



Episode 1,284: How Northerners Used States' Rights to Fight Slavery

Guest: Michael Boldin

WOODS: I thought we would talk today about a topic that you suggested. You texted me. I said, "Yep, this is a good one." And in particular, it's timely because of this whole acting attorney general — is it Whitaker? I'm not even following it.

BOLDIN: Right, Whitaker.

WOODS: Yeah, that he's pro-nullification, and as well he should be, because all the evidence is in favor of it, so there's nothing wrong with that, although all the law school people are all telling him, "That's wrong. I didn't learn this law school." I mean, it just goes to remind you that, as Kevin Gutzman says, don't ever confuse legal training with an education. So I'm going to have an episode tomorrow where I'll go through and address this whole matter of: is this guy crazy to believe in notification or not? But anything that makes the establishment go berserk, I just have a knee-jerk support for.

So you wanted to talk in particular about the completely neglected history of Northerners who, not for the first time, made use of the ideas of nullification and the principles of 1798, of course the year of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, but in particular, focusing specifically on abolitionism and slavery, because that is the opposite, *the opposite* of the comic book story that we get. *It was stupid Southerners who wanted to enslave people, and that's why they wanted to nullify federal laws.* Of course, there aren't any anti-slavery federal laws for them to nullify. And I might also mention before I stop talking that I just put on Twitter an excerpt from Jefferson Davis' farewell address to the Senate, where he comes right out and says: *now, look, you know, there are a lot of people who favor nullification, the idea that mistake can stay in the Union, while not living up to its constitutional obligation to enforce the law. Let me tell you, that is not my theory at all.* So again, I just love living in reality, where things are so much more textured and interesting than the comic book world these jerks want us to live in. So all right, where do you want to start this story?

BOLDIN: Oh, man, there is so much good to go on. And really, I got interested in studying this a few years ago, reading your incredible article, "The States' Rights Tradition That Nobody Knows." And you wrote this early on, talking about — well, early on in my realm — talking about how nullification was not, as they all like to say, this tool of the slavers. And in fact, even though I would make the case that this guy Whitaker really doesn't support nullification — it is just propaganda and using it as a tool to set up the argument that nullification is a tool of slave owners, and therefore Trump is bad, because he has this guy here. Now, mind you, Whitaker says that he said specifically as a principle, that nullification was turned down by the courts and the federal government hasn't recognized it, so therefore, he's really setting

the stage for, "What are you talking about? Like, nullification can't be used, or maybe we could try it, but, well, the courts are against us." The whole point of nullification is that the courts *are* against us, and the federal government doesn't approve it, and that's why we have to nullify things.

But of course, the article Andrew Kaczynski, and then I saw you had responded to a tweet from some legal expert over at CNN, Renato Mariotti, talking about how nullification was an argument made by Southerners prior to the Civil War, who believe their states could nullify federal laws, and therefore it was crushed in a losing case in a war against the North. And the implication there was that nullification was used to support slavery, and they lost, and therefore, don't talk about it. It's bad. It's evil. But the fact of the matter is, is that nullification was used by Northern states, *Northern* states to go after the federal Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. And the one thing that really led me to it was simply reading the South Carolina Declaration of Causes. This was a document they put together with their Ordinance of Secession, and it said this, and I'm going to read this. It says, quote, "The states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa have enacted laws which either nullify the acts of Congress" — that is the Fugitive Slave Act — "or render useless any attempt to execute them." So I don't know, what was that, like 10, 12 states? I went to government school, so my math is bad. I can't imagine the idea of nullification being used as a tool of slavery, when all these Northern states were nullifying things that the slave owners were actually supporting, and that is the Fugitive Slave Act.

WOODS: And just as with the kinds of things you talk about today with the Tenth Amendment Center, there are different levels of resistance that we see in this case, just as with today, there are some states that just go full-blown, *We're going to resist the federal government head-on*, to, *We're going to make the federal government's life a little bit more difficult than it might otherwise be*. And you and I, being liberally minded people, we want to have a broad definition of nullification. I include all those sorts of things in my definition. And the same thing is true here. Not every case was: we are absolutely going to defy every aspect of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850.

