



## **Episode 570: How to Respond to North Korea's Nuclear Bluster**

**Guest: Michael Malice**

**WOODS:** We had a great time seeing you when we were in New York City, a lot of fun, a lot of Uber rides. I had a lot of free rides, and we sure took advantage of them. I wish we lived in the area. Like I'd love to say, if only you could live in our area, but I wouldn't wish that on our worst enemy. But we really, really did enjoy it. And you know, one funny thing before we get into North Korea, on one of those Uber rides, you and I were in an intense conversation, and unbeknownst to either one of us, Heather was recording the conversation.

**MALICE:** Oh!

**WOODS:** She's got 25 uninterrupted minutes of you and me going at it. Now, I have to listen to it, and I'll let you listen to it, because I did say some things that I, let's say, wouldn't want broadcast, but that's what makes my conversations fun, you see. That's why it's fun to get to know me in person. But anyway, if it's any good, I'm thinking, hey, 25 minutes, I've got a free episode here.

**MALICE:** Yeah, free illegal episode.

**WOODS:** Yeah, illegal episode (laughing), I know.

**MALICE:** This is why I left Russia, my God.

**WOODS:** (laughing) Anyway —

**MALICE:** Wait a minute! Excuse me. So now I understand that when you called me "weasel," it's a term of affection, because that's pretty weaselly to be recording people.

**WOODS:** It is weaselly, but look, I'm not going to say that about Heather; you just said it.

**MALICE:** (laughing) I just said it. It's undeniable.

**WOODS:** Yeah, it is undeniable, but she's not sharing it with anybody, which would be extremely weaselly. But anyway, if there's anything good in it, any good meat in it, I

think it could actually make a decent show, but of course I wouldn't do it without your permission. Anyway, speaking of spying on people and listening in on their conversations, let's talk about North Korea, right?

**MALICE:** (laughing) Hold on a second.

**WOODS:** What?

**MALICE:** You're not segueing out of this. Hold on.

**WOODS:** What?

**MALICE:** (laughing) Hey, Michael, by the way, we've been recording you in secret.

**WOODS:** (laughing) Look, don't say "we"; I didn't even know about it. I didn't even know about it!

**MALICE:** Uh huh, good cop, bad cop, I see.

**WOODS:** No, I'm completely in the dark about stuff like that.

**MALICE:** My God, okay.

**WOODS:** I know, and I looked at it, and it's 25 solid minutes. I said, you know what else is 25 minutes? The Tom Woods Show – at least the guts of it.

**MALICE:** I mean, is there a camera in my bathroom that I need to be aware of, besides my own?

**WOODS:** Well, look, we're not going to give away all our secrets.

**MALICE:** (laughing)

**WOODS:** All right, all right. And by the way, on yesterday's episode – that would have been 569 – or now, 568, Episode 568 – I actually played the clip from Kennedy in which you made fun of me.

**MALICE:** Well, you asked me – see, that's the other thing. You asked me to make fun of you on the air.

**WOODS:** Yeah, what I did was we were walking. I knew you were going to be on Kennedy the next day, and I said, why don't you say something, even just a word or something that you wouldn't have said otherwise as kind of an implicit shout out to us, so we'll know you were thinking about us or whatever. And so instead, you do this thing (laughing).

**MALICE:** Yeah, it was great.

**WOODS:** If you missed Episode 568, you don't know what I'm talking about. Listen through the whole way to the end of the episode. It's so great. When I heard that on Kennedy, I thought, I can't believe that weasel.

**MALICE:** And then you were shocked that I didn't mention your name. Why would I bring that stigma on myself on national television?

**WOODS:** I wasn't shocked that you didn't mention my name; I was pretty glad —

**MALICE:** My God.

**WOODS:** No, I realize you have a reputation to uphold.

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** Anyway, what you're doing in your spare time when you're slumming and you're not involved in Fox Business, that's your business and now you can talk to me; no one has to know.

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** Anyway, I could send Kennedy a note, by the way. I could figure out a way to get through to her.

**MALICE:** Yeah, use Heather's secret KGB sources.

**WOODS:** Yeah, exactly, exactly. All right, I think we'd better talk about North Korea. You know, one of these principles of podcasting is they say — and I think rules are meant to be broken half the time, but they say you've got to be rolling into the topic within one minute. And now, see, that sounds like the Soviet Union to me. Say what, comrade? One minute? Are you kidding me? All right. Because I think I'm like, grand total, you and me talking and my introduction, I think we're like five minutes in. But who cares? Who cares? People are stuck in their cars; where else are they going to go?

