



Episode 659: Afraid of President Trump? How About Presidents in General

Guest: Michael Malice

WOODS: It has been four freaking months since I've had you on the show. That is — that's just horrifying, and that can never happen again.

MALICE: Get it together, Tom, like Donald Trump said.

WOODS: That's right; that's right. Yesterday I didn't even do an episode. I just had so much fallout from this horrifying problem with the podcast feed, so if I'm not going to do an episode, then the one that follows the missed one had darn well better be — you know, we'd better turn that up to 11. So I thought, Michael Malice, absolutely. So you have a column in *The Observer*, and — well, in fact, you have a column in *The Observer*, a regular column in *The Observer* at Observer.com.

MALICE: Yeah.

WOODS: And I'm going to link to the column, of course, as I always do, on the show notes page. And this column — now, do you come up with the headlines, or do they sometimes override your headlines? Who's responsible for the title of the piece?

MALICE: So they come up with the headlines. Like the last one I did, I just had a piece about Phyllis Schlafly. Now that I understand their syntax — this is a biweekly column — I'm trying to fit into their kind of style, but the first two columns was their choice.

WOODS: Okay, but this column — this title's not bad. It does kind of sum up what you're trying to say in the column. So it's called, "It's Not President Trump that Scares Me — It's Presidents, Period." That's so great. That is — that actually is a great sentiment. That's really great. All right, so let's unpack this a little bit. Everybody is saying that it would be terrifying to have Donald Trump as president. I've got Max Boot saying he would rather vote for Stalin. Can you imagine that? I mean, I think he really needs to be taken to task for minimizing the crimes of Stalin by saying that. But something tells me that it's okay to say that you'd vote for Stalin. It's a weird society.

MALICE: Well, hey, most of those *National Review* types were ex-Stalinists, and this is perfectly fitting —

WOODS: It's totally natural for them, right.

MALICE: Forget it.

WOODS: Yeah, so you would rather vote for Stalin than for Trump. All right. And we're getting people who say they're going to move out of the country if he gets elected. These are all people I would love to see leave, so, you know, don't tempt me.

MALICE: (laughing)

WOODS: So it's just one crazy thing after another. Now, the guy drives me up a wall too. He says one thing, and then he thinks that the Fed is blowing a bubble, and then on the other hand he says, but I like the low interest rate policy – okay, but that's the thing. That's kind of the thing.

MALICE: Right.

WOODS: So there are a lot of these that drive me crazy. But the point is, if I were to look through a lot of other presidential candidates, you know, I'd find a whole lot – they don't know anything about the Fed. Come on. Most of them don't know anything about the Fed. So in your piece, you say that it's a cliché that a Trump presidency is a terrifying prospect, but then at the very end of just that first paragraph, you say it's the presidency itself that is a terrifying reality. How can you say something so extreme?

MALICE: Yeah, we don't have room for extremism on this show.

WOODS: Oh, not on this show. Aren't you throwing out the baby with the bathwater?

MALICE: (laughing) Yeah. President Baby. That sounds like a terrible NBC show. No, first of all, you do know that Trump has said that he would audit the Fed by executive order and within the first 100 days of his presidency. Did you hear that?

WOODS: I did not hear that.

MALICE: Yes. So he has on record – who knows if that means anything – but he has said explicitly he will issue an executive order to have the Fed audited within the first 100 days of his presidency. That's number one. Number two is – you were one of the people who pointed this out to me, that one of the big problems we have is that people look up to the presidency, and it kind of is this Hamiltonian aristocracy, and that allows these people to get away with literal murder and all sorts of other heinous acts. And if Trump were the president, you know, I make the point in this article, Trump would be able to get away with half the things that Obama gets away with, because Obama's a great guy. He's a nice guy; he looks good on TV; he listens to the music that you listen to, you being the median voter. And Trump is a crazy person foaming at the mouth. So he would not have the social room to do half the things that Obama or even Hillary can.

WOODS: Yeah, but you wonder, though, given some of his bluster and his I'm-in-charge kind of personality, would he even care? Wouldn't he just say, look, I'm the president? I'll do whatever the heck I want; I'm the president.