BOLDIN: Well, and I like to get my strategy right from Thomas Jefferson. November 10th, 1798, 220 years ago this past Saturday, the Kentucky House passed resolutions drafted in secret by Jefferson against the Alien and Sedition Acts, formalizing the principles of nullification. After it was signed by the governor on November 16th, one day later, he was all excited. He sent a letter to his friend James Madison with a copy of the results. And he said, you know, we should hold to these principles all the time, every principle, important principle they contain, but we should also not be pushed to extremities and push things as far as events will render prudent. So, good strategy. A great strategist like Thomas Jefferson told us to look at the situation on the ground and find ways to defeat these things. And sometimes, like you said, that means going full-bore and addressing the whole thing, and sometimes that means undermining parts of it.

I think the important thing we should discuss, then, is what was the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850? The Fugitive Slave Act 1850, the short version, tried to make everyone in the North into a slave catcher for the South. It basically denied any person accused of being a slave any semblance of due process. A white man could go and say, "This black person is my property," and then it would go in front of a commissioner, and the commissioner would get paid \$10 if he held in on the side of the so-called slave owner, and he would get paid \$5 if he set the

person free. So the people in the South — and in fact, on top of it, the law itself says that any testimony of the alleged fugitive slave could never be admitted in evidence. So people in the North — and Lysander Spooner actually put together a really interesting document on this, on even the constitutionality of slavery and how states could take on the Fugitive Slave Act. But many people in the North, legal experts actually opposed the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Act and took action to resist it. So again, whether it was states like for Vermont passing the Habeas Corpus Act, which allowed habeas corpus and evidence in court or in these hearings in defiance of the federal act, or the people of Ohio, who actually arrested a federal marshal and his agents in the famous Oberlin-Wellington case, where they protected someone against the federal Fugitive Slave Act there.

WOODS: So what I've got — I actually, it turns out, I've got a few pages of about this in my book *Nullification*. I knew it was in there, but when I went back to look at it — I wrote this book eight years ago. When I went back to look at it, I thought, hey, there's more than I thought. I forgot all this stuff. This is pretty good [laughing].

BOLDIN: Oh, yeah.

WOODS: This book ain't so bad. So it was things like, I remembered, just because I've given speeches on this, that they would do things like make clear that federal officials could not use local jails if they wanted to house accused fugitives, or they would punish state officials who were collaborating with the Fugitive Slave Act.

BOLDIN: Massachusetts was famous on this. Michigan was famous on this. Massachusetts, actually, if you were licensed in the state as an attorney and you represented a slave catcher in a fugitive slave case, you'd get disbarred. You could not use jails. There were basic ways that we talk about nullifying and undermining federal acts today. It's an effective strategy. And we know that in places like the Northeast, where it was very strong resistance — they called Syracuse the great central depot of the Underground Railroad, and the hated Daniel Webster came there in 1851 or so to say how they were going to enforce this Fugitive Slave Act, no matter what, even here in the midst of the next anti-slavery convention. But in the Northeast, the last person that was captured and return to the South, at least recorded, was Anthony Burns in 1854 in Boston, but it was very effective at stopping this.

And the President himself, Millard Fillmore, who I absolutely despise, an editorial in *The Memphis Daily Eagle* in the late 1850s, shortly after Vermont passed her Habeas Corpus Act, it was reported that the Fillmore administration was threatening to invade Vermont over the nullification crisis. The article was called "The Administration and Nullifying Vermont." So how can you say that nullification was used to support slavery? And we have article after article after article — we've done research, Mike Maharrey and I, over the last few years looking up the historical record on this. Virginia Governor John Floyd condemned Vermont in a speech for her nullification of the Fugitive Slave Act. *The New Orleans Bee* put out an article talking about Vermont's vile theories of nullification. This was all over the country, this evil nullification happening in the Northeast. But it was very effective by simply saying: you can't use these resources. Well, where are they going to hold them? They did not have federal fugitive slave facilities, so when the state simply said we're not going to participate, there was nothing they could do.