**MALICE:** (laughing)

**WOODS:** Only to other 8 zillion podcasts in the world. All right, this week — actually, now I don't know when it was, but it was relatively recently —

**MALICE:** Last week.

**WOODS:** Last week, yeah, last week. We read in the news of a nuclear test carried out by North Korea. There was some dispute about whether it was actually an H-bomb or not, but the point is it was a nuclear test, and apparently the fourth such test, and there is some unease about this, and the North Korean government says that it's doing this as a way of protecting itself against the imperialist Americans in case they should do anything to threaten the sovereignty of North Korea.

So all right, first of all before I even give you any specific questions, what was your response to this, given that as I just mentioned in the introduction, you did right *Dear Reader* about another North Korean leader; you do have some insight into the regime. How do you respond to this?

**MALICE:** Well, I've got to tell you, there's nothing that upsets me so much as watching people in the press who don't know anything about North Korea run their mouths. And it's very disconcerting for many reasons, because a) they're allowing North Korea to play them like a fiddle, and b) they're speaking out of complete ignorance. And it's very dangerous, because North Korea is doing — this is a complicated issue, so let me break it down, and it's one of the reason I wrote *Dear Reader* is because everybody is pro-liberty vis-à-vis North Korea. I don't care where you are on the political spectrum; everyone agrees that they need more social liberalism and economic liberalism. This is not a point of contention in political discourse nowadays.

But what they do is this. So when they have these, like, saber rattling, which is really a best term for it, that really distracts from, you know, the horrors of the regime, and it's a very effective technique. It's like misdirection, just like what magicians use. And the thing is they gloat that this is their technique. So North Korea, when I was writing the book, when I went to North Korea and I got all the propaganda, and as you know, Tom, when I was writing *Dear Reader*, I read 660 books as background, including everything they have. And they openly talk about all their techniques. This is what was shocking to me.

And there's a book that they have called *A Duel of Reason Between Korea and the U.S.*, and this talks about the nuclear kind of conflict between them and us, and I'm just going to read this one paragraph. This is their writing, and they say, "Korea's U.S. strategy is to win the war without gunfire. A hot war" — meaning, you know, military conflict — "will result in the ruin of the Korean peninsula." So they know it. They know they can't win. "Therefore, her strategy is for all intents and purposes to compel the United States to follow the way to peace by using her weapons and military forces as the cards to settle political and diplomatic disputes." So they are explicitly saying, look, we know America's stronger than us; we know America's bigger than us, but if we put on a big show, we can kind of bend you to our will, and that's exactly what happens.

Here's a metaphor I always use when describing the regime and how they operate, because they give off this impression very intentionally that they're crazy. I'm crazy, and I'm capable of anything. Well, let's look at bank robbers. If I don't produce anything — and North Korea produces nothing of value — how am I going to get food? The only way other than production, as you know and as all your listeners know, is through force or fraud. I have to steal from somebody else if I want to get food if I'm not making any food. So there's two types of bank robbers if you're going to use force. One is the bank robber who goes into the bank and starts shooting up everybody and, you know, getting their money, and there's the other guy who goes into the bank and starts shooting in the air and gets the money and gets out of there. Now, which would you rather be interacting with?

**WOODS:** All right, so you're telling me in other words, then, that we're getting all worked up about something that really is nothing other than political theater?

**MALICE:** Correct, because look, that bank robber metaphor is perfectly appropriate, because when they fired a missile launch in I think it was the '90s, they fired it into the Sea of Japan. They didn't fire it into Seoul. They didn't fire it into China or Tokyo. So they intentionally aimed it into the ocean. Doesn't that tell you that they're putting on a show for specific political reasons? And it works, and they laugh that it works every single time.

And this is another quote from another one of their books, which was about the songun politics of Kim Jong Il. Songun is Kim Jong Il's policy. Now, people are familiar with the great leader, Kim Il-sung, the founder of North Korea; his philosophy's called Juche, which meant self-reliance. Kim Jong Il refined that into songun, which means "military first," and this is how they — this is their words: "Korean diplomacy is characterized by the fullest use of verbal power. The tone of her statements to the enemy sound high and intense, but if you read them carefully you will find that preconditions are given without fail. In other words, if the preconditions are met, there will be a way out."