MALICE: Well, I mean, I think that's the policy now, and I think that was the policy in the Bush years. I wrote this article for *The Guardian* a couple years ago about why I don't vote ever, and the point I made is that democracy and the law is really an *ex post facto* rationalization for politicians to do what they intend to do anyway. So we remember in the aughts during the Bush years, he went to the UN for authorization for Iraq, for the Iraq War. He was denied it, and he didn't say, well, we didn't get authorization, we're going home; he was like, well, here's this other backend loophole we're going to use to further our goal. Same thing with the Democrats and Obamacare. They just used the — I forget what it's called, the reconciliation package, which was meant for budgeting, to push through Obamacare when Scott Brown's election lost them Congress.

So this idea that the Constitution is going to bind people and that politicians are willfully going to tie their hands is a fallacy. And Trump, I agree with you, will be just like Obama and everybody else, meaning he'll have his executive orders — like, even *The New York Times* was saying that half of those executive orders that Obama was passing were grossly unconstitutional, and they were looking around at each other, being like, should we do something about this. And they didn't know what to do, because again, he's one of their own. So this is something that's problematic — and I hate using that word — for any president and would not be unique to President Trump.

WOODS: How about that point about, it's fair game to kill the families of terrorists. Surely, that's exclusive to Trump.

MALICE: Well, no. As you know, this is the policy now. There was an article written — I forget what paper it was, some British paper — by someone who's on the government's terrorist watch list. Now, when you get on the watch list, just like on the do-not-fly list, they don't tell you that you're on and they don't tell you why you're on. So what was happening was this guy had to stop — and let's suppose this guy's a terrorist and deserves to be killed. I'm going to give him the opposite of the benefit of the doubt. I'm going to say this guy really deserves to be killed, right? But the thing is, he's going to, like, his cousin's weddings, and he's going to, like, schools, and the missiles are hitting the schools and places where he's eating meals and innocent people are being killed. So now he can't associate with anyone, which I guess is the point, but the consequence is, this is already the policy that's being put into place by the Obama administration, and no one on the Left seems to have a problem with it when it's done with a smile and in it's done implicitly. When Trump goes on TV and says we're going to do that, yes, it's terrible, but the point is, I don't understand why anyone is saying it's terrible that he's going to do this. Isn't it much worse that this is currently being done?

WOODS: And, I mean, I like this — let me read just a little passage, because the last sentence of this really, really sums up the weird and, again, I call it Trump Derangement Syndrome. They can only see problems with Trump. I see problems with

Trump, but I have apparently a big enough brain to see problems with a lot of these people.

MALICE: Oh yes.

WOODS: So you write: "Our drones and our armed forces kill, and the apologies are never forthcoming. We live in a time where the U.S. Air Force bombing of a Doctors Without Borders hospital in Afghanistan causes as much furor as President Obama's decision to wear a tan suit. True, President Obama is not perceived as erratic. He does not make glib comments about his opponents. When he executes, he does so with a steady hand." So in other words, okay, it's true he doesn't call people names and it's true he's not uncouth about it when he goes and kills people, but is that really sort of the moral point here? We should get so worked up about, well, Trump will be worse because look at his crazy behavior. Okay, so now we've got a calm murderer. We've got a really steady, even-handed murderer. That's a lot better. What is wrong with you people?

MALICE: And it's interesting, because everyone likes to compare Trump and Cruz to, like, these historical figures. So Trump, as we all know, is both literally Hitler and the Antichrist and also somehow Mussolini in that mix, but if you want to play that game, we could compare Obama to Robespierre, who was one of the big architects of the French Revolution, and Robespierre was known as "The Incorruptible." You know, he was a virgin all his life. He was a true believer, and he very calmly sent people to the guillotine, because he thought this was the right thing to do. He had this sense of moral authority, and he surely felt no guilt about executing so-called class enemies.

And that's the whole thing with politicians. There's this sense of — I think there has to be psychologically, frankly, a sense of self-righteousness, because if you have the gall to execute people, knowing innocent people are going to be killed as a result of your actions and to be fine with that, that takes a certain psychological step that I think is very, very dangerous and frankly, a little bit foreign to my thinking and I'm sure yours. And people don't realize that, that they don't think the way that we do. I mean, it would be very hard for me to be like, you know, make that phone call and go out to this place and just bomb this hospital.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, indeed. I think it would be for all the sorts of people who never consider running for office and never would be part of the machine, that is true.