WOODS: It's almost as if our opponents are not that familiar with Millard Fillmore.

BOLDIN: Well, they're either really ignorant — I personally think —

WOODS: I just wanted to say the name Millard Fillmore.

BOLDIN: [laughing] Oh.

WOODS: I don't think it's ever been said on this show in 1,284 episodes.

BOLDIN: [laughing] Twice in a minute. So I personally think that most people are complete idiots on this era. They just simply haven't studied any of it. They don't know what the hell they're talking about. And does that mean that Andrew Kaczynski and this Mariotti guy are just ignorant or stupid? Maybe. They could be total liars. I mean, we've run a kind of a tweet storm at Mariotti, so if he looks at his notifications and he saw any of ours, he'll know that it was the anti-slavery abolitionists, like John Greenleaf Whittier, the famous poet, who said that in regards to the Fugitive Slave Act, he was quote, "I am a nullifier." Or Walt Whitman, who wrote a poem called "A Caution." He said, "The states should resist much and obey little." So this was a popular view. It wasn't necessarily a dominant one, but it was very popular and very common, and a fact that South Carolina and then also Mississippi, Texas, and I believe Georgia in their Declarations of Causes to secede also cited Northern nullification of the Fugitive Slave Act as one of the reasons for leaving the union.

WOODS: All right, I love this stuff like this. I mean, this is in a nutshell what you and I love doing.

BOLDIN: Oh, I geek out on this all the time.

WOODS: Yeah.

BOLDIN: I mean, you got me going on this, talking about the Joshua Glover story. And remember, we did that great event in Cincinnati at the —

WOODS: Yeah, it was the Underground Railroad Center, and it had a Harriet Tubman Auditorium or theater in it.

BOLDIN: Yes.

WOODS: And that's where we had it. It was fantastic.

BOLDIN: Yes, and to hear the story about the resistance in Wisconsin, where the state supreme court took the position that they were nullifying the federal Fugitive Slave Act. I have one of the quotes here handy: "Resolved: this assumption of jurisdiction by the federal judiciary in the said case and without process is an act of undelegated power and therefore without authority, void, and of no force." That could have been written by Thomas Jefferson back in 1798.

WOODS: Well, I think the Wisconsin Supreme Court more or less did either — let me see. The Wisconsin legislature issued a resolution in support of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. But let's go back a couple steps here and tell people who Joshua Glover was. Then we can celebrate what Wisconsin did, because the state supreme court of Wisconsin just came right out and

said that the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 is unconstitutional, void, and of no force. Now, first of all, I might also point out that I can understand why somebody, just a pure constitutionalist looking at this, may say, we may not like the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, but there is, after all, a fugitive slave clause in the Constitution. So maybe here you can make only a moral argument and not a constitutional one. But whether you accept them or not, there were constitutional arguments being made by abolitionists and opponents of this act at that time. So first of all, they felt like the fact that the accused fugitives were not being given a proper jury trial, which in effect meant that —

BOLDIN: No Fifth Amendment.

WOODS: Yeah, they were in effect being kidnapped, potentially. They could just be any old person being taken out of the state.

BOLDIN: And the Michigan Personal Liberty Law was an act against kidnapping.

WOODS: Yeah, that's exactly — yeah, that was how they framed it, was that a state has an obligation to protect its citizens against kidnapping. And then also, the Fugitive Slave Act was claimed to have the authority to make bystanders assist in capturing fugitives and things like this. But then if you want to be really nit-picky, the Constitution requires that judicial officers must be paid by fixed salaries, but the fugitive slave commissioners were not paid by fix salaries; they were paid by fees. And as it turns out, they were paid in variable fees. If you return the accused fugitive to slavery, you get \$10. If you set him free, you only get \$5. There's a certain bias built into the system.

