



Episode 1,410: The New Right: A Journey to the Fringe of American Politics

Guest: Michael Malice

WOODS: So glad to be talking about you here on — this is Michael Malice Week on *The Tom Woods Show*, and I'm so pleased for you that this book, which, it's a long time coming. Publishers these days, doggone it, it can take a long time for a book to come out. But here it is, finally, the release of *The New Right: A Journey to the Fringe of American Politics*. So I thought in this first of our episodes together, we would do a big-picture overview of the book and what's in it, what your aims are, all that sort of stuff. But before we can do that, I think as a matter of terminology, I'd like you to describe what you mean by "New Right," because although that kind of term is used from time to time and has been used — it was used to refer sometimes to different aspects of the right in the 1980s, for example. You really are coining this term to refer to a phenomena that we're observing now. So why don't you explain what you mean by it?

MALICE Why don't you read what I wrote, because I was very specific, and I don't have the book in front of me?

WOODS: Okay, I've got it exactly. It's on page three. I know exactly what you're talking about.

MALICE But before we get to that, I just do want to say that one of the things that I talk about in the book and in general, like on Twitter or when I do appearances, is how important it is to use language precisely, and how that's a technique to combat people that you don't like, which the progressives often use, is they will use language loosely.

WOODS: Right. Right, right, and you're very precise about stuff like this. In fact, you've even indented the definition to make sure people can't miss it. So you say: "Though terms like 'New Right' and 'alt-right' are used in very ways in various contexts, for the purposes of this book, the New Right is defined as a loosely connected group of individuals united by their opposition to progressivism, which they perceive to be a thinly veiled fundamentalist religion dedicated to egalitarian principles and intent on totalitarian world domination via globalist hegemony." Oh, my.

MALICE Yes, that's the definition.

WOODS: That is who they are. Now, a further question on terminology: how does your term overlap with, differ from, include or otherwise, the alt-right? Just to make sure we're clear on — because alt-right is defined differently by a lot of people. The media define alt-right to mean — I mean, they think Ben Shapiro is alt-right, for heaven's sake.

MALICE They think he's a Nazi.

WOODS: Yeah, which just, it's insane.

MALICE Well, now, someone had to turn in the rest of us.

WOODS: [laughing] I suppose so. All right, so how you handle that part of the question?

MALICE It's the next sentence.

WOODS: Oh, for heaven's sake, do I have to do all the work on this show?

MALICE I already did the — Tom, I did the audio book. Now I've got to do it again on your show?

WOODS: All right, all right, so: "This is a broad definition that encompasses several subgroups. The most well-known faction is the alt-right, which includes members of the New Right, who perceive race, not racism, to be one of the most important sociopolitical issues, if not the most important one." And then, you know, I'm not going to read the whole book, but it goes on from there. Yeah, okay, all right. But this kind of means, though, that — well, I'm not exactly sure what it means. The New Right to me — when you hear "New Right," you think, well, there must have been an Old Right. And you do use the term Old Right to talk about the paleo phase of the early '90s, so we'll get into that at another time. But for me to distinguish what — this New Right, the way I think of it is that what makes it new is that it's a break from — maybe we'll call it, for lack of a better term, the establishment right. It is definitely and consciously a break from the world of *National Review*, the Heritage Foundation, official conservatism, Inc. That to me was how it was a New Right. Is that also how you're thinking?

MALICE No, that's part of it, but there's two ways I would disagree. The New Right argues that if you're talking about DC and *National Review*. That's already the symptom of the rot, and that's kind of — you know how magicians, they'll do something with their left hand to distract you, while with the right hand they're picking your pocket kind of thing? So Washington is the fourth quarter. So if you're focusing on — so that's a little subtle distinction. And the other way I would say that the New Right is, is it's a focus much more on tactics and strategy than on issues. You can sit here, and one of the things I point out in the book — and I'm glad we're talking about the book, because for two years, I've been saying, "as I discuss in my book," and now it's actually —

WOODS: Now you can finally talk about it, yeah.