MALICE: Right.

WOODS: Now, there is one point that you make that might be — might have been slightly eclipsed by events, and that is the point about Republican candidates just carelessly, thoughtlessly advocating shooting down Russian planes —

MALICE: Yeah.

WOODS: – because I saw an article where apparently Trump has said, under some circumstances, yeah, you might have to do that. So unfortunately it blurs the point a bit. But your point is that, at least up to quite recently, we would be hearing these candidates – even Kasich, who was supposed to be the moderate reasonable one, would be talking about this. Sure, of course we've got to shoot down Russian planes. And people just accepted that as, well, you know, that's their policy and whatever. Well then, Trump would say, I think I could sit down with Vladimir Putin and we could work something out. Then he was insane. But it was not insane – it might be misguided or unwise, maybe – maybe, *maybe* – but certainly not insane to advocate shooting down planes of one of the strongest militaries on Earth. Again, that's weird to me. That's Trump Derangement Syndrome again.

MALICE: And we all remember when we were kids and we were all growing up, and we were in school, and we'd always ask the teacher, like, "Why is there war?" because it seems so obvious to most children that war is just this insane situation. And basically the thing we were always taught in school is that, look, it's a last resort, and you know, there's bad people out there, and sometimes these bad people won't listen to reason, and the only thing you can do is kind of beat them up and shut them up, or otherwise a lot of it is that people are going to be killed. And that's a plausible framework. I can accept that.

But the idea that, like, oh, if Putin insults me, I'm going to start World War III – no. No, no, no. This bluster and this chip on your shoulder, you know, it's really, just because these guys are in suits and saying these things calmly, if you unpack it it's really kind of creepy. Not every country in the world is going to like us. Not every country in the world is going to respect us, and the idea that, like, if you disrespect me, I'm going to go and start killing people is like the worst, low-class, violent, mob behavior that these law and order Republicans decry when they see it in their own communities or own televisions, and then they're advocating it on an international scale.

WOODS: There was a candidate – I don't know if it was – I think it might have been Cruz, actually, but probably more than one, who said something along the lines of, I don't really want to have a man as president that I'd have to block my children's ears around; you know, who's going to use foul language and be uncivilized. We don't want that. And I've heard that from a number of conservatives. We can't have this, a president I'd have to shield my children from. But for heaven's sake, okay, again think about this. In the same way that for the Left it's worse for somebody to make an unguarded racial remark –

MALICE: Sure.

WOODS: – than it is to bomb some country for no good reason –

MALICE: Yes.

WOODS: – because they don't ever, ever advocate ruining somebody's career over the second one, but the first one you'll never be heard from again. Well, same thing with the conservatives. It's worse for Trump to boast about how well endowed he is than it is for George W. Bush to launch a war for absolutely no reason whatsoever that can be remotely justified, that led to untold human suffering. That's a model? I want to keep my kids from that. I'll keep my kids from that.

MALICE: I think they're acting like spurned girlfriends, because here's how it is: when Trump is doing that, he is quite explicitly signaling that in a literal sense he's not going to speak their language. When you're talking to someone who's a progressive, you have to use your language accordingly. You have to say, you know, "differently abled"; you can't say "disabled"; there are certain terms. And these are verbal cues people use to demonstrate that I'm part of the "in" group and I'm part of the team and I know what's up, right? So when Trump is using foul language, which, I have many friends who are born again Christians, and this is one of their – coming from Brooklyn, this is one of their things where they're lining the sand. You know, these words are against God and terrible and these other words are okay, and somehow they get to decide which words are which. And it's perfectly fair when you're hanging around people to respect their boundaries and to speak accordingly.

So when Trump is refusing to do that and is speaking in his own kind of low class, in a sense, jargon, this is telling them – he's telling them, I don't care how you guys act. You're going to have to get aboard the Trump train or go away. So of course they feel repudiated and spurned, but I think he's making it a point to show he's swinging toward the general and making a point to modern Americans that he's not going to cower to the religious Right, which was, for years, a great tar-and-feather technique that the Left used to say, you know, if you vote in President Romney, next year you're not going to be taught evolution in schools. Sorry, Bob Murphy.