Every time North Korea declares hostility, they always say something in the following way: this is horrible; we won't stand for this; no one disrespects North Korea; we're going to blow up the world, unless you want to compensate us for this huge insult to our country and our character. So it's a ransom note, and they do this time and again, and the West falls for it constantly. Now, you could say that the West doesn't have a choice but to fall for it, but the idea that at any moment they're going to nuke Beijing or Seoul is absolutely insane.

**WOODS:** Well, speaking of absolutely insane, when you wrote *Dear Reader* and you did all this reading, did you come to the conclusion that in his case, in the case of Kim Jong Il that you were dealing with somebody who was somewhat unbalanced or somebody who was trying to project the image of being unbalanced?

**MALICE:** If they're a suicidal country, how are they the last one standing? They must be really bad at being suicidal, right, if they're the last Stalinists. No, Kim Jong Il was very — you know, Donald Trump — your friend — recently got into a lot —

**WOODS:** My friend?

**MALICE:** Yeah, he's been tweeting about you.

**WOODS:** Oh, that's right, he's been tweeting — if people didn't watch the Hamilton debate that you and I had, they won't get that reference, but if they didn't watch that debate, I can't call them my friend anymore (laughing).

**MALICE:** (laughing) So he tweeted out something to the effect of you've got to give Kim Jong Un credit, he did what was necessary to hold power. And all of a sudden people in the press began to care about North Korea, because this was their chance to

get offended and attack Trump, but the point he made is valid. Kim Jong Il and Kim Il-sung and now Kim Jong Un are ruthless, and they knew exactly what it takes to stay in power, and we know that, because they've been in power for 70 years. This is not an accident.

So they have no regard for human life, so they're insane in that sense. You know, they have no sense of moral sanity. But in terms of, you know, being rational actors and Machiavellians, they're the best. In fact, think what an accomplishment it was for Kim Jong Il in 1980 to be named the successor to his father, you know, when communism was still conquering half the world, because the idea of a son inheriting the leadership position flies in the face of all communist principles, and even at the time it was this shocking moment. And yet they pulled it off. So they're very, very clever. They are very, very evil. And the idea that they're crazy is simply false, because the data does not support that in any way whatsoever.

Now, a lot of what they say is crazy. A lot of what they teach their population is crazy. But frankly, the crazier the propaganda, the easier it is to spot people who aren't being obedient, because if you can have an entire population smile and nod and tell you that Kim Il-sung can teleport and that Kim Il-sung can literally walk on water and can turn wood into bullets, you can very easily spot the people who have critical thought, and those are the dangerous ones, and those are the ones that can be isolated or killed.

**WOODS:** So the North Korean regime wants to influence U.S. policy, but what exactly does it want the U.S. to do? Does it want the U.S. to withdraw physically from —

**MALICE:** It wants money. All it wants is money. They're shakedown artists.

**WOODS:** So they're not asking the U.S. to withdraw support for the South Korean regime?

**MALICE:** I mean, they are, but that's a secondary issue — I mean, this is one of their big points of contention. And something else they say which is not absurd is, look, there's been only one country in history which has killed civilians using nuclear weapons. There's only one country in the world where the leaders, meaning the American presidents, go on TV and say things like, "All options are on the table," meaning, "We will nuke you if we feel it's appropriate." And they say this isn't right. So there's something to that.

And of course, they are very upset about the South Korean stuff. You know, if you go North Korea every map has Korea as one country. They don't capitalize the "n" in North Korea or the "s" in South Korea, because they say Korea is one country, indivisible, and the bottom half is a colony under the control of the U.S. imperialists. So they want the Americans out of there, but part of the reason they want the Americans out of there is they want reunification on their terms.

So it's not — it's a little from column A and column B. Yes, they're upset, but they will find any excuse to be upset, because that will give them an excuse to get angry, which forces people to give them money and food.

**WOODS:** What are they — on what grounds can they expect to get money? They've been nothing but hostile toward the U.S.

**MALICE:** The same grounds a mugger gets money. That's exactly the grounds, and those grounds have worked. They say we're going to close down this nuclear plant in exchange for food, and Clinton said okay. It works.

