



**Episode 525: States Defy Federal Government in a Dozen Areas, Crickets from the Media**

**Guest: Michael Boldin**

**WOODS:** I want to talk about your special report that you just released. I got it early, because I was having you on the show, and then I received it directly from the Tenth Amendment Center. It's the 2015 edition: The State of the Nullification Movement report. So I want to talk about that, but before we do that, a little background. I haven't talked about nullification on this show in a long time, and in that long time, I've gotten a lot of new listeners. I think most of those listeners know that I wrote a book called *Nullification*, and they probably know a little something about nullification, but they may not. So I'm going to let Michael Boldin, who directs the Tenth Amendment Center, who founded the Tenth Amendment Center, say something about what nullification is. And on the show notes page I will link to my book *Nullification* for people who somehow through some gross oversight never got a copy and also the link to TomWoodsAudio.com where they can get the free audiobook. So go ahead, tell us about not jury nullification – we've done episodes on that – but state nullification.

**BOLDIN:** Well, I think jury nullification if you're looking at – and we look at nullification in kind of a broad spectrum – we define it as any act or set of acts which has as its result a particular federal law being rendered null and void, either in law or in practice, so it can be a combination of various different things, either from a state legislature, from individual action, from juries, from local communities, that even if the federal government has a particular law on the books, as long as they're not enforcing it, we're seeing that as nullified in practice. And personally, I believe in nullification as the proper way forward on just about everything, because the federal government absolutely cannot be trusted to limit its own powers, and I think you talk about that quite a bit more in your book, the whole Jeffersonian view on the federal government and the Supreme Court being the final arbiter of the extent of its own powers, and we know from our own history that when you allow that to happen, that power will always grow, no matter what you try to do about it, especially like voting the bums out, for example.

**WOODS:** I like at the beginning of your report, you do give an overview of nullification, you do talk about your strategy and also what you consider to be nullification. I happen to like the broad definition that you give, because to me, as long as the outcome is that the law isn't being enforced or can't be enforced, I almost

don't really care how we got there. So that's a good way to start. Then we get into the different issues that you've been dealing with over the course of 2015 in the various state legislatures, and some of these are familiar topics, but they are evolving, and there's some new stuff here. Where do you want to start? Of course, the obvious stuff would be marijuana, but I almost feel like people are kind of sick of hearing about marijuana at this point.

**BOLDIN:** I'll tell you though, to me that's fascinating, because when we first started doing this, the first thing we used to hear from people is, oh, that doesn't count; that doesn't count as nullification because it didn't fit into the kind of old school, South Carolina Calhounian version of nullification, that the state was going to go out and block the federal government from doing something. But it really is a great example of how things are different today than they were back then. Back in the 18th century, the 19th century, the federal government was far smaller than it was today, so in order to nullify something, you really had to take a very aggressive stance to stop it.

Today, the federal government, anything they do — and in fact, the National Governor's Association said a couple of years ago that the federal government relies on the states to implement "most federal programs." So just in a strategic kind of a chessboard type of approach, we recognize that the federal government doesn't do anything without a partnership from the states, so when a state legalizes something that the federal government prohibits and it encourages people to start doing this in the marketplace, there's very little that the federal government can do about it. And in fact, we've done some research and to us, it would take about 40% of the federal government's budget to shut down one city like Los Angeles alone on marijuana. So as long as states continue doing this, they can have all the laws they want in Congress, but they're not going to really be able to do anything about it in the long run. And this should be applied on various other issues, as well.

**WOODS:** You know, it's funny that I said that people are sick of hearing about marijuana. I think the reason is that it's become old hat, because everybody knows that the states are changing policies and that opinion is changing. But that didn't just happen just spontaneously and automatically; it happened because people took action. People actually did things, and among those people were you, so I don't want to disparage that or minimize it in any way.