WOODS: I don't know, we'll – I keep saying we ought to do an episode with the three of us. I'm not sure that would work. I've got to think about it. But anyway, we'll talk about that another time.

MALICE: (laughing)

WOODS: Before I forget, this is hard to explain away, I think, for people who look to Trump as somebody, though, who is anti-establishment, he's going to shake things up. But if he's going to shake things up, how come Chris Christie is leading the transition team, and how come we're hearing that Newt Gingrich is at the top of his potential VP list? I mean, what is going on with that?

MALICE: Well, he said explicitly that he can't have – you know, he's smart enough that if you've never had political experience and you're going to be the president, you need someone who knows how Washington works to kind of get your program through. I mean, he said this very, very explicitly. This was a big problem I think for Jimmy Carter at first, because he didn't really get along well with the congressional Democrats, and despite having big majorities, there were a lot of issues there. So

Trump's smart enough to be like, look, I can get elected, but I still don't know how the system works. You can only know how something works from the outside to a certain extent.

My opinion, it's going to be Rick Scott, who is the governor of Florida, because he's also an outsider. He has a lot of healthcare experience. He's endorsed Trump. I think it would be very, very dubious to have Gingrich on the ticket, because Gingrich is also known for his infidelity and coarseness, and he's also pretty much reviled in Washington, D.C. On the other hand, Gingrich really knows how to stick it to Hillary, so that might be a good thorn in her side. Maybe he'd name Gingrich as, like, his Secretary of State or something like that, I don't know.

WOODS: Yeah, I have this sinking feeling that he would get elected on this wave of anti-establishment disgust, and then he'd surround himself with Council on Foreign Relations people for his foreign policy team, and it would just be same old, same old people, except with a blustery guy —

MALICE: Well, it has to be the same old — I mean, the pool is not that deep, and the point I always make to people is, if I had to bet money, I would be President Trump would kind of govern like Schwarzenegger governed California or Michael Bloomberg governed New York. Like, you know, he was just about management. But Trump doesn't have any strong — he says very offensive things and acts in an offensive manner, but I read his book, *Crippled America*, right? It has no cognitive contents whatsoever.

WOODS: (laughing)

MALICE: It's things like — hey, Tom, did you know this? Our tax system is broken, and the dummies in Washington don't want to fix it. They don't have real leadership, so we need a real leader who's going to bring our tax problem under control. Next chapter: education. Hey, Tom, did you know it's a real mess? It's a disaster —

WOODS: (laughing)

MALICE: — and there's no leadership, and we need leadership who understands — this is literally the entire book. The only cognitive content in the book was him saying explicitly, I'm not going to touch Social Security. And he's also saying that he's going to raise taxes on the rich and cut budget deals, so when it comes to economics, he's really this kind of Bloomberg figure, moderate, let's just cut a deal. You know, I don't think he signed Grover Norquist's pledge to never raise taxes, because he's explicitly said he intends to raises taxes. And he's open to raising the minimum wage.

WOODS: Yeah, that's another thing. And people are up in arms about that, and I am very unhappy about that. But we should remember —

MALICE: You don't think there's benefits to raising the minimum wage?

WOODS: Wait, hold that thought for a minute. Mitt Romney favored raising the minimum wage, so again, if you're going to be – I don't remember people absolutely going berserk when Mitt Romney has supported raising the minimum wage. So again, there's the same thing, that when Trump does it it's like an unprecedented violation of liberty, but this is exactly the sort of stuff you tolerated from the other guy. So all right, are you actually going to tell me there's – tell me – the one benefit to raising the minimum wage would be, if I were a real misanthrope, I would say that envious people and ignorant people would then get what they deserve.

MALICE: No, no, my argument for – and I'm very sincere, and I've been on this train for a long time, is I am sick and tired of dealing with these Morlocks at the cashiers. Their only job is to introduce errors between my order and the inputting process. I want these people out of work. I want them to turn that screen around, and I can input my order. When I go to CVS, I will wait in line for that self-checkout. I do not want to interact with these people. So when the minimum wage is implemented, they'll all be out of work. They will not be cashiers interacting with me, and my life will be significantly better.

WOODS: Wow. (laughing) All right –

MALICE: And I'm not the only person I know who's an anarchist who feels this way. This is very much, like, you know, if you have to choose your poison, this is my poison.

