

THE TOM WOODS SHOW

Episode 1, Destruction of New

Guest: Michael Malice

WOODS: I'm inspired to have you on because of all the episodes you've been doing with Dave Smith on each other's shows, and I thoroughly enjoy them. I like what each of you has to say, and I like the way you interact. And it's just great. It's such a good idea. It's one of the silver linings to come out of the end of the world.

So I have a few sort of current event topics of my own that I want to run by you and get your get your thoughts on. So I guess it was a maybe a couple of days ago that, in an interview, Dr. Fauci said that New York did it right in terms of its response to the virus. And this led to an outcry among a lot of people saying: how could he make a statement like that, when by far, New York has like the highest per-capita death rate of any place in the whole world? I mean, how could he make a statement like that? So you'd think there must be some meaning to it that we're not grasping or whatever. So I'm curious to know, given that you have been in New York this entire time and you've lived in New York, as far as I know, your whole life in the US, first of all, your response to that, and secondly, where things really do stand in New York right now?

MALICE: I don't know that — I mean, just because it's the worst per capita, it could have been worse, you know what I mean?

WOODS: Yeah, right.

MALICE: So maybe there's something he's to what he's saying. I don't know what he means by it. And when I heard that, I was so over all this BS that I didn't even bother to investigate what he meant by that statement. I mean, when he said, "did it right," it could have been referring to: took the whole process seriously, correctly. I don't know. I don't care.

I think this whole coronavirus thing has been brazenly disingenuous. I think we were all told we have to stay in our homes, and then the next week we're told we all have to take to the streets, and now we're being told you've got to stay in your homes again. I get how you should err on the side of caution when you're dealing with a potentially devastating plague. Sure. But I also feel that many people are very comfortable giving orders without considering the deleterious consequences of those orders.

And I recently had a poll — I was in the Dennis Miller show; I brought up there — on my Twitter, which was only a little tongue in cheek, where I said: who do you think has done more long-term damage to New York City, Mohamed Atta or our current mayor, de Blasio? And de Blasio won 9 to 1. And I think that's accurate. I think what's happening in the city is extremely disturbing. My social group has been just devastated by people — you know like you're playing poker and at a certain point, people are like, *All right, I'm out?* Like, people have just had it with the shenanigans here. I'm extremely concerned about the direction of this city, while I remain very hopeful about the direction of America as a whole.

And I've got to tell you, it is very disturbing and unprecedented in my lifetime, and probably ever, to be walking around New York and having the streets be empty and all the stores boarded up. This is something that you only see like literally in movies like that Will Smith movie or *Vanilla Sky* or something like that. It's very jarring to see. It still hasn't returned. The self-righteousness of these politicians is just simply despicable and the way they blindly feel

comfortable shutting down entire industries. I mean, there's an awful lot of talk about the working poor and so on and so forth. I mean, the waitresses, the busboys, the bartenders, people who work at the gym, people who work at the movie theater. They don't care. It's the kind of thing like with the AIDS crisis. If you are engaging in high-risk activity, it is incumbent upon you to take the necessary precautions. If you are someone with a respiratory issue, if you are elderly, you should assume that wherever you go, you're going to be possibly in contact with this virus and act accordingly and take precautions accordingly. There is no law or principle that is going to be able to keep you if you are someone who is immunocompromised from being safe, and it is just really kind of outrageous that so many things have been shut down for so long. And as you pointed out: to what end?

WOODS: Yeah, I mean, it seems when you look at the pattern of how the virus affects one society after another, I mean, I'm not saying that mitigation measures couldn't conceivably help, but I am saying that it does seem to follow the same pattern no matter what we do. No matter where the society is, the curve is the same. It's very straight. It does not correspond to what you would expect that. Like, for example, I've talked about somebody who's done some work on Google mobility data. You'd think as people started to not really observe the social distancing requirements quite as much and they started moving around and not following the stay-at-home orders quite as much, well, then places where there's more mobility must mean that the virus is spreading faster. And that didn't seem to be the case. So there's so much about this that doesn't make sense, and frankly, so little curiosity about it, because people want to just repeat the same orders over and over again.