**WOODS:** Oh yeah, that's true. Gosh, I've forgotten about the Clinton years already.

**MALICE:** George Bush was the one who took them off — they were officially designated as state-sponsored terrorism. George Bush was the one who took them off of that.

**WOODS:** Ah, all right, okay. So — good grief.

**MALICE:** Yes, so you see, that's how clever they are. When you look at all of this, put all the puzzle pieces together in a row, it's like, wait a minute. This is like a symphony. They're playing us like a fiddle.

**WOODS:** All right, tell me how China fits into this picture.

**MALICE:** Okay, so this is actually — they've been playing other countries like a fiddle for, you know, 70 years. So North Korea refers to itself as a "shrimp among whales." So during the communist era, ending in like '89, '91, what they would do is they would barter with both China and Russia under something they called "friendship prices." What that meant is China and Russia — or the Soviet Union, excuse me — would send them, let's suppose, gasoline or things of great value, and in return they would get terrible socks. And in terms of accounting, this was regarded as a wash. So China would get these socks that they'd throw in the garbage, but North Korea got gasoline or things of use, and this was their way of accepting effectively bribes from other countries. Come the end of the Soviet Union, no one wanted to give North Korea anything, because they were serving no purpose.

But China is the big issue here, because the Tumen River is what separates North Korea from China. You have 24 million people in North Korea who've never even seen a computer, who don't speak Chinese. Come the fall of the regime, those people are swarming over the border to China, and the Chinese don't want them there. So this is really the big sticking point. China is their last ally, but China's not a big fan of North Korea by any means. But they have no choice to kind of make nice with them because of the physical proximity between the two nations.

**WOODS:** All right, we're going to pause for a minute, and when we come back I want to ask you about what you think about American policy makers and their grasp of the situation, so that's in just a second.

[Sponsored content]

All right, now I bet you've read more books on North Korea than most analysts of the subject, so how do you, based on what you've read in the news, for instance, about, let's say, American policy makers' commentary on the situation, what is your assessment of their understanding and handling of the situation?

**MALICE:** Well, let me tell you what their assessment is. It's very funny. So Kim Jong Il in one of the books, he gloats that in 1994 when the great leader Kim Il-sung died and Kim Jong Il took over that all these — they mention Charles Krauthammer by name, that's what sticks out — how all these American idiots were saying the regime's going to collapse and North Korea's going to implode and that didn't happen. So they kind of love to thumb their nose, like, oh, you thought we were going away; we're not going anymore. So most analysts don't have a clue.

Now, here's the thing. North Korea did collapse. During the '90s when the famine hit and up to 10% of the population starved, by choice, because the North Korean regime would not let food in, because otherwise they would be regarded as superfluous — the government, that is — that is a collapse of a society. When you don't have food distribution and you don't have any real kind of market in the broad sense of exchange or anything like that, that is a collapse. However, if you're willing to let 10% of your population starve to maintain your hold on power, it's going to take a lot to get you out of there.

**WOODS:** All right, I know there's a lot of overlap between the Democrats and Republicans in policy making, domestic and foreign, but I'm curious, is there any difference in the way the Democrats and the Republicans are approaching North Korea?

**MALICE:** I think that politicians as a rule in Washington, you have to give them a little bit of credit, because — like, it's easy for the Republicans to be shaking their fists at, like, Muslim majority countries, right, because the Overton window is there. Like that's understood to be appropriate for a Republican audience. And for the Democrats to be more pro-refugee or whatever. North Korea doesn't fit into any of these kind of specific boxes for either party, so they don't really know what to say other than it's terrible, and they kind of keep their mouths shut, which is I think great.

You notice like for Obama, North Korea has not been a priority for his entire tenure, and you know, Bush include North Korea on his Axis of Evil, of course, but even they tried to make nice with them, and like I said, towards the end of his term Bush removed them from being a state sponsor of terrorism, which they were in 1987, I believe. North Korea blew up an airliner to spite South Korea for getting the summer Olympics, and this is all in my book, of course, the whole story there.