WOODS: Okay. (laughing) Okay. I'm not sure I've had quite that experience, but I've seen on Facebook the line-by-line exchanges that you've had with various cashiers, and if that had been my experience –

MALICE: Oh my God.

WOODS: Yeah (laughing).

MALICE: I'll give it to you in one sentence. Let's suppose the bill is \$6; I owe them \$6. And I'll hand them a \$10 and a \$1 bill, making 11, so they can give me back a 5. 100% of the time, they void their bowels, because they don't understand what's going on. And it's like, you don't even have to think. Just put "\$11" into the machine, and it will tell you to give me back a 5.

WOODS: Yeah, I have done that too, and they confusedly try to hand you back the 1.

MALICE: Yes.

WOODS: No, first of all, I want to get a 5, and secondly, I'm letting you keep your 1s, because I know you need them for small change.

MALICE: Yes, yes. And it's at the point, like, if I go to a restaurant and it's like, suppose I get sushi, and it comes with soup or salad and I don't want either of them, I'll still choose one and throw it out, because otherwise it's, "I don't want either." "But

they're free." "I don't want either." "Are you sure?" You know what? I don't need that argument. Just give me the salad, and I'll throw it in the garbage, because I don't want a discussion with you. I don't want to talk to you. My entire life has been structured by being able to not talk to people I don't want to, and this minimum wage will really help me out profoundly.

WOODS: All right, this is a completely insane twist that the conversation has taken.

MALICE: (laughing)

WOODS: I don't know what else to say. Do you have any predictions about how Trump versus Clinton would turn out?

MALICE: I do. Just you wait until he's at the debate, and he points to Bill Clinton in the audience and says, your husband is a rapist and you knew about it and you covered it up. And he's already started on that train. What possible response could she have to something like that?

Here's something else I tweeted. Hillary likes to have these canned one-liners. She thinks she's very funny. She's very knowledgeable about, you know, intricacies of bills and things like that. You have to have an ear for that. She's not quick on her feet. And that's fine; not everyone's quick on their feet.

She's going to come in with her little smarmy smirk and have some kind of joke about Trump, and he's going to improv some devastating one-liner, and then when she's rocked on her heels, her instinct is always sarcasm and snideness. "I was dead broke —" If you listen to her interview with Terry Gross and Terry Gross asked her why she changed her position on gay marriage, she explicitly said, Terry Gross from NPR, who's clearly a closet Republican operative, she's like, no, Terry, you're accusing me of changing my position for political purposes. But obviously that's what she did. So as soon as Trump gets her back, she's not going to have a comeback on her feet, and she's going to look weak and pathetic. He's going to dare her to say, I dare you to say "Islamic fundamentalist terrorism," and she'll either obey him and look weak or refuse and look cowardly.

And this is the one. I'm predicting this one right now. If she has one of her coughing fits onstage, he is going to attack her rapid fire, and she's literally going to be unable to speak, and he's going to say things like, look, she's dying in front of us; look, I like grandmas but they should be in a home, not be president. She's weak; she's pathetic. And she's just going to be coughing the whole time. And he's like, let's take a break, she needs a breather, this woman is not well. That will be the moment that destroys her campaign. He's going to eat her alive in those debates.

And as you know, most people in the middle don't care about ideology. They just respond like dogs in a visceral way towards strength, and I like the sound of this guy or this woman. And in those debates, he is going to have her in the palm of his hand. There's nothing she's going to be able to do.

WOODS: Yeah, and this is where one of his clear weaknesses is going to be a strength. One of his weaknesses is he is weak on specifics and he's light on his knowledge of the ins and outs of policy and the economy and all that stuff. He just doesn't know it. He's got some instincts, and that's about it.

MALICE: Yup. And in 2012, Candy Crowley attacked Romney, and she's the moderator, remember? Candy Crowley and Obama both double teamed Mitt Romney, and he stood there and took it, and Candy Crowley would prove to be wrong later about that, even though it was completely appropriate. Can you imagine one of the moderators teaming up with Hillary against Trump? He would flay them both and completely emasculate them both, which is hard to do with someone as manly as Hillary.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah. Well, in this case, we also need to remember that most people, when they watch a debate and they don't have very much invested on either side, they're moved by who seems to be in charge, who seems to be winning, who seems to be confident.