Now, you mentioned the working poor, and a lot of those people are struggling, and even above that, even the middle class where they've sold everything they have of value, and it's the last straw for them at this point. And the brilliance of the current strategy is they've shamed everybody into keeping quiet. Normally if somebody's life is ruined and everything they've worked for is destroyed, they would complain. And it is astonishing to me the compliance of most people in not complaining about the complete ruination of their lives.

MALICE: I'm not surprised about that. I always cite Lincoln's quote that the average man does not want to be free, he simply wants to be safe. I think people are taught since they were children and trained accordingly that obedience is virtuous, submission is virtuous. We are all told explicitly all the time that the point of education is to make good citizens. And that's a very Orwellian way of saying: broken and defeated and waiting for orders from the person at the front of the room, regardless of how mediocre they are as a human being. And they are inevitably mediocre at best. So that didn't surprise me in the slightest.

There was an incident — I put this on my Instagram a while ago, which I found, it takes a lot for me to get disturbed by something. This did it. There was this Asian guy in his 30s — you know, Western dressed; it wasn't like he was in a rickshaw or something — and he was sitting on the train, and the train was empty, which is also quite rare in New York. And this older man, late 50s, early 60s, he stood up over him, was screaming at him, *screaming*, "Put on your mask. You're going to make us all sick. Go back to where you came from," and all this other stuff.

And you see this also in kind of totalitarian countries, when you have this scheme that everyone is involved, it gives permission for really just awful people, just really horrible people to take it upon themselves to be the enforcers of the regime and take pride in themselves in doing it. It's exactly, *exactly* — I'm not using this as an analogy — the psychology of dogs who are barking in front of a house protecting the property and seeking the approval of their masters. I always encourage people to watch *The Dog Whisperer*, because human beings and dogs co-evolved over millennia, and we both changed our behaviors to adapt to the other. So it's a lot better way of understanding how human beings operate than reading, I don't know, Robert Nozick or John Locke or something like that.

WOODS: I hear that. Yeah, I hear that, and I see that —

MALICE: You hear the dog whistle [laughing]?

WOODS: Yeah, of course. Of course, I hear all those. But I see that in a lot of areas of life where people are anxious to please. And it doesn't matter who they're anxious to please, but generally, it's society as they perceive it, or perceive the people they think to be in charge handing down the rules. They want to be compliant. It's just that to see the compliance go down — I mean, even a dog, if you start actually torturing him, may in his mind start to imagine life without his master. And yet, even here when people's livelihoods and everything is wrecked, you have very, very small turnouts in terms of protests and poll numbers, more or less say, *Yeah, we have to do this*. That amazes me, just the depths to which people will go, that they're willing to see this happen to themselves, but rather than put themselves in an unfavorable light, they'll just bite their tongue about it. I mean, I wonder if the Faucis of the world really expected that kind of compliance, but they got it. They got it.

MALICE: I think you used the wrong word, because you talked about the depths, and I don't think very many people have depth whatsoever. I think there is quite literally no self there. There's no one home. And you're actually a little inaccurate about the dogs. There was this — I forgot who it was, and I'm sure someone listening, they'll be yelling at the screen right now. There was a point where there was a school philosophy where they regarded all life as mechanistic, right? That basically just people are machines made out of meat. And there was this one situation where they were operating on a dog, and they were marveling that this machine would be licking its owner's hands while surgery was being performed on it. I don't know the veracity of the story or anything like that, but I think a lot of people will tell themselves — it's kind of like, well, sacrifice — and Rand talks about this a lot, Ayn Rand, the vampire novelist — sacrifice is proof that you're doing the right thing, right? This goes back thousands of years. It's kind of like you burned food to appease the gods. Why? Because historically, you have to put off gratification. You have to put off pleasure. You have to put off food. You have the winter. Then you have the spring and the summer, the Ant and the Grasshopper, that fable. So the idea is, well, if I'm suffering a lot now, logically speaking, that must mean I'm going to reap the whirlwind later. And they really believe this is the case. This is something to the kind of the Protestant ethic mentality, where hard work is inherently virtuous, and when you are hurting, that must mean it's the right thing. No pain, no gain, right?