MALICE And I'm actually pointing to it.

WOODS: Yeah.

MALICE If you are talking about third-world immigration or transgender bathrooms or any one of any myriad issues that happen to be the flavor of the month, that is missing the point. Because if you just — it's like a Hydra, right? You cut off its head, and then they're on to the next one. It's not about principles; it's about whatever tool can be used at that moment to further domination. So this is, I think, a big distinction between the New Right and I'd say

conservatives, which is the conservatives will stand their ground to be like, all right, you're talking about transgender bathrooms today; I'm going to tell you why you're wrong. Whereas the New Right is like, no, no, this goes much deeper, and if you're going to sit here and discuss this minor issue, in terms of percent of population who identify as transgender, you're missing the forest for the trees.

WOODS: I think also you might say that the New Right is not necessarily satisfied all the time with constantly having the agenda being dictated to them by the other side, that, now the other side says this; now we have to react. Well, we don't want to constantly be reacting. We want to lob some rhetorical bombs of our own so that the other side has to react to us.

MALICE Right. So conservatism has for decades — exactly correct. Conservatism has for decades been described as reactionaries, but it's true. It has been reacting to a leftist agenda, as opposed to, no, we're not going to do that, and we're also not even going to engage with you. So if you want to sit here — and I use this line in the book throughout. It's like, it's 2019. How are we having this conversation? Well, we are, and if you don't like it, that's fine, but I'm having it, and that's how it's going to be. So I think that is a new style, strategy, and approach to dealing with specifically the evangelical left than what would be broadly conceived of as the right wing.

WOODS: I want to throw out an historical example and see where you think it shares something in common with the New Right and where you think it's different. When Murray Rothbard would talk about the Old Right, from his point of view, he meant, to the extent that there was a right wing around the time of the New Deal, before World War II, he was thinking of basically isolated writers here and there like Albert J. Nock or John T. Flynn —

MALICE It's like five people.

WOODS: Yeah.

MALICE It's Albert J. Nock, Garet Garrett, John T. Flynn, and like another guy.

WOODS: Yeah, and maybe H.L. Mencken. I mean, you could maybe put him in there.

MALICE Sure.

WOODS: But the idea there was that there's no figurehead. There's no Bill Buckley uniting them all. They don't necessarily agree on a lot of stuff. There's no institutional link, like they all belong to some think-tank or something. There's something about that that I think the New Right has in common, but not entirely, because there is a sense in which we have here, as you're describing in your book, a lot of scattered individuals, some of whom know each other, some of whom like each other, some of whom hate each other. They don't all belong to a particular think-tank. To what extent is that a similar kind of situation?

MALICE Well, I'm going to pick on someone that a lot of people like, and I think that we all tend to look at those who've walked before us, and we kind of make allowances for them, and you know, think that they're greater than they are. And so we're protective of them, because — I'm going to go after Albert J. Nock. So Albert J. Nock, you know, and it's not just because he wrote a book about Jefferson. I have two big issues with him, and this is kind of a big

distinction between the Old Right and the New Right. First of all, he identifies what he called the Remnant, correct, or something like that? Was that his term?

WOODS: Yeah, that's his essay, yeah.

MALICE And his whole point being like, well, we're done, so I'm just going to sit here, and we're going to, like, talk to ourselves, and basically, we're going to be that one candle in the wind storm. So there was this sort of — and maybe there's nothing he could have done in that point in time. He's writing the '20s and early '30s. But that's sense of like, I'm just going to sit in my log cabin like Thoreau while the world goes to hell, that is a very, very different psychological mindset from the New Right today. That said, maybe he didn't have a choice. Maybe at that point, that would have been the realistic mindset, although I don't think it is. And one of my big criticisms in this book is attacking cynicism and hopelessness. I'm very, very against that.