BOLDIN: What's that adjusted for inflation? What would you guess?

WOODS: [laughing] I have no idea.

BOLDIN: I mean, I think it was significant. It was significant, and it was double. I mean, think of somebody who's in this position. Oh, you send 50,60 people. And the story *12 Years a Slave* really is a Fugitive Slave Act story. This is about a person who was born free that was caught up in this system and thrown into bondage in the South. And many people were caught up in this, not that I would ever make the argument that any human being would own anybody, but just in case Think Progress is listening, it's important to mention that. And even under the idea that slavery was constitutional — Spooner thought it wasn't — and that the Fugitive Slave Act could be enacted in some way, the fact that someone could not even present their case in a court or in a hearing is totally a violation of that person's rights. They're basically just putting it up to some dude. Okay, this guy says you're his property. Okay, you lose. And then that's the case that people made in the North, that unless you could have a proper trial, habeas corpus, then there was no way they were going to support it.

WOODS: So what can you tell us about specifically — let's talk about the case of Joshua Glover. What happened?

BOLDIN: Oh, man. So I grew up in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, where in downtown Milwaukee — and I used to walk by this all the time. I had no idea what it was. But there's a historical marker in the middle of the city talking about the rescue of Joshua Glover.

WOODS: I actually didn't know that.

BOLDIN: Yeah, yeah, I'm sure it's probably on the Wiki page. But you didn't know the Milwaukee part, or — ?

WOODS: Yeah, I didn't know that there was this monument.

BOLDIN: Yeah, there's an actual monument right in the middle of downtown Milwaukee that says, "The Rescue of Joshua Glover." And it's basically on the — well, short version: he escaped slavery in Missouri, made his way up to Racine, Wisconsin, which is right between Chicago and Milwaukee. And the former slave owner, this guy, Garland I think it was, he tried to use the Fugitive Slave Act to recover him. Glover was captured, taken to a jail, but a whole mob that was kind of brought together by a good newspaper man, Sherman Booth, they broke him out. He then escaped to Canada via the Underground Railroad. But then there was this whole case. The feds came in on these people and tried to go after them, and that's what you were talking about, Tom; the legislature passed a resolution, and then the state Supreme Court in 1859 said that the feds were in the wrong on this.

WOODS: And the way they said it was just amazing. They were very uncooperative the whole time. So they really dilly-dallied about getting a proper record of the case over to the US Supreme Court. This went on for years. So the whole thing started in 1854. It wasn't till 1857 that the US Attorney was finally able to get a copy of that record. And again, late 1858, the US Supreme Court ordered that Booth be turned over to federal custody. Again, the state supreme court refused to comply. And again, if you read the statement in support of its state supreme court by the legislature of Wisconsin, it's drawn right out of Jefferson and nullification. Can I read one — I want to read one passage to the folks.

BOLDIN: Yeah, please. No, it's so good.

WOODS: This is actually now from something different. Several weeks after Glover was captured, there was a handbill circulated announcing the establishment of the quote, "Anti-Slave Catchers' Mass Convention." And here's the language used on that handbill. This is 1859 in Wisconsin:

"All the people of this state who are opposed to being made slaves or slave catchers and to having the free soil of Wisconsin made the hunting ground for human kidnappers and all who are willing to unite in a state league to defend our state sovereignty, our state courts, and our state and national constitutions against the flagrant usurpations of US judges, commissioners, and marshals and their attorneys, and to maintain inviolate those great constitutional safeguards of freedom, the writ of habeas corpus and the right of trial by jury, as old and sacred as constitutional liberty itself, and all who are willing to sustain the cause of those who are prosecuted and to be prosecuted in Wisconsin by the agents and executors of the Kidnapping Act of 1850" — I love how they call it the Kidnapping Act of 1850.

BOLDIN: Oh, yeah.