Before we go on, I'm sorry, I should have asked this before: I want you to say something about the anti-commandeering doctrine [00:07:03], because we see it really articulated in the *Printz* case of 1997, which was Sheriff Mack's case before the Supreme Court — and I'll link to the episode I did with Sheriff Mack at [TomWoods.com/525](http://TomWoods.com/525). You can also read the report we're talking about, *The State of the Nullification Movement*, also at [TomWoods.com/525](http://TomWoods.com/525). But can you take a minute just to talk about that, because I think that's going to surprise a lot of people?

**BOLDIN:** Okay, so the concept that we're talking about — basically taking a hands-off approach, doing things, not participating in federal prohibition of various things, whether it's gun control or plant control, whatever it may be — is based off of advice

that was given by James Madison in *The Federalist Papers*, Number 46 [00:07:46] . He gave four steps that he recommended to use that would be very effective in stopping federal programs. Again, keep in mind, this was at a time when the federal government was going to be totally tiny compared to what it is now.

And one of those things, the most prominent in my view, is he said specifically, "A refusal to cooperate with officers of the Union." [00:08:12] "A refusal to cooperate with officers of the Union," is one of the four things that the so-called Father of the Constitution said you should use to stop federal programs you don't like, whether they're constitutional or not. So the federal government may do something, and we think it's totally okay under the Constitution, but if we disagree with it from a policy standpoint, we're still supposed to use this.

Now, generally we don't look to the Supreme Court to say whether we can do something as right or wrong, as our validation, but when you have validation from the Supreme Court, it's very effective, especially when you're going out to the general public, to state legislators, Judiciary Committee members who are often lawyers who are trained in just following whatever the court says. And that's what the anti-commandeering doctrine, it basically puts into practice in the Supreme Court doctrine what James Madison's advice was under Federalist 46.

The Supreme Court for over 150 years starting back in 1842 and then through 1997, the *Printz* case you mentioned, Tom, and the more recently the 2012 *Sibelius* case, which is the *Obamacare* case, basically says that the states cannot be required to expend resources or use personnel to help enforce or effectuate federal programs. So even the Supreme Court has said for 150 straight years in four major cases – there might be another one that kind of ties in, but at least four major cases – that the states don't have to participate. So if a state says, hey look, you may prohibit this plant or this gun, we're going to authorize it or we're not going to participate in, we're not going to help you enforce it. And because the federal government relies on the states so much and local communities to help them enforce things, if you don't participate, it's a very effective way to bring down these programs.

**WOODS:** All right, let's shift to some specific issues here. Let's talk about surveillance, because you've got several different forms of surveillance that you're talking about here. You've got the drones; you've got stuff involving license plates and then tracking cell phones and stuff like that. First of all, what are they using drones for within the United States anyway? Are they spying on people's houses? What are they looking for with these things, and what are you doing about?

**BOLDIN:** Well, we'll just put it this way: I don't trust any of these people, the government people with technology that can watch over us, and even though there isn't a drone outside my window today – there has been in the past, but I think it was just a filmmaker. Even though there isn't one out there today, I know that the Department of Homeland Security is funding millions of dollars worth of these products, handing them out to local law enforcement agencies to use for surveillance,

and they don't believe that they should be constricted by the use of a warrant before they spy on somebody.

Another item that we're talking about is a StingRay device. This is a handheld device. I recently — if you watch the TV show *Homeland*, which is amazing propaganda, but very entertaining. I was watching an episode recently where this CIA agent went and he actually talked about this StingRay device. This is something that the FBI has generally wanted to keep under wraps, but people are starting to learn about it, so I guess it's getting in popular culture. It's a handheld device the law enforcement uses, and what it does is it mimics a cell phone tower, tricking all the cell phones in an area into thinking that it's connecting to the cell phone tower, but it's really connecting to this device, and it sweeps up all the communications and data from the cell phones in that region, and then they have all that activity, including the location, the real-time location of where you are with your phone.

They also track you through your license plate. These red light cameras and like these toll cameras on the freeways, they scan the license plates, and they can tell where you are, your location by your license plate, and they've built this nationwide tracking program.