The other thing Albert J. Nock did — and I do think Jonathan Haidt is one of the most profound thinkers ever. Jonathan Haidt discusses how people reason backwards, and I talk about that in the book. We come with our conclusion, and then we often have a rationalization. And Albert J. Nock's *Our Enemy the State*, with that title, you would think, oh, my gosh, yeah, this this guy's my guy. And basically, he distinguishes between the state and government, and he tries to draw this line, and like, the state's really bad, but government's good. And like, dude, it's just like there's parts of governments you like, parts of governments you don't like, and to kind of make it out that they're inherently different, I found that to be very weak.

WOODS: Yeah, I mean, if you're going to say the state is bad, but —

MALICE Not bad, the enemy, *our* enemy.

WOODS: But if you're going to say that, but then — I can understand people who want to preserve the word "government" for things like the government of a chess club or student government or whatever. Those are different things, because they're not the state. They don't have coercive power, and they want to make that distinction. That's fine. But you're right. I found that book to be highly unsatisfying because of this obsessive, weirdo distinction. And I also, frankly, thought his biography of Jefferson was extremely idiosyncratic. I mean, it's like half a page on the Declaration of Independence., no mention of the Kentucky resolutions of 1799. This is who Jefferson is. What kind of crazy book is this?

MALICE Oh, I really thought — oh, I'm glad. I thought this was going to be like a total sidebar, like total myopic argument between you and me about Albert J. Nock, who I don't even mention in the book, and I'm glad we're on the same page.

WOODS: Okay. Yes, yes, we are indeed. We are indeed.

MALICE So that's my other point. I get how Rothbard is — and I'm not using this word in an insulting way — desperate to find a grounding for his predecessors, because he was such a pioneer and a revolutionary in many ways. Unlike Rand, who basically in many ways presented herself as coming fully formed from the head of Athena, you know, Rothbard was trying to have that direct link from the prerevolutionary era to him. So he's got a latch on to these

rando figures who, sure, if I had to have them as my senator, I'd be really happy, but to portray them as John Galt, not that he particularly did, but it kind of misses the mark.

WOODS: Yeah, it's a small and scattered group of people. It's true, but for a small and scattered group, I mean, Garet Garrett wrote some of the best stuff on the New Deal I think that's ever been written. And there were some, let's say, '40s and '50s congressmen were pretty proto-Ron Pauls. And interestingly enough, Howard Buffett, Warren Buffett's father, was a Republican congressman from Nebraska, who even wrote a letter to Rothbard to say, "I've been reading *Man, Economy, and State*" — can you imagine a congressman saying, "I've been reading *Man, Economy, and State*"? — and he asked Rothbard, he said, "I have a son" — and he means Warren.

MALICE Oh.

WOODS: "I have a son who's very interested in reading books about financial crises and bank crises and crashes. I'd love to get a copy of your book on the Panic of 1890." So I mean, I think Rothbard was not unreasonable to say, that guy's an ally. We do have some. But it is, as always, really slim pickings. All right, so now we've gotten some of this —

MALICE But that's the thing. That's the whole point, like the New Right doesn't regard it as having to be slim pickings. Like when Roger Ailes sat down to create Fox News, they wanted him to compete with CNN. And he said, I'm not going to compete with CNN; I'm going to destroy CNN. And he did, so I think that is a very different approach.

WOODS: Ah, that is.

MALICE That's what I'm saying. That's the difference.

WOODS: Yeah, that is an excellent and very important distinction. All right, but I want to ask a really meta sort of question here. Why this book? You're knowledgeable in a lot of areas; you could have written a lot of books. Why this one?

MALICE Well, I knew that someone was going to write it. I was at the epicenter of this scene as it was forming, and I figured if someone's going to write this book, it might as well be me. And I'm also well positioned, being culturally a New Yorker, being an immigrant, that I can discuss this thing, so that people — well, the guest that called Ben Shapiro, they called me a Nazi. But I certainly don't fit this mold of a Rick Santorum.