WOODS: — "for the alleged crime of rescuing a human being from the hands of kidnappers and restoring him to himself and to freedom are invited to meet at [such and such place.]"

Now, that language about maintaining and defending our state sovereignty against the "flagrant usurpations of US judges," that's the kind of extreme language and irresponsible language that Think Progress would absolutely condemn you for today.

BOLDIN: [laughing] Yeah.

WOODS: Think Progress, for anybody listening who doesn't know, it's the Soros-funded thought control website that makes sure that we don't think about things like this. I'm reading you a passage from my book *Nullification*. I quote from that handbill in my book. But this is the kind of thing that happens with Think Progress. They never once — they attacked me for years over my book — never once quoted one word — and I'm not joking. Not one word quoted from the book, because the book is very, very persuasive. I mean, I have to say, this book makes a very convincing case. So not one word quoted from it. But you notice that the language that the Tenth Amendment Center uses was used here, word for word, to support runaway slaves. That's important.

BOLDIN: Yeah, and you know, when people have read your book, they know the Glover story, they know this from reading our work, they know this from the Nullify Now Cincinnati event — not tons of people, but there are many cases like this. One of the other ones that we highlight was a similar case about an escaped former — I hate using the word slave, but you know, in quotes, this is someone who was someone's "property" at some time, John Price. And I mentioned it briefly. He escaped to Oberlin, Ohio, where he was arrested by a federal marshal. But this was an anti-slavery hotspot, as well, and so they ended up breaking him out, because the marshal was hiding him in some motel room. They broke him out, got him to freedom. Well, the people of Ohio then arrested the federal agent and all of his deputies, and it created a negotiation, because the federal government came in and arrested 27 people and charged them. And so what happened was, there was kind of a tradeoff, and it created a situation where the feds had to back down. They released 25 of the 27 in response to Ohio releasing the federal agents, and the last two that went to a jury trial only got short prison sentences of like 20 and 60 days each. So this shows how, when you create a scenario that becomes difficult for the federal government logistically and politically, you can really get them to back down.

WOODS: I'd like you to move off this topic for a minute and talk to us a bit about an Abbeville Institute event that you attended with other friends of this program as a speaker, just in the past several days. And I want to know about what you said, and then how you or anybody else there were portrayed by the Think Progress reporter who was there. And again, remember, everybody, the purpose of Think Progress is to control thought. It is not to — and you think I'm exaggerating or I'm being dramatic.

BOLDIN: No, they're the worst.

WOODS: That is why they're there. It is to control thought. And so there's no way they're going to accurately describe what Michael said, even though they probably know that people could get access to Michael's talk, so they could easily find out that the Think Progress people are distorting things. But they're willing to roll the dice on that. So talk to us about that.

BOLDIN: For years, Tom — I mean, for people who don't know, you and I, we have run into these nasty people. And sometimes I'll call them clowns, but I think that diminishes them. They are not incapable. They have tens of millions of dollars behind them from the Center for

American Progress, and they go out of their way to quote people out of context, if they quote them at all, to make sure that they fit a certain narrative, that if you aren't on Team American Progress — which is just such a misuse of the phrase — then you're clearly the bad person. And they've gone after you aggressively for so many years. And I would run into reporters years ago, and they'd be like, "Oh, hey, there's a friend. your friends with that Woods guy, huh?" Honest to God, this has happened to me many times.

But what they use as a tactic — mind you, I've been in the mainstream media, CBS News, Reuters, AP, US News, *New York Times*, *LA Times*. Every single time one of these people talks to me, if it's in person, they hand me a card or they say their name, they say, "I'm so and so I'm reporting with *The New York Times*. Can I ask you a few questions?" Well, what does Think Progress do? And it's the same approach, no matter who it is, no matter what year it is. They walk up to you right after your speech and are like, "Oh, hey, man, that was pretty awesome," acting like your buddy. "Oh, by the way, I'm a reporter. What do you think about blah, blah, blah?"