So this is really a case where, you know, the public politicians kind of shy away and leave it to the people behind the scenes to try to make nice. There are all sorts of back channels going on with North Korea, and again, there's really only so much we



can do, because the border between North Korea and South Korea, which is ironically called the DMZ, the demilitarized zone, is the most militarized zone on Earth. It has, you know, landmines and all sorts of horrors. But it's China that's the ones that have to do something to kind of give them a golden parachute.

Here's another thing. If you look at Libya, and if you look at Egypt, and if you look at Chile, what they tried to do with Pinochet and Slobodan Milošević, when these regimes fall, the people at the very top are often personally killed. So that's another big problem. Like, there's no incentive for Kim Jong Un to take his hand off the trigger, because he's going to be shot, and with good reason. So this is a very, very big problem. Now, if we put pressure on China, that would help, but again, what are we going to do with these 24 million people? It's a very tricky situation.

However, there have been some positive signs of progress. Because the government has been unable to provide food, there has been a grudging acceptance of black markets throughout North Korea as a mechanism for people to get food and to get rice. Now, once people start relying on markets to get food instead of the government, that is a very important, if not conscious but subconscious ideological shift from, you know, we're a complete communist, statist country to be like, well, you know, markets do provide some value and some utility. And that's not a concession that North Korea wanted to make, but it's one that they've had to make.

**WOODS:** I seem to recall in one of our earlier conversations, and I hope I'm remembering this right, that it's your opinion in the world of today, North Korea is the worst regime. Is that your opinion?

**MALICE:** Absolutely. I think that's kind of undeniably true. I don't know any other country that has concentration camps. I know that Eritrea, which was a part of the former Ethiopia, they have less press freedom because they don't have any foreign journalists in the whole country. But you know, North Korea, the good part is – somewhat good, as good as you can get in a dark nightmare – is that they have started – see, there's a lie in the West that North Korea is immutable and hasn't changed, and this is completely false.

And here's a good example: North Korea tourism used to be limited to Pyongyang in the capital city and Kaesong and a few other cities. Now, Pyongyang is the capital. It's all for – it's the capital, but it's all for show. It's their show city. If you're not loyal to the regime, you're not allowed to step foot in Pyongyang. Similarly, if you're disabled you're not allowed to be in Pyongyang. They exile you to the country, because everyone in Pyongyang has to look good. This is their fascist mentality.

Now the tourism has expanded to throughout the whole country. So whereas before in the northeast where the most hungry people are and politically unreliable, they were kept isolated from the outside world, now foreigners are allowed there. This is not through choice. This is like, okay, what do we have to sell, i.e., tourism, that can bring in hard currency, meaning euros, Chinese RMB, or American dollars. So they are

experimenting in their own central planning way to try to incentivize foreigners to invest in them so they can get money.

So they are — you know, Ayn Rand often said that you can fake reality, but you can't fake the consequences of faking reality. So they are up against it, and it's getting harder and harder for them, and I think it's very much a ticking time bomb.

**WOODS:** Well, the reason I posed that particular question is that in yesterday's episode, 569, we talked exclusively about the subject of humanitarian intervention. So military intervention that is not related to the strategic interests of some country, but it's done presumably out of some sheer benevolence. So we look at a regime like North Korea, and we can't imagine, in this world anyway, a worse one. It's the worst one there is.

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** Now obviously you can't go to war with them, but it seems — wouldn't it be tricky for a libertarian to say — and I'm just asking you this as devil's advocate — that the best possible strategy for dealing with the worst regime in the world is to do nothing? I mean, not even officially try to undermine them in any way, but actually do absolutely nothing. Could that really be the best approach?

**MALICE:** I don't think that's the best approach. I think the best approach is — there are two things that brought down the Soviet Union, which was economics, but also information. So the Soviet Union kind of collapsed in a very peaceful way. It could have gotten very ugly very easily, right? Gorbachev and many of these leaders at the top realized that there was a moral corruption inherent in it, and an example I always use is, you know, you had Russian women watching American soap operas like *Dallas* and *Dynasty*, where the maids own fur coats, and then they go home and they wonder why they're wiping their butts with newspaper. It's just as simple as that.