WOODS: So in the early part of your book, you give some good reasons for doing it, and you say that — I mean, I'm going on memory here, but you say that people might be inclined to just dismiss all the people in your book. And your view is that that's just not ever a good idea, and even if some of the people you're talking about in your book are bad dudes, well, maybe you can reach some bad dudes by engaging with their arguments, and so on. I mean, I like, the way you frame it, that it's just not good just to write off a whole group of people. Let's actually take a look. Plus, it's a phenomenon that's not going away.

MALICE Well, also the other broader point, in terms of democracy, if you're going to ascribe somewhat correctly that there's these huge populations of racists in America — and I'm using that term "racist" very broadly — well, their votes count just as much as yours. So to say like,

Well, we're not going to deal with them, well, you don't have a choice. Having a government and having democracy means you are locked into an association and a polity with these people, and their vote counts just as much as yours. So what happens when you're adding up those ballots? So this fantasy that people who you don't like — *whoever* a given individual doesn't like, you know what I mean? Like, I don't like communists — their vote counts. If there's enough of them, they can control the culture and move the culture. So it's very bad strategy, to just say, well, this population doesn't exist. Okay, that's nice. Well, they do. So what happens now?

WOODS: I want to read a couple of sentences from your book and jump off from there:

"When it comes to progressivism, the New Right is united, but without that common enemy, there was very little in common to be had."

Okay, let's jump off from there. So they're anti-progressive, but then what are they for? It reminds me of the old book *What the Anti-Federalists Were For?* Well, some of them were for one thing, and some of them were for the other.

MALICE [siren in background] I mean, this is the beauty of this scene. I'm a lover of all things unorthodox. In music, culture, I like the weird stuff. Some people don't like it. That's fine. This is all the unorthodoxy on the right side of the spectrum, so you're going to have the white nationalists, but you also have the anarchists, and you have the monarchists, and you have the trad-cons, and you have just the MAGA people. There's all these different bubbles, and they interact and interrelate in different ways. And one of my favorite lines — I said this on Glenn Beck yesterday. I pointed and I go: look, more white nationalists and white supremacists died fighting the Nazis than urban feminists. So to say that this is the same phenomenon is historically inaccurate.

WOODS: By the way, the sirens that you hear in the background are not coming from Florida. That's Michael's backyard, where we're getting the sirens.

MALICE I don't hear any sirens.

WOODS: We had some sirens. I'm hearing them in my ears. That's okay. It makes it authentic.

MALICE That's in Florida.

WOODS: I've got headphones on, Mr. Genius, over here.

MALICE Notice how loud those sirens are in Florida.

WOODS: You say you are at the epicenter, and that is part of this. I mean, you're — I wouldn't say you're like —

MALICE Forrest Gump.

WOODS: — Virgil taking us through —

MALICE I literally said I'm like Virgil. It's like at the end of chapter one.

WOODS: Oh, did you? Okay, then that must have stuck in my head. That must have just stuck in my head.

MALICE I guess my book's a failure.

WOODS: I like to appropriate other people's ideas and then just —

MALICE Deny them.

WOODS: Yeah, just say, "Oh, it's my middle-aged brain playing tricks on me again." All right, so you are like Virgil, so I didn't just invent that. But in what way were you at the epicenter? Because a lot of this happened before we knew each other, back in the dark days of your life when you didn't even know the about Tom Woods?

MALICE Oh, yeah, the salad days.

WOODS: [laughing]

MALICE I mean, a lot of this came, it started with NRx, neoreaction and the Dark Enlightenment and Mencius Moldbug. So this came — I was exposed to it through a lot of anarchists I knew who were being drawn into the world of neoreaction and this whole idea of unorthodox right-wing thought. I mean, the corporate press likes to portray this whole scene as these kind of hillbillies who are basically Klansmen. But a lot of these types are very bright, extremely well read, nuanced. And I, as someone who has a good grasp of how ideas become mainstreamed, I saw that all the intellectual energy on the right wing was coming from these blogs and these Facebook groups, and so on and so forth, because I have a pretty good library of right-wing thought. For a long time, I liked to read about this kind of stuff. And these were ideas that were being expressed in new and innovative ways. So I'm like, all right, this is going to be the next thing in a few years. And it was.