WOODS: I get that. I can see the logic of that. I guess maybe it's more that I'm frustrated with this situation than anything else.

MALICE: Well, that's on you. I mean, if you are expecting dogs to not be able — and by the way, if people are offended by my analogy of dogs, most dogs are better than most people and more interesting. I'll just put that out there. So this isn't using dog as —

WOODS: But I think it's because I hang around with people who tend to see the world the way I do, and sometimes I make the mistake of extrapolating from that to the general public. And I forget that what you need to do to remind yourself that you are a distinct minority is go to a mall and walk around and just be reminded.

MALICE: Oh, yeah, it's amazing what people will — I mean, here's an example. People will tell you with a straight face something literally no historian believes: that Lincoln started the Civil War to free the slaves. Yeah, they will all tell you this. I would say a majority of people would tell you this with a straight face. No — and when I'm saying no, I'm not exaggerating — no historian would say this. But they all think it and will tell it to you.

WOODS: Yeah.

MALICE: And will tell it to you. That's the interesting part, the certainty with which people have these beliefs that they're trained. Now, that's the irrelevancy. Lincoln is not here. The Civil War is long gone, but that psychology can be extrapolated into literally any issue. They will tell you to your face things that are not only false, but incoherent on their own terms.

WOODS: And if you try to correct them, you're an unbelievably bad guy, no matter what the proof you have. It doesn't even matter. They're not going to listen to you.

MALICE: That's because *everybody knows X, Y and Z*.

WOODS: Yeah, right.

MALICE: Therefore, you are transgressing.

WOODS: Yeah.

MALICE: It's like you're giving the finger to a child. You don't do that. That's a transgression. It's the same kind of thing, like how dare you defy what everybody knows? What kind of person are you?

WOODS: They said not that long ago that — I mean, I know this is not your main priority, but you love the city, and so it matters in that way — that Broadway would remain closed until 2021. I don't see — I mean, they kept pushing it back, pushing it back. It's like a flight that's late, and they push it back 20 minutes, then 35, then 40, and whatever. So we all know that the flight is actually going to be later than that. So 2021, it seems to me by their metric — now, if you would have asked me in March, I would have thought, *2021, what are you crazy? There's no way you're going to wait that long to reopen Broadway*. Now. It's like wow, 2021 seems kind of premature, by their standards. It seems impossible. You'd have people sitting side by side making their own decisions about their own health. This is not thinkable. So I mean, I don't understand. Broadway is one of the main reasons people come to New York, one of them.

MALICE: Yeah, and do you know how hard it is to make it as an actor, and how exciting it is for these people, and this is their livelihood, and it's also what brings them joy? And to just have that taken away, it's just so stupid.

WOODS: It is awful and it breaks my heart, and yet every single one of them is too terrified even to say that. They could say, "Listen, I know we have to make these sacrifices, but my gosh, my heart is broken for the thing I worked so hard for and that brings me such joy." They're even too afraid to say that, these people. They can't even say that? You can't just be a person with feelings? Like we're not even allowing you to do that now?