And that's what they did to me at the end of the Abbeville Institute, which was last Saturday, November 10th, the anniversary of the Kentucky House passing Jefferson's resolutions against the Alien and Sedition Acts. And he asked me some question about this Whitaker guy. I'm like, "I don't know. All these people are awful. Jeff Sessions was garbage, and maybe Rudy Giuliani, whoever's next, is going to be garbage. By the way, who do you write for." And he says, "Oh, I've written — you know, I do a bunch of stuff." Just ignores it. "No, no, no, really, who do you write for?" And he says, "Well, I've written for" — I think he said *Slate* and somebody else and somebody else. So he tells me who he's written for in the past. And I'm like, "No, who are you writing for now?" And he says to me, "Well, I'm writing for Think Progress." I'm like, "Think Progress, your buddy Ian Millhiser there" — who, if people want to look up, has attacked both Tom's and my work — "you know, they don't like us. He doesn't like us. You guys have switched on war. What happened to you guys?" Blah, blah, blah.

The reason they do this is because they want to act like your friend and try to get you to say something. He was trying to get me to say something in support of the acting attorney general, even though I didn't know anything about what was going on, because he wants to paint me into a corner. Now, he quoted me in one statement. He quoted me saying, "Remember, remember the 10th of November," because I wanted people to remember the history of nullification, as Thomas Jefferson talked about it back in those resolutions.

He did not quote me talking about the principles and the strategy that we use to nullify in practice, even if not in law, the federal laws banning a plant. I spent 25 minutes giving the heroic tale of Angel Raich, who defied the Supreme Court, and even after she lost the *Gonzales v. Raich* case, where Justice Scalia said growing six plants in your backyard, never crossing state lines with them, consuming them in your own home, and never buying or selling them was somehow interstate commerce, she actually said: you know what? I'm going to continue doing this, and I'm going to help other people do this as well, even though the Supreme Court says otherwise. I told this heroic story of this woman who did this. I talked about how war is bad; all the bombs that are being dropped, no matter who's in there; opposing mass surveillance; federal forfeiture; things that people in the mainstream left might agree with us on. He didn't quote any of those things. I even talked about Hillary Clinton tweeting that states are the frontier to protect things that progressives believe in. I talked about Rosa Parks saying no.

None of this made it into a report. What he did cover was: *Oh, there's a bunch of radical people talking about things that were proposed by racists and slave owners. It was proposed by these people, it was defeated in the Civil War, and therefore it is wrong. And then it was used again by Wallace and racist people in the 1950s.* And that's all they put. And what they do is they go out of their way to tell a story that is isn't true, because they don't want people learning about this.

And before we started recording, I actually mentioned to you Tom — and I think this is a good story to share, as well. Once I found out there was this Think Progress guy, we did a Q&A session, and I talked about how Think Progress — actually, Ian Millhiser, the guy there, he actually wrote an article years ago to oppose our effort to nullify the NSA, to turn off the water to the Bluffdale facility in Utah, which we've covered on this show, because it might work. And if that isn't to me a green light to keep pushing forward, I don't know what is.

WOODS: Yeah, it's just laughable. It's not like they don't know what they're doing. The guy sat through what you said. And then the idea that, oh, this was used by bad people we don't like. So was the federal government, far more often. The federal government itself centralized power, has far more often been used for bad things. But at no time — if I were to say that to him, and say, "Look, the federal government in X, Y, and Z," they'd say, "Well, look, you know, nobody's perfect." That would be their answer.

BOLDIN: And then he wouldn't quote you as saying that.

WOODS: [laughing] Right, yeah.