WOODS: When you say "neoreaction," some people listening will know what you mean, but I'd be willing to bet a majority of people don't. How do you want to explain that?

MALICE Neoreaction is — there's so many definitions. It's kind of kind of like defining obscenity; I know it when I see it. Neoreaction is — I don't even know how I would — the idea that basically what we're presented as — how I would define it, and I'm sure neoreactionaries would disagree — that what we're presented as, in terms of our American culture, is really degenerate, is their word, and transparently so once you look at it from that lens, and what can be — and decadent. So in a sense, it's that we're living in Weimar.

WOODS: Ah, okay. And so then, therefore, what is called for? What are we to do?

MALICE Well, that's the big question. Some of it is, all right, do we accelerate it, hasten the collapse? Do we have the man and the white horse come in and save us all? Do we decentralize? I mean, that's where the discussions were. So in that scene, it's like, all right, now that we have recognized how low America and the West has gotten, is it hopeless? That's what they call the black bill, like, we're done, there's no hope. Or, you know, do we fight back? What's behind this? So I mean, there's like so much discussion in these circles.

WOODS: Well, let's put some flesh and blood on this. When you use the term New Right, are there people — well, yes, there are. Give us some names of people that you associate with the New Right.

MALICE Sure. Here's the thing: St. Martin's wanted this to be personality driven, and I hated that, because I think it's so much more important to discuss ideas and cultural movement. For example, who would you rather discuss, or what would you rather discuss? Twitter and how Twitter acts, or Jack Dorsey? I mean, to me, this is a completely obvious question. So, sure, there's people like Milo, and Cernovich, and Trump, of course, and Mencius Moldbug, Ann Coulter, in a sense, the people in Charlottesville. But again, it's so much more about — because it's a loosely connected movement, there really isn't this figurehead that they would like, in the same sense that, who would you say represents the Tea Party or Occupy? I mean, nobody, right?

WOODS: Right. Well, now, that actually makes me want to ask: what's the relationship — and it's obviously a complicated one — between the New Right and a particular individual, namely Donald Trump?

MALICE I mean, they're skeptical. They saw him, I think across the board, as a wrecking ball, which in some ways is true; some ways it's not. There's always a cheering for when the elites get their comeuppance and are humiliated and denigrated. And I think I talk about this in the book, about how that's the Rothbard aspect to it, where he just really liked it when those who decided they were better than the rest of us and are going to tell us how to live our lives, got a pie thrown in their face. Like that, from my reading of him, was like the Acme. Like, yeah, that it's not that they have to lose; it's that you've got to rub their nose in it. And I think Trump, what he did when he personally humiliated Jeb, you know, Hillary, "You'd be in jail" — I just tweeted this out last week; it got like 1,000 likes. Do we all remember — we all have amnesia. Do we all remember, Nancy Pelosi and all those congresspeople got on a bus to go overseas to visit, the military buses, and he pulled their clearance, and they just turned the bus around? I mean, this is hilarious. *And oh, my God, how could he do this to the Speaker of the House?* But that is the aspect of Trump that everyone likes.

WOODS: Right, right, right. And sometimes, then, when you you'll say to them, "But look, on this issue, he's been a disappointment; on that issue, he's been a disappointment; that issue," there's a recognition of that. Yeah, he hasn't been good on this or this or this, and he should be better. But the support, such as it is for him, remains at kind of a visceral level, that he's sticking it to the people.

MALICE Visceral, yeah.

WOODS: He's sticking it to these people.

MALICE But it's very mixed, because where's the wall, would be one of the big issues. And again, the point I make is, the corporate press wants to make this all about Trump. I think everyone in the New Right is thinking long-term and are thinking, okay, he gave this some kind of breathing space, they would say, but this is not going to be a battle that's going to be won or lost in four or eight years.