And in North Korea when they're seeing how the rest of the world lives, how — you know, if they see tourists or college kids, and the college kids are wearing just a pair of denim jeans, just crappy jeans, which are still higher quality than anything they've ever seen in their store, because the highest quality products they have are imported from China, which are the kind of things we'd see in like a 99 cent store, it doesn't take much to put two and two together, and it becomes harder and harder for the regime to justify why you're all so hungry and starving and can't wear makeup when everyone else on Earth at least has that option. And they start a kind of consumerism in Pyongyang, because there's this whole corrupt elite where the people have money and they want products and they've kind of imported products and started having kind of little shopping malls. And this cynicism, as I think I've said to you before, is very, very healthy, because it's very good to be skeptical toward the leaders, Kim Jong Un the current leader, and be like, this guy's not magic; he's just a fat kid who inherited his dad's criminal gangster empire, and there are better ways. So there's hope, and I think the hope is, again, through information.

I talked to a refugee, and she made the good point that that movie, *The Interview*, would be good for them to watch, and I was shocked that she said this, and her point was they are told that the rest of the world is terrified of North Korea and Kim Jong Un, right? And they have nukes; we're all quaking in our U.S. imperialist boots. If you watch that movie in which he's treated as a clown, that's indisputable proof that this idea that we're terrified of them is simply false. So the more — you know, the bigger the lie, the easier it is to dismantle in some sense, because it's just like letting some water in through a dam. All of a sudden everything comes crashing down, because the math just doesn't add up.

**WOODS:** One other thing I want to ask you, I know about East and West Germany and how they were as good a controlled experiment as you're going to get in this world about two different social systems, but I know that when it came to Berlin there was a wall separating the two, and you couldn't escape, and so on. What is it like — what is the division between North and South Korea like in that regard?

**MALICE:** Well, it's very, very tricky. Besides the physical division of the DMZ, when Kim Jong Il met with the South Korean president, they could only understand I think 90% of what the other said, so the languages started separating. And another thing is, when you have North Korean people who escape to the south, they automatically have South Korean citizenship and they're given, like welfare for a couple years.

However, they are treated as complete garbage. First of all, they're all shorter, and South Korea's this very kind of hierarchical society, and their accent was regarded as — the term I heard when I was reading about it was "guttural," and I asked someone in South Korea, like, what's the American analog, and they said it's like someone from the very deep south. Now, you can imagine how people from the north, these northy, snooty jerks hear someone with a southern accent and think they're better than them because of their northeastern idiocy; well, it's the same thing in Seoul. So Seoul being their kind of capital city, they hear someone with a rural accent, they dismiss them immediately. So these men who have all their lives been told when to report to work, had every minute of their lives accounted for by the North Korean state, given freedom they don't know really what to do with it, and it's a very, very, very difficult transition for them. So it's very ugly in that regard.

However, North Korea has — you know, there are two points they make which are very fair, one of which is they weren't enemy combatants in World War II, so is it they were divided just like Germany was; that's not fair. That's a valid point. The second point they make in the literature, which I was shocked, is they go, look, people think it's absurd we can reunify, but they point to the Germanies reunifying 50 years later and they point to the Irish accords and how peace was made there, and the example they always use is if you're saying the word "impossible," you're not speaking the Korean language.

So they still very much hope for reunification, but the Southerners don't care about them at all. I met a couple of tourists who were also from Seoul, and they knew nothing about North Korea whatsoever. They don't care about them, so it's even more

tragic, not from the oppression level also, but in terms of hope for their future. It's very, very, very bad.

**WOODS:** Well, I'm sorry to end on such a note, so people should mentally think back to when you were saying there was indeed hope, and it does seem just so anomalous for there to be this regime in this day and age.

**MALICE:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** You just can't believe that it's actually happening, it's actually part of the world.

**MALICE:** And the other thing that I can't believe is how people in the press regard them as a laughing stock. You are laughing at children who are being starved for political purposes.

**WOODS:** Yeah. That's not funny, and I cannot encourage people enough to read *Dear Reader*. We're going to link to it at [TomWoods.com/570](http://TomWoods.com/570), so if you're driving around and you for some reason can't remember the title, *Dear Reader*, then just remember 570, and we're going to link to it there and to Michael, of course, whom you should visit at [MichaelMalice.com](http://MichaelMalice.com), who, as I told you in a previous episode just a couple of episodes ago, not only does he know all this, but also knows more about sea life than you and all your friends put together.

**MALICE:** (laughing)

**WOODS:** So Michael, as always, it's a great pleasure, and let's look for a reason to talk again soon.

**MALICE:** Thanks, Tom.