MALICE: I'm more concerned — not more concerned. I'm as concerned with all the people who had to have their social isolation escalate, with people who are — you know, there's plenty of people that you and I probably know, whose only human contact is going to the office, talking to coworkers, or going to movies and seeing others. And to have that taken away from you, psychologically, is extremely disturbing and on a subconscious level. So when you miss that, it really does a number on you. We all know what it's like to be unemployed and when that phone isn't ringing, and even if it's only a few weeks, it does a number on you. Because your mind, your animal mind is screaming at you: resource scarcity, resource scarcity, resource scarcity. Why aren't you hunting for food? And there's nothing you can do. But the anxiety is pervasive, and it's that — anyone who has money problems knows what it's like, it's the background music to every day.

And just not that long ago — I had this wet shaving hobby, shaving soaps and brushes and all that good stuff. And I was on this message board, and some guy, older in his late 50s, was selling off some stupid soaps he had. And I bought something from him, and I got to talking, and his wife, who's 58, who knows, was just laid off. Like, being 58 and trying to find a new gig in this economy, in this situation, that's not fun. And my heart broke for her. I went on Twitter, we raised 200 bucks, just something to give to him, go buy her a nice dinner. But I remember, I had this big argument with Dave Smith on his show, because there was this clip about Cuomo, and he was basically being defensive, the choice being, look, if I have to choose between people being dead or people being out of work, it's not going to be a hard

choice. And I get that, but just because some cost needs to be paid, that cost still needs to be acknowledged and recognized. And it seems kind of like, *Well, too bad. Sit down and shut up.*

WOODS: Yeah, that's exactly what it is. Yeah, I think the point you made is an under-appreciated one, because there are very, very substantial costs to the lockdowns in terms — like for example, UNICEF says they expect 1.2 million child deaths. I don't know how to calculate that, but I mean, that's a staggering figure. If that's true, that's overwhelming.

MALICE: In America or around the world?

WOODS: Around the world, around the world. But the point is that most of the wreckage that's caused by the lockdowns is not quite that dramatic. It is somebody who has to start his life over again in terms of employment, or it's something simple like our friend Kevin Gutzman, he got his PhD from the University of Virginia, and one of his children went to the University of Virginia. And for her graduation, she was going to walk down that same aisle that he walked down and receive her degree, and he'd been waiting for that for four years. And they took that away. Now again, compared to somebody dying, I get that that's nothing. But that's still something, you know? And there are so many of these little somethings. Everybody has probably 50 of these little somethings, and no one can talk about it, because then you want your grandmother to die. The level of discourse is ridiculous. Intelligent people can't even talk about anything.

MALICE: Can I say something? One of my favorite writers — actually, I don't even like her as a writer per se; I just love her as a person and her personality, and I think she's an amazing human being — was Zora Neale Hurston. She was one of the big luminaries of the Harlem Renaissance and kind of faded into obscurity and was rediscovered by Alice Walker, among others. And she had this quote that I put on my Instagram and my Twitter at different times. And she says, "If you are silent about your pain, they'll kill you and say you enjoyed it."

WOODS: I saw you quote that, yes.

MALICE: And I think it is very important. I think one of the things I fight as much as I can, tooth and nail, is cynicism and sneering and this kind of very — it's very much an affectation among urban media elites. And there are certain kinds of people, certain people who are approved, and if anything happens to them, we have to stop the world and accommodate them. And if you are not part of that group and you talk about your pain, *Sit down and shut up. You have it so good. You have no right to complain. Ha ha. And they will laugh.* And I think it is something that is really sick and sinister. I think in other contexts, these types, we talk about how dangerous it is to silence people and marginalize them not only for that person themselves, but socially, it's going to have consequences that are not going to be desirable, to put it mildly. So I think this is an example where Zora's words might be of use.

WOODS: Let's shift to a different topic for the rest of our time. I haven't run this by or anything, but this morning in *The Wall Street Journal* and then all over, there is an article describing a poll that was done by *The Wall Street Journal* and NBC News. And it found that 56% of people polled agreed that American society is racist. Now, there are majorities among whites, blacks, and Hispanics. A slim majority among whites, but all three races, a majority say American society is racist. Only men, the demographic of men, at 46% had fewer than 50% saying American society is racist. Women, two-thirds of them say that. And then when you dig a little bit deeper into that poll, it's interesting to note that white people are more likely to think that the problem is individual people who are racist. And black respondents are more likely to say that it's the system in general, it's a systemic problem rather than just isolated individuals. I'm just curious how you respond to a poll like that. What are your thoughts when you hear those numbers?

