with your name — maybe Nazi, right? The fact that so few Republicans, elected officials, distanced themselves from him is very telling. Because if they're not going to go out of their way to throw Roy Moore under the bus, they're going to be a lot more willing to defend a sitting president, in my opinion.

WOODS: That is an interesting point. Okay, that's an interesting point. Well —

MALICE: And they've learned. They've learned from their mistakes. I think they know that if you give the Democrats an inch, they're going to be shopping for blood. It's not going to be magnanimous like with — you know, there was no magnanimity after Nixon. They waved that bloody shirt up until Clinton and beat the Republicans with it. And you know, I can't blame them. I wouldn't blame them. I would do exactly the same thing. *This is the party of Nixon. This is the party of Nixon. You're all corrupt. You're all terrible. It would work.*

WOODS: Well, the thing is Trump has rallied the left like no force ever. I mean, Rachel Maddow was, in the ratings game, in the basement for years. She couldn't even touch Fox. And now she's been not entirely consistently but fairly often number one. So that's —

MALICE: But she's —

WOODS: But my point is: so why would the left ever want to get rid of this guy? He is giving them the best shot in the arm to rally their base they've ever had.

MALICE: Well, because then you want to bring — I mean, no offense to Elizabeth Warren — you want to bring that scalp home, because then you can say we won.

WOODS: That's true. Yeah, that's true. Now you have Mike Pence as president. Congratulations.

MALICE: Right, right. Actually, no. I had this girl, Janice Erlbaum, on my show a couple of weeks ago. She's a far-lefty. She does those marches where she's screaming at the sky with everyone else outside Trump Tower. And I said to her, "Are you going to tell me with a straight face Mike Pence, who's like a religious conservative, would be a better president than Trump, who's like an urban real estate developer?" Like, Tom, there's no way that Trump cares about drugs or prostitution or things like that. He runs hotels. The guy's not exactly a WASPy type.

WOODS: Right, right. I'm sure.

MALICE: And she goes, "I would rather Mike Pence because I know what he is and I can understand him." And she goes, "I don't know where Trump is coming from and this causes me existential stress."

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, that's what it is.

MALICE: And that makes a lot of sense to me. What is this guy going to do next? You're just walking on eggshells. Whereas with Pence, it's like, *Okay, you're horrible. I've seen this horror for decades. I know what to say. And I think we have the numbers to beat it.* And they're right. I mean, gay marriage was passed by the Supreme Court, and there's nary a peep from the Republican Party, so they know how to fight that fight. And when it comes to things that Pence believes — or a Pence. I don't know about him specifically — I think the left does have the numbers.

WOODS: Yeah, and how about that crazy phenomenon online where, on the left, people were saying, *If only we could have George W. Bush back. We appreciate him now. He was a good guy*, or whatever. Ugh, you've got to be kidding me. You've really got to be kidding me.

MALICE: But they would want him back because they beat him. It's not George W. Bush; it would be George W. Bush's beaten up corpse.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true.

MALICE: As a leftist, I would love that in the White House. I could take my shots at him all day and know I'm going to get accolades for it.

WOODS: Yeah, that's right. And he'll grovel and apologize to you, whereas that's one thing Trump won't do. All right, well, I have a funny thing, Michael, that we here on the show may be hearing from you sooner than some listeners may think, so we don't have to say any emotional goodbyes at the end of this particular episode. But I will recommend that people check you out at MichaelMalice.com, but really, follow you on Twitter. I mean, come on, people. A lot of people listening right now, you're on Twitter, and I know some of you are not following Michael. And what I have sometimes done — this is not a joke — to unwind at the end of the day, I review Michael's Twitter account. I look at his tweets and retweets for the day, and it's immensely entertaining, and I just feel terrible that I would be keeping that to myself. So follow him on Twitter @MichaelMalice, and Michael, I hope we'll talk again soon.

MALICE: Thanks, Tom.