So basically what's going on, all these little technologies, these gadgets that are being used on a local level are generally being funded by the federal government or handed off to local agencies by the federal government, and then through a program called ISE — it's Information Sharing Environment — the local agencies are then passing off all the data over to the federal government.

So we know, after years and years of it being hidden, that the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency — or is it Administration? Whatever. The DEA has been running a nationwide license plate tracking program for about eight, almost nine years now. Well, they don't run these license plate readers themselves. They fund the states to do them, so the states have been doing this, passing off the information. Now the national government is tracking where everyone is based off of the data provided by states and local communities. So again, we go back full circle to this idea of anti-commandeering, refusing to participate. If we can get legislation passed banning the use of these devices by state and local communities, then there's no data to pass off to the federal government, and it really hamstrings it. And we've seen some good results on those fronts in the states just in the last year or so.

**WOODS:** All right, so tell me about what states you've had the best success with and what does the legislation say. What do the bills say, and what are they going to be able to do?

**BOLDIN:** So in Washington state, for example, there was a bill passed — it was maybe 80 to 5, 88 to 5, like wide margins — that bans the use of a StingRay device without a signed warrant. Just real old-fashioned, kind of due processy type of stuff. You can't spy on people; you have to be able to target exactly who you're trying to pick up their communication before you use it.

California also passed a similar bill here. It was actually signed by Jerry Brown, who almost always vetoes any type of privacy legislation, but he signed it. There was a lot of pressure on him, that they can't actually collect any electronic data without a warrant, and in another bill that says StingRay devices can't even be acquired by local communities unless they have an open meeting where the public can have some input. So that's not going to stop them from getting them, but it creates another layer, another roadblock into making these things happen. So what the FBI does, for example, they hand these off, and if someone sues about it in federal court, the FBI would rather that the local government lose the case than have to explain the whole process that's going on behind the scenes, so the more that we get this out into the open, the better.

A number of states have also passed similar legislation. Minnesota, for example, restricted the use of ALPR, automated license plate readers, that's the program that's passing off the location of your car through your license plate to the DEA. They can't use those without a warrant. States like Florida, for example, further restricted drones. Same again, they've got to have a warrant before they're spying on people, and that's real important. You're not going to reform government — first of all, "You're not going to reform government," is a really good statement. But you're not going to stop government from doing something from the top down. That's never going to happen, in my view. It's very difficult to get it to happen from the bottom up, but sometimes you can, so if you're going to take political action, I believe that the best way to do it is starting locally and moving your way up.

**WOODS:** Incidentally, I assume, given the way my microphone works, people cannot hear the sirens in the background, but this is how you know that we are speaking — this gives away that we're recording a Tenth Tuesday on a Monday, because every Monday at noon in Topeka, Kansas, they test out the tornado sirens.

**BOLDIN:** That's an air raid. That's an air raid siren.

**WOODS:** So if you have been, let's say, that you're hung over — not that I have been since moving here — and you're sleeping late, 12 noon you're waking up in Topeka. That is it. No sleeping into the afternoon here. All right, I don't know why I'm talking about this; let's talk about other things. I know in the past when I've had you on to talk about yearend retrospectives about nullification over the course of the year, we've talked about hemp and the Second Amendment and marijuana and so forth, so that's why I want to try some different things — we talked about Right to Try legislation. Not that we can't do updates on these things, but what about, you have here as an item in your Table of Contents — and by the way, thank you for the mention and the quote on page 53. I did read the whole thing.

**BOLDIN:** Thank *you* for the quote. That was a test to make sure you actually got through it.

**WOODS:** Yeah, that's right. Well, I succeeded. I got there and I thought, doggone it, he's a sneak.

**BOLDIN:** (laughing)

**WOODS:** Federal militarization of police. What can the states do about that?

**BOLDIN:** Let's quickly touch base on Right to Try, though, because we — you're the first person that I talked to about this last fall. Sometime in November, we had a little conversation, because Arizona, there was a proposition — I think it was 303; it passed like 80% to 12, something like that — basically saying that people, if they're terminally ill, they can try an experimental treatment, a drug, whatever, that hasn't been given full approval by the FDA. Again, this is the same concept that you authorize something on a state or local level that the federal government prohibits. So this is doing an end-run around the FDA approval process, saying, you know what? If someone is dying, why would anyone say you're going to die in three months anyways; you're not allowed to give this a shot, because it might kill you. It's absurd.