BOLDIN: Well, that is what I think is the greatest level of dishonesty. And in the past, I've had *The New York Times* talk to me, and they sent me an email after talking to me, saying, "This is what we're going to print. Is it out of context?" That doesn't happen all the time, but it does happen from time to time. And even from publications that we might think are against us — because they're politically slanted, there's no doubt about it — at least some of the on-the-ground reporters are honest. This guy go, and every person — I've dealt with many of them over the years — at Think Progress, they go out of their way, with their \$30 to \$50 million of funding every year at Center for American Progress from George Soros — not to just try to make like a boogie monster, but this is a fact. This is the money there that's going on for a certain message. They go out of their way to not quote you saying anything that their supporters might want to hear. Well, good thing that enough of our message got to enough progressives on NSA surveillance when Barack Obama was in power, that they actually had to go out of their way to say, "Don't do it. Here's why." Now, hopefully, it didn't convince too many people, because we're going to continue ramping that up and pushing it forward.

WOODS: Well, that's good to hear, because that's one of the reasons that —

BOLDIN: I'm rambling a little bit, but these people really irritate me.

WOODS: It's so absurd at this point, I can't even generate the outrage anymore, because I've followed the same people over the years, they write the same inane articles with the same arguments that they know we've answered a million times, but they figure the general public doesn't know that, so they can get away with it. I know that's how and why they're acting the way they are. But I will say that your determination and your creativity, like the proposal to

turn off the water in Utah to the NSA, which needs it to cool its computers, is, you know, it's a kind of nullification, and that's a great idea. None of these libertarian or conservative think-tanks came up with anything like that. They keep soliciting donations, even though they've got tens or hundreds of millions of dollars. Imagine what Michael Bolton could do with hundreds of millions of dollars. Things would change in this country. And this is why I donate to the Tenth Amendment Center. I think I give the Tenth Amendment Center more than I - well, I don't know; I guess there's one - okay, you're number two.

BOLDIN: You're very generous, Tom. I mean, I can't tell you, on a monthly basis, how many people tell me: oh, I signed up as a member, because I heard Tom talk to you and say he personally supports it. So there's something to that, when people listen to someone that they trust over and over, and that person that they trust says, "I support these guys." So I can't even express to you how much help that's given us, beyond even the very generous financial amount that you give every month. So thank you.

WOODS: Well, it's my pleasure, because I know that there are people out there who want to do something. Of course, a lot of people want to volunteer, and I know that you're happy to have people help you out, but there are other people who don't have the time to volunteer, but they have a little bit of cash, and they'd like to do something productive with it. And I say that helping out Michael Bolton and the Tenth Amendment Center is one of the great outlets that you have. It's an excellent way to put that money to work, because, for one thing, Michael is not going to spend it on chauffeurs and fancy hotels. I know that Michael is extremely frugal and is very, very careful with how he spends that money. Which again, it's not exactly something you could say about a lot of think-tanks out there. I mean, your donation went to the half of somebody's \$85 dinner. That's where your donation went. You know, so screw that. Help out the Tenth Amendment Center. So tell people how they can find out more and contact you and give and everything else.

BOLDIN: Well, we're actually, after this conversation, Tom, I'm actually building a new page dedicated to just this issue we've been talking about, TenthAmendmentCenter.com/fugitiveslave, TenthAmendmentCenter.com, all spelled out, /fugitiveslave. It will be live well before this show actually is posted. And then for anyone who wants to support us, of course, TenthAmendmentCenter.com/donate. It's always hard for me to ask, but I can't tell you, nothing helps us get the word out more than the support of our donors. Whether it's \$2 a month, or \$2,000, or whatever it may be, we make very good use of it. I want people to actually learn about this and spread the information to others more than anything.

WOODS: Absolutely. Well, as I say, Michael, of course, as you know, I couldn't be a bigger supporter. And I'm glad we had a chance to talk about this topic. It's a tantalizing look into something really, really important and overlooked. So definitely TenthAmendmentCenter.com - right? TenthAmendmentCenter.com/fugitiveslave. All right, so I'm going to link to that page in particular at TomWoods.com/1284, and I'll probably also link to my humble contribution to this conversation, namely the book *Nullification*. So that stuff will all be at TomWoods.com/1284. Well, thanks, Michael. Hope to see you soon.

BOLDIN: Awesome, Tom, thank you so much.