MALICE: I don't care, is my response. I think the example I use — I think this is in my book *The New Right*, but I use it frequently — is let's suppose I came to you with a genie lamp. And if you say Abracadabra, you get a wish, right? Well, you'd say it so fast, you'd split your lip. And

this is not a big, shocking prediction. If you tell people, well, if you say this other word *racist*, people will do what you want. Well, why wouldn't you, irregardless and regardless of the veracity of that claim? So whenever you give human beings some sort of power, some of them will tend to use it. And it's also even better if you're told, well, it's the right thing for you to do, you are owed certain things, and so on and so forth.

Look, if I am treated poorly, in any regard, anyone, it's a lot easier for me to think it's the other person's fault than that I have something to do with it. It's not that I'm a jackass. It's that, oh, they don't like me because of this. They don't like because of that. Or why does this person have a more popular audience to me? Oh, it's because of this or because of that. And the other thing is, there's an asymmetry in that question, because it costs something to say no, because now you're being defiant, whereas saying yes is smiling and nodding. So I think it's one of those questions where it's not really earnest in and of itself, because that term is almost entirely incoherent.

WOODS: You mean the term *racism*?

MALICE: Yes.

WOODS: Well, how about the idea of systemic racism? What is your response to that?

MALICE: Yeah, I mean, look, this is kind of the whole Marxist concept of things like false consciousness and all these other ideas that why doesn't society look like you want it to look? Well, it must be because of the system itself. I mean, if you're going to ask me, is there systemic racism? I would say yes, in that there are certain things in the system that treat different races differently, and some races will have more advantages than others. And when you have a caste system racially, it's going to be racist against someone by definition.

The question is, how much is this systemic racism affecting your livelihood? How much is this affecting your opportunity to succeed, and so on and things like that? Is eliminating systemic racism possible? I mean, for example, you and I are both munchkins. Every study ever shows that tall people have great advantages over short people. The one thing that they don't have is a longer life lifespan. So, ha ha, I'll see you in the grave. But they will have enormous advantages in dating, in terms of getting jobs, and so on and so forth. What are we to do with this? Like, literally what can we possibly do with this?

Now, I know you could say, okay, well, that's different. You can't control your height, but people of different races are identical. Sure. But people from different races also come from different cultures. Someone who is born in Jamaica is going to have a different upbringing than someone born like myself in the Soviet Union, or someone born in Canada, or someone born in Arizona, and to say that, well, somehow we're going to be able to equalize all of these things makes no sense on any level, and it's not even at all possible.

So a big part of progressivism since the early days in the 1890s has been using the state to engineer society to look like what you want it to look like, right? And at a certain point, if it doesn't look like what you want it to look like, well, you've just got to keep on turning more levers and adding more knobs and just keep fiddling with it until you get the outcome you like, even if those fiddles end up putting human beings through the meat grinder.

WOODS: What do you think – and this is the toughest, most – maybe you don't find it a tough question. But I don't know, looking at where everything is right now with the virus, with race relations, and of course, all the demonstrations and sometimes rioting, I don't know what this means for Trump, because on the one hand, you think people just want stability, and if they think they can get stability without this guy in there, they're not going to ask a whole lot of other questions. But on the other hand, it could be that maybe there is a Nixonian silent majority that looks around and wonders: is this the society I want to live in, basically with mayors and governors telling police to stand down while cities are destroyed? Maybe that benefits Trump. I don't know. I think he's doing a very bad job capitalizing on any of it, if you ask me. What do you think it means for November?