**WOODS:** Yeah, exactly. This is why I love this issue, because everybody is going to agree with it, and then that makes everybody a nullifier. And then we say, look, you're already a nullifier; it's too late now. Might as well join us.

**BOLDIN:** Yeah, so it's setting the stage. Arizona was the third or fourth state. Since then we're up to 24 states, I would say, as of today that have these passed as law. The only major one that it didn't get through so far is California. It got to the governor's desk; was vetoed. They're talking about an override, but that hasn't happened in decades. So this is a great way to — like you're talking about: you set the foundation. Look, you guys already passed this type of legislation saying you're going to defy federal policy. Let's try to get it going on something else.

Now, some people will say there's no way this is going to work; this'll never happen. But this is the same thing we heard back in 1996 after Prop 215 was passed here in California authorizing the use of marijuana for medical purposes, and we know how that's played out. You open the door to the marketplace; someone's going to say I can find a way to create a business out of this; I can provide a service to people who need it, and the market says it's needed. It's going to happen. It may take time, but we have 24 states in one year — we're talking about 24 states in 17, 18, 19 years on marijuana, so this is really, really, probably I would say the most successful type of legislation that we've seen in modern history, at least in getting it passed legislatively. Now it's going to be up to people and businesses to put it into practice.

But you wanted to talk about militarization, right?

**WOODS:** Yeah, because I don't see — well, let's just say before reading this report, I don't see obviously what the states could do, but then I read it and I thought, well, I don't know why I didn't see this.

**BOLDIN:** Well, to me it's a really powerful issue, and I think especially among libertarians, people who believe in advancing liberty, the idea of a police state and police power is very concerning, and so that's why I think this is something that's got a

lot of legs. We've seen a lot of support on this, and we've gotten good media coverage from the Left and Right. We don't really hear anything negative from people unless they work for law enforcement agencies or they're the attorney general of a state. Then they hate this.

But the idea, what's going on is that the federal government is providing military-based equipment — like raiding Fallujah type of equipment, seizing a country type of equipment — to local police. And to me, I don't think a peace officer is supposed to be a military officer. There's a total different mentality and approach, so the more that you militarize police the more they're going to act like a military, and the more they're going to be capable of carrying out federal programs like the drug war, gun control programs, etc., and this is exactly what they do. So under what's known as the 1033 Program, the Pentagon is handing a bunch of this gear — I mean, we're talking grenade launchers, all kinds of stuff — to local law enforcement agencies and militarizing them.

And we recognize, not just through this program but through every program if we have an honest study of our modern history, when the federal government starts getting involved in giving stuff away to people, it comes with strings, and eventually the federal government will control them. And we can see some overtures towards the idea of nationalizing police in recent media reports, so this is a very serious issue. So the Pentagon is handing off all this equipment, but they're not the only one; in fact, that's the one that's famous. After the Ferguson issue came up, a lot of people talked about, well, we've got to restrict this 1033 Program. Well, that only makes up about a third of the military transfers. The rest of it is done through a DHS, Department of Homeland Security, grant. They hand off the money to local law enforcement, and then they go out and buy the equipment anyways.

So what states can do is simply say, hey, we're not going to participate in these programs. The first state that passed a law on this was New Jersey earlier this year. This was similar to what I was talking about with California and the StingRays. They basically said in order to get any of this equipment, you have to get it approved by the local governing body in an open meeting with the public, so this kind of allows the local community to interpose themselves into the process. Right now, it's a direct connection between the Pentagon or the DHS and the local law enforcement agency, and when that type of a connection happens, it's almost unbreakable, so anything that can kind of get a wedge in there is a positive first step forward, and that happened in New Jersey.