WOODS: You have a chapter in there on Ann Coulter.

MALICE Yeah.

WOODS: And she's an interesting figure for a lot of reasons, but I think she's changed in some ways. And I don't think that's any huge discovery on my part, but I just remember, during the run-up to the Iraq War, there was no piece of propaganda she didn't repeat in one of her columns. She was totally on board. I remember those columns vividly.

MALICE Do you remember the quote? She said, "We should conquer their nations, kill their leaders, and convert them all to Christianity."

WOODS: That's right, yeah. That's right. Yeah, and which, by the way — she may well have believed that, but it could also be: this is what everybody thinks, I believe, anyway, so I may as well double down and just —

MALICE I think Ann tends to be sincere, I would say.

WOODS: How could she possibly believe in the forcible conversion of people to Christianity? Nobody believes — I mean, that's forbidden. I mean, you can't — there's nothing —

MALICE I don't think she means literal, like they're taking the sacrament and thinking and believing in transubstantiation. I think what she means is having Christian values.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, I suppose so, but you've got to be clear when you when you talk like this.

MALICE You do?

WOODS: Yeah, of course you — if you say we've got to convert them to Christianity, then yeah, doggone it, you've got to be clear. *Well, I don't actually mean what these words plainly indicate.*

MALICE Why? Why do you have to be clear? If your goal is to agitate people and to be thought provoking, clarity is often a detriment.

WOODS: That's why I'm always going to hit a ceiling, because I can't do this [laughing].

MALICE Sometimes on Twitter, people are like, *What do you mean by this?* and I just tell them, "Am I being detained?" I'm not spelling it out for you. And if you think something's wrong, and you get all worked up, that's fine.

WOODS: What do you think's different about the Ann Coulter of today?

MALICE I think she has gotten more right-wing. I think before she was much more of a humorist and much more about the Democrats, the Democrats, the Democrats, and much more of a partisan hack, for lack of a better term. Now that there has been this kind of right-wing schism, how it's pronounced — is it "skism" or "shism"? I always have this argument.

WOODS: It's actually "scism," like there's no "ch" at all.

MALICE No, it's not. Are you serious?

WOODS: I promise you, yeah.

MALICE Wait a minute. I'm looking this up.

WOODS: All right, go ahead.

MALICE That doesn't sound right.

WOODS: Well, look, I mean, I —

MALICE "Skism!" I'm looking at it right now. It's "skism," Tom.

WOODS: It is not.

MALICE I'm looking at it. Just go to Wikipedia —

WOODS: No. Yeah, okay, no, no, look at Dictionary.com, the first pronunciation is "scism." They also allow "skism."

MALICE Okay, so "skism." Okay, fine.

WOODS: All right. Bastard.

MALICE She has certainly now gone to the New Right side of it, and her books are much more ideological and much more aggressive vis-a-vis the Republican Party, specifically, and are much less within what could be considered acceptable mainstream thought. And what I talk about with her in here is, I had met her at the VDARE party.

WOODS: I love that story.

MALICE And at the time, VDARE was still largely considered acceptable. Or VDARE was the border, and now I think they've been driven into the wilderness. Although in all fairness, their Twitter has also gotten increasingly strident — and not necessarily wrong. I'm just saying they're not making this facade of respectability.

WOODS: Well, look, Coulter, I got really annoyed with during those George W. Bush years, but then she's gotten much better on issues like that, on foreign intervention. She's much better, and so I am the sort of person who I want to know where you are right now. Maybe you weren't so good the other day, but if you're good today, that's a good foundation for the future.

MALICE And if you look at who she follows on Twitter, she follows a lot of the big alt-right names.

WOODS: I loved that she followed, then unfollowed you, then followed you back. Was that what it was?

MALICE Oh, yeah.