MALICE: I think that we need to remember — it's funny how sometimes the corporate press just pretends certain things never happened and we all forget about it. Remember Ferguson? Remember 80 years ago, Ferguson, the Ferguson riot in Baltimore? No one ever seems to think that these riots that happened recently were historically unprecedented. We haven't seen the likes of them for 100 years. No, we saw them a couple years ago. And the behaviors were very similar in certain ways. And what that led to were historically unprecedented Republican majorities. At one point, the Republican House majority was their largest since the 1920s, since before the New Deal.

So historically speaking, we saw this happen in New York in 1993 in Crown Heights, which before the coronavirus, it's a neighborhood in New York in Brooklyn, which is very mixed between Hasidic Jews and African Americans. And there's been a lot of historic tension between these two groups. In 1993, there were many riots, and I think one Jewish kid was killed, and so on and so forth. And Mayor Dinkins, who was the first African American mayor in New York City, seemed basically powerless or disinterested in preventing this. And as a result, we got a Republican mayor, Rudy Giuliani, in 1993. So I think it does tend to go toward the Republican candidate.

That said, Donald Trump doesn't seem like — if you're going to talk about law and order, Trump doesn't seem like an *order* person. He's a chaos person. So it might even be flipped, in that the person who represents order in this country might be Biden, who would be in very many ways a direct continuation of decades of kind of Washington rule.

WOODS: So are you willing to — well, the thing is I don't want to make a bet on this. But I had a bet going with David Stockman, and it was just a gentleman's bet, which is too bad, because he's loaded. I could have really taken for a ride. But he did not think Trump was going to survive 2018. He thought they were going to get him out one way or the other, because he thought Trump has lost the Republican Party, and so if he doesn't even have the Republican Party, he's in the same position Nixon was in. And I did not think that was the case.

MALICE: Well, so here's the thing. The thing is he may have lost the Republican Party, but the Republican Party saw what happens or is increasingly aware of when you work with the Democrats. So then it becomes about self-preservation.

WOODS: Yeah, right. Well, so anyway, so obviously, as you know, Trump is still in office. So do you want to put odds on the outcome? I mean, what do you think?

MALICE: I am more curious if Biden's going to be on the ballot in November.

WOODS: Really? What do you think's going to happen in between? I mean, November's not that far off.

MALICE: I think there's several things that could happen. Given that we live in a simulation, it would not at all be unlikely that he would get killed by coronavirus, because that would be the most ironic situation, God forbid. I had said that you know that they're thinking about replacing Biden when you see hit pieces on Governor Cuomo in the corporate press, because they'd be planted by Hillary, because they would be used to make him toxic, so she'd be viewed as a natural replacement. And that has started happening. Jake Tapper of CNN, of all people, has gone after Governor Cuomo, even though his brother Chris Cuomo is an anchor at CNN. So I don't know what's going to happen before now in November.

I think it's going to be a question if we have debates. I think it's going to be completely a bloodbath one way or another, the debates. I think Trump is the best when he's counterpunching and when he's down and when he doesn't give a damn. And he's just going to steamroll Biden, I think. It's going to be very hard for Biden to deliver — Biden's going to come in with some good one liners. Biden was pretty smooth in his heyday. When he was debating against Paul Ryan in 2012, he did a great job. He's no dummy in that regard. But he seems to have very clearly lost his capacity to speak articulately and coherently. If you

watch some of these speeches he gives, he's not speaking English correctly, and this is some kind of verbiage issue.

So I'm not at all comfortable making predictions. And I think absolutely, it's not at all impossible we're going to have a Supreme Court vacancy between now and November, and that's really going to turn things nuclear. Ruth Bader Ginsburg has cancer again. I wish her the best. But Stephen Breyer has this magic power where everyone forgets he's alive. He's like 80-something.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, I'd actually forgotten how old he was myself. So yeah, that's a major factor here.