And then a little bit later on this year in Montana — it actually just went into effect I think at the beginning of October, so just last month — another bill passed, House Bill 330, that actually bans local communities from acquiring specific equipment, whether it's from the Pentagon or the DHS, and they have really set the stage to kind of sever themselves from this federal control, this federal program of militarizing local police.

A similar bill that kind of combined these two approaches — it banned some equipment and then also required local approval for all other equipment — passed the

legislature here in California by huge numbers but was vetoed by Governor Brown. It's fascinating to side note, there is no state in the country that passed more nullification or nullification-type bills than California this year, and that is not unusual. What is the norm is that they tend to get vetoed by Governor Brown.

**WOODS:** Yeah, that's very interesting. I noticed there is also a bill pertaining to asset forfeiture and the federal government's abuse of — well, I think the whole thing is an abuse of course, but tell us about that bill and how it can frustrate federal attempts to grab people's stuff.

**BOLDIN:** Well, okay, so there's a couple of different layers going on with asset forfeiture. This is just government theft of property. They basically come in; they are investigating a situation; they're going to take all your things, because it might be associated with like a drug crime, for example. There's another reason why the drug war is a serious problem. Obviously that's a different conversation. So what a lot of people have been trying to do — Institute for Justice, IJ.com I think is the website, has been working on this for a number of years, trying to reform or restrict governments from being able to do this.

So what happens, though, is even if you restrict the state government from doing it — for example, California has some of the most highly rated asset forfeiture restrictions in the country. What they do is they basically partner with the federal government and they hand off investigations to the feds, and the feds have what's called an equitable sharing program where they collect the assets and then give 60 to 80% to the local government. So the short version: California was already restricted from doing this on a state level, so they just go in and then say, okay, hey federal government, we were doing this investigation, but we think this is a federal issue, so you have it. So then the feds collect all the stuff, and then they pay the local police. So it's really important for state legislation to be out there, what passed already in New Mexico, that closes this loophole. Another bill was passed by big numbers here in California that closed that loophole, saying they can't hand this stuff off to the federal government, but then, again, it was vetoed by Governor Jerry Brown, our good friend.

**WOODS:** All right, at this point, given that I've arbitrarily decided to skip entire categories, I want you to say what you think is important in terms of successes or even just publicizing the ideas of nullification over the course of 2015. First of all, how's it doing as compared to previous years? You can be honest. Either way could justify more money for the Tenth Amendment Center, so you can just tell us —

**BOLDIN:** (laughing)

**WOODS:** — but what do you think are the biggest deals of 2015, and what do you look forward to in 2016?

**BOLDIN:** What I think is really amazing to me is that 10 years ago — I'm on 9 ½ years running this organization.



**WOODS:** Get out of town.

**BOLDIN:** 10 years. Amazing, isn't it?

**WOODS:** What was the exact date that you opened?

**BOLDIN:** June 26, 2006.

**WOODS:** June, okay. All right, if that's not a weekend, then we're going to run the 10-year retrospective episode of the show on June 26, 2016.

**BOLDIN:** — I can talk about my part-time job that I was working at the time.

**WOODS:** It's going to be great. So while you're giving your answer to my other question, I'm going to be ignoring you and checking the calendar, okay?

**BOLDIN:** So what I think is fascinating is that 10 years ago, no one was talking about this as a concept. Or if you were talking about it, like okay, well that's just relegated to the weed people. But this is now spreading into other issues, and if we just use weed as a blueprint to kind of watch how this plays out, we know there's really a very powerful future ahead of us for liberty as long as people kind of take this baton and run with it. We've seen this growing into other things, and that pun is intended. In 2006 it was mostly just marijuana. There was also the Real ID Act, which we could talk about if we really wanted to, but this is going into other issues now. There are states like Tennessee, Kansas, and Idaho that have set the foundation to refuse participation in any new federal gun control programs. Alaska, which could expand that beyond just new — Kansas could as well technically. Hopefully we see something positive there.