WOODS: I think that's how we all feel when we follow Michael Malice. But regardless of how you feel about immigration, the fact is she wrote a book just praising Trump to the skies, and then had the stones, so to speak, to say he's a total disaster. Like even though it undermines her position completely, it undermines her book, it undermines her professionally, she stands up and says he's been a total disaster and a disappointment.

MALICE I think she called him a moron.

WOODS: Maybe. Maybe.

MALICE It was either moron or idiot. Like, I mean, a very strong, negative term.

WOODS: I mean, she was somebody who clearly had his ear, the ear of a president of the United States, and then turned on him.

MALICE Or no, he turned on her — I mean, it's not clear who turned on whom.

WOODS: Well, but the only reason he would turn on her is that she was being so tough on him on immigration.

MALICE On the wall specifically, yeah.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, so anyway, I think she's an interesting person.

MALICE Oh, very much so.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, definitely worth talking about.

MALICE So I discuss her at length and her book, *Audios America*, at length.

WOODS: Let me say, and you can get as specific or broad as you want to about this, but as we bring this big-picture episode to an end, so then in the future episodes we can get into some much more nitty gritty —

MALICE Oh, my gosh, it's been half an hour already. Oh my gosh, wow.

WOODS: Yeah, I know. It's crazy. Time flies when you're talking about your book. "Apocalyptic" is a word that I sometimes associate with the right wing, because the world is always ending. Now, eventually they're going to be right. Like maybe it will, at some point. But it could be ending for a variety of different reasons, according to them. And one thing that I found very interesting about your book is that you just will not tolerate apocalyptic thought or language at all, because you think it's missing major, major pieces of the puzzle, that they are only seeing downsides when you keep trying to point out the positives. And it's interesting that you're somebody who, you don't vote, you have no hope for the political process, but that doesn't mean you have no hope for civilization and society in the future. So is there anything you want to say about that?

MALICE Well, yeah, Arthur Herman wrote this book called *The Idea of Decline in Western History*, and that's my go-to, and he just points out how there's these cycles of apocalyptic thought that happen all the time. And what's funny to me, like on social media, where people are like, *How can you say this? Obviously, blah, blah, blah* — you know, *Caitlyn Jenner's on TV. Obviously, we're in Weimar America, right?* And it's like, nothing is obvious when it comes to socioeconomic trends. These are things that take looking at a lot of data and a lot of analysis. So something is obvious to you. That usually implies you haven't given a lot of thought and are reacting viscerally to something that you don't like, at the same time you're — it's the broken window fallacy applied to culture, right? *Well, I see this broken window.* I'm like, yeah, but you're missing the sweater you could have bought, or you're missing, it could have been ten broken windows, or you wouldn't have had windows at all. So I do go throughout all these examples of, *We're doomed. We're doomed, blah, blah, blah.*

I mean, one of the best ones, an argument the alt-right makes, is demographics is destiny. And they make this point that, oh, if America becomes majority minority, there's 100% certainty America's ruined. You're never going to have these people voting Republican. At the same time they'll admit voting Republican's not going to save the republic, either — but whatever. But the point I make is: are we really more left-wing now than under FDR? And what about when the idea that the South would never vote Republican? And they argue, okay, these were conservative Democrats. No, they weren't. These were economic populists, many of them, who were very, very, very left-wing. And there was also the argument back in the day: well, the lower classes will never vote for the right-wing. I mean, that's how economic classes operate. Economics is destiny. And that's been turned out to be true also. Now, I'm not saying that demographics is something to be ignored or something like that. The point is, to be absolutely sure that this is what's going to happen, that's not how politics works.

WOODS: Well, of course, the book is *The New Right: A Journey to the Fringe of American Politics*. I'm linking to it at TomWoods.com/1410. This is going to give us ample fodder for the remainder of the week. So, Michael, I'd like to say thanks for being on the show, and I'll see you later, but obviously, you and I both know I'm going to be talking to you again about five seconds from now. But thank you.

MALICE Thanks, Tom.