MALICE: He's 81. Yeah, he's going to turn 82 next month. That's no joke. But there's plenty of others who are aged on the Supreme Court, as well. So I mean, when that happens, can you imagine? I mean, we thought that Kavanaugh was like, okay, this is as nuclear as it's going to get. I don't know that that's true.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, it's going to be really — I mean, to some degree, you wonder about people being willing to accept a nomination at this point. You would have to be absolutely confident in your life. And even then, it's not enough, really. Even then.

MALICE: And here's the other thing. The Democrats could say, with a straight face, you didn't give a chance for Merrick Garland in 2016, and now that you're having the same situation, you're ceding this guy. We're going to pack the court because you're not playing fairly. And I don't think that that's a ridiculous position for them to take.

WOODS: Yeah, no, I can hear that. But it doesn't matter. I mean, none of that — I remember maybe a year and a half ago, a lot of people among the Democrats talking about court packing again, because they can see the writing on the wall.

MALICE: Sure. But now they would have not a bad reason to validate it.

WOODS: And Strictly speaking, of course, just for anybody who doesn't know, there's nothing in the Constitution that says the court has to be nine people. So strictly speaking, there's no constitutional problem with it. When FDR tried to do it, it failed, even some Democrats were opposed to it, because it just seems like such a brazen power grab that he lied about the reasons for, initially. Initially, it was that they're too old and we want to help them out. And then it was, okay, they're striking down my programs. So that was a little bit too transparent. But I think in this day and age, I know it sounds like a cliché to say that we're more partisan than ever, but I think we are somewhat more partisan than we were then. I don't think they would care about openly saying yeah, we need new justices so we can protect the rights of vulnerable Americans, right?

MALICE: Oh, there was there was a book that came out a couple of years ago. I'm blanking on the title. And basically it was a handbook, it was written by college professor, and his point was, this is our plan to solidify and institute a permanent rule by the left in America. And there were certain things that he had, he's like these are things we could do immediately that will make sure that there's never a Republican president again. And from their perspective, well, a Republican president is fascism, is Hitlerism, and they don't care about norms anymore. So why should we? And the things that he rattled off are, number one, you have amnesty, so then you have millions of new Democratic voters overnight. Packing the Supreme Court, giving statehood to Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico and I think there was another one.

The book's called *It's Time to Fight Dirty: How Democrats Can Build a Lasting Majority in American Politics*. He just goes through, point by point, systemic changes that they can — oh, here, I have it right here. Breaking California into several states, making a larger House of Representatives, passing a new voting rights act, and expanding Supreme Court. You're saying these are all things you don't need constitutional amendments to do, you could do it by

democratic majority. And they will make the case that you will never have a Republican majority in this country again. And why wouldn't they? There seems to be very little pretense anymore that both sides are playing by the rules.

WOODS: Michael, do you want to tell us what you're working on now, or do you want to keep that a secret?

MALICE: It's not a secret. I've been talking about it a bit on my locals and on my live streams and things like that. I'm just working on a book called *The White Pill*, and I'm having a little bit of trouble conceptualizing it entirely. But yeah, it's going to be a handbook for hope.

WOODS: Well, I'll say the cheeseball host thing: well, we could certainly use a dose of that right about now. Well, anyway, a much better thing to say is whatever Michael Malice has written, I'm always interested to see. Well, thanks for coming on. I'd love to get up to New York if I could. You're the only reason I'd go there, at this point.

MALICE: What they've done to this city is unforgiveable.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, awful. I'm doing a thing at my house in a few months, where I'm having some supporters over, and I just want you to know that — I'm saying this on the air here — I invited a couple of our mutual friends as special guests. I did not invite you, simply because I thought you would consider this to be like a nightmare, like surrounded by people who just want to talk to you about what you said on Episode 23 or something. But if you want to come down for that, I'd be glad to bring you down. But anyway, we'll talk about this off the air. Thanks a lot.

MALICE: Thanks, Tom.