But we see these Right to Try Acts, and when these pass, these are generally passing like 99 to 2. There's almost no one that's against these, and so that tells, Tom, like you were mentioning before, that look, they're willing to do this. As long as it's an issue that seems real common sense, that's popular with the general public, these state legislators who we generally think of as our enemy, and in many situations they are, they're willing to do something as long as they have the public pressure behind them.

And as far as how successful this has been, I've never seen more of these bills pass in a year. I don't want to set the stage that it has to keep going like this, because I can't imagine dozens of them passing next year. When we had our first annual State of the Nullification report come out last summer in 2014, I believe at the end I wrote that, like, we hope to get 20 or so nullification bills passed in the coming years. I didn't realize that we'd get double that in a single year. So things are going very well in this regard. What it's telling me is that we're building a foundation for liberty going forward, and I think somewhere in the future we're going to look back at this time saying, look, people are recognizing that you can't go to the federal government to fix problems created by the federal government. The only solution is to withdraw consent and take action on a state, local, and individual level to stop them.

**WOODS:** Now, I did actually listen to what you just said —

**BOLDIN:** (laughing) Okay.

**WOODS:** — because I'm really fast with my Google calendar here on my smartphone. June 26, 2016 is a Sunday, so Tenth Monday is going to be June 27th. We will have you on; we're going to talk about 10 years with the Tenth Amendment Center. It's going to be a great story, but I guess for some reason arbitrarily I've decided we can't talk about it until June 27th of next year.

**BOLDIN:** I don't even — it's not even happening.

**WOODS:** (laughing) But it's fine; it's fine. Look, 9 ½

years is very nice too, and in your report you have a very, I think, sensible eight-part program: How do you succeed in getting one of these bills passed. We've talked in the past, by the way, about some of the really exciting bills that you've actually thought up, like the turn off the water to the NSA facility that needs all these millions of gallons of water. You know, that's brilliant, and we want to keep trying out things like that. But what is the basic approach? I'm a guy in such and such state, and I'd like to promote something that thwarts the federal government. What are some things that the battle-tested Michael Boldin can advise?

**BOLDIN:** 9 ½ years of battle-tested, strategic proof.

**WOODS:** Exactly. What do you have to show for yourself is really what I'm driving at here.

**BOLDIN:** Ha, well, the number one thing I recommend to people is, first of all, don't overdo it. There are so many things that are bad that happen in society. There are so many bad things that government does, you cannot fight them all. And I see some very good activists trying to take on everything all the time, and even in kind of a Tenth scope, a Tenth mentality. It looks like we do a lot. I say no to so many issues, because we just don't have the manpower; we just don't have the resources, and I don't have enough hours in the day to do it.

So if someone is motivated, if you're motivated, for example, by sound money, if that's your number one issue — think of what your number one issue is. Say I'm going to dedicate some time to doing this, to working on this issue, whether I work on it as an individual or I try to get legislation passed, whatever it may be, that's the number one step, and I think it's the most important, because if you spread yourself too thin, what ends up happening, what I've seen over these 9.4 years is that people come on real strong, they work on a bunch of things, they don't get success right away, and then they stop. And none of this stuff happens quickly.

For example, the Illinois medical marijuana program took 10 years to get moving, and now some people are saying, well, of course that would pass. Of course. But it took

some people 10 years of dedication, because they believed in that particular issue. Now, if we have that same type of fortitude over our right to keep and bear arms or over the use of sound money, you get different segments of a population working on different things, that's going to overwhelm the ability of the federal government to control us all like they want to do. So that's the first thing. From there, I mean, you could go through our report over at — what is it? [TomWoods.com/525](http://TomWoods.com/525)?

**WOODS:** Yes.

**BOLDIN:** Okay, [TomWoods.com/525](http://TomWoods.com/525), you're going to find this report. It's 53 pages. You're going to learn about the foundation, what we talk about what qualifies as a nullification project, and then you're going to see what other people are already doing. Pick one of the issues in there, and start working on it. We also have on our website, [TenthAmendmentCenter.com/Legislation](http://TenthAmendmentCenter.com/Legislation) — Tom, hopefully you can link to that on the show page, and then you can find model legislation that works along these various issues.

So for example — I keep bringing up sound money, I think this is a major deal, especially with the way the economy is going and continues to go. I think it's a major issue. Texas this year passed what's known as the Gold Depository Bill. Basically what it does is it establishes a place where people, kind of like a separate bank, but just for metals, so people can deposit gold, silver — I guess technically palladium, platinum, all this other stuff — in the depository, which has yet to be built, but that's in process. And then it sets up a system for electronic use. You can make transfers and payments. It's creating an alternative payment system, and so the idea if a number of states do this, then people are going to learn, it's kind of that reverse Gresham's effect, people can learn about the use of other currencies instead of just fiat money.

And so that's extremely important to me, for example, so if that was the only thing I was working on, I would then pick up the phone and call my state legislator. I don't care if I think they're horrible or not. And I would call him and I would be real nice and be like hey, my name is so and so, and I'm in your district, and I want to talk to you about this bill. And if they ignored me, I would call them again, and I would call them again, and I would call them again until they got fed up hearing from me. And you know what? Sometimes doing that will get them to introduce a bill or talk to you about it or tell you some — they may tell you, hey, I'm opposed to this concept. But okay, great. Which one of your colleagues might be in favor of it? I am your constituent. At least give me that information. And then you can call that person instead. Or if you've got a back-up — say what can we find that we can agree on. Are you in favor of hemp farming, for example? You might find someone who opposes you on one issue to work with you on a different one. Pick a back-up issue that maybe they'll get a bill introduced.

And if you're over at [TenthAmendmentCenter.com/Legislation](http://TenthAmendmentCenter.com/Legislation), you can download the PDF of that bill and send it over to them and get the process going. But it takes a lot of this kind of personalized conversational work on a one-on-one basis.

**WOODS:** Now, I told people before that I send the Tenth Amendment Center a reasonably substantial donation every month, and I have a very, very low tolerance for shysters or for people who, whatever — who spend money badly or who have nothing to show for themselves. I mean, if there were any justice in the world, the Tenth Amendment Center would have the \$80 million annual budget and the Heritage Foundation would have your existing budget, because you guys produce as if you have an \$80 million budget. So imagine what would happen if you had even a fraction of that. So I hope people will consider supporting the Tenth Amendment Center. As I say, there aren't that many places that I shell out my own dough to support, but when I find one that's good, that actually produces and that does things that I believe in, then I commit myself to it, so I'm very glad to do that. But I'm sure you would also accept donations in the form of volunteer work?

**BOLDIN:** Yes, [TenthAmendmentCenter.com/Volunteer](http://TenthAmendmentCenter.com/Volunteer), that's how we do a majority of our work. This is my full-time work. I do this all day, all night, everyday, sometimes seven days a week, sometimes six. I'm actually just back from a trip for my anniversary this last week, so I got a couple of days off, but that's rare. We have a couple of part-time people that work for us. Officially they're onboard, part of the team, but a lot of the work is people who volunteer their time, because there's no way to do all this stuff. I mean, we're tracking multiple issues in 50 states. Just to be able to figure out what's going on from time to time, reporting on it, blogging on it — theoretically, each issue goes on for — let's say a bill gets introduced. It goes through 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 stages depending on the state, and in order to be most effective, we need to come up with an action alert telling people what's going on, a report to tell people what it is at each of those stages. So it takes a lot of time and energy, and if someone wants to help out, that's a place that we can take a lot of help — I mean, almost any area, but certainly volunteer work is as important as a donation, and sometimes even more.

**WOODS:** Well, we'll link to all this at [TomWoods.com/525](http://TomWoods.com/525). Always a pleasure talking to you, Michael. Best of luck with everything as the legislative session for the next year begins to get started. Good luck with that.

**BOLDIN:** Tom, thank you so much.