MALICE: Except for our debate, where people just felt bad for you.

WOODS: Oh, yeah – oh, geez, I should have put a caveat in there.

MALICE: (laughing)

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, yeah. But my goodness, it's funny that sympathy alone could have led to such a crushing and overwhelming victory on my part. Isn't that funny?

MALICE: It's not funny, because this is America, and people have big hearts and small minds.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah, yeah, yeah, that's our big problem. That's our big problem here in America. All right, so you think then that he's going to run away with it for these reasons. But on the other hand, can't – I mean, look, the Clintons are dirty and vicious, and they'll do anything to win. Aren't they going to dig stuff up? I mean, you don't even have to dig that deep. You dig two inches and find stuff about Trump.

MALICE: Well, here's the other thing. I think first of all, I just like in '08 with Obama-Clinton, it is much harder for him to have gotten the nomination than it would be for him to win the general. That was a major, major feat, to take on 16 other Republicans with great resumes and to win in that divided field. That's I think going to be much harder on paper than to win the general, just like for Obama it was much harder to beat Clinton than it was to beat McCain. So that's a big one. Number two is their strategy is to keep calling him racist, and it's like the 10,000th iteration is not going to do it. You're going to have to hit him with something else. And he's so mercurial, it's very hard. The polls already came out that he's tied with her in the swing states. Now, he hasn't even turned his guns on her yet.

And now the other brilliant thing about her is, wait until he starts hitting Clinton with all these past scandals, which they thought were dead and gone and which Hillary's like, I don't want to talk about the past. Well, when Trump makes an insult, then objective journalists have no choice but to explain what these references are. When he says these crazy things, the reporters have to be like, what he's talking about is this, and thereby all these old stories are revived and brought to the surface. I made this prediction earlier, I think on Kennedy. If he's willing to accuse Ted Cruz's father of being involved in the JFK assassination, I am certain he's going to bring up the rumor that Webster Hubbell fathered Chelsea Clinton. And why wouldn't he? And then they have to start explaining that one.

WOODS: Yeah, I'm sitting here just contemplating this. This is why, you know, when Lew Rockwell and I used to review the Republican presidential debates here the day after, the debates with Trump and Clinton are going to be – these aren't going to be the Lincoln-Douglas debates (laughing)

MALICE: No.

WOODS: They'll be very, very different. But they're going to make for darn good podcasting. I'm already salivating at the very prospect.

MALICE: It's going to be a bloodbath, and here's the other point. You know, she is treated with such reverence by her cabal, right? Like, the Clintons are very known for their extreme secrecy and extreme loyalty, and that's fine. Can you imagine being the guy who has to pretend to be Trump when she has her debate prep? Can you imagine – they're not going to be willing to go as far in their debate prep as Trump is going to be willing to go onstage. If who was playing Trump in preparation, you think who was going to even in practice say, your husband's a rapist, I dare you to confront that?

WOODS: Yeah, right.

MALICE: They're going to treat her with kid gloves, which is doing her an enormous disservice, but they have no other choice but to treat her with kid gloves, because this is someone who you work with, you respect, you admire. You're not going to want to go there towards someone you have on a pedestal.

WOODS: And not only that, but I mean, in the back of their minds they have to know she's the ice queen –

MALICE: Yes.

WOODS: – to people she considers to be even mildly her enemies.

MALICE: Yes, and I forgot who it was, but some woman – remember, when they were president, some woman refused to testify against the Clintons. She was one of their inner circle, and she went to jail for them. So their loyalties run strong and it runs deep, and that loyalty is just going to manifest itself in pussyfooting around the

horrible – and it's also hard to predict where he's going to come from. Listen, Ted Cruz could have prepared for debates for years. The idea that your dad shot JFK was going to come up, this is not a likely scenario that crossed anyone, and that is exactly what happened.

WOODS: Exactly, exactly. All right, listen, I'm going to let you run here. You know, when you write these columns, half the time they – well, I don't know about half the time. One-tenth of the time? Some percentage of them would make for good podcast episodes. Probably every single one. I'm just give you a hard time. But I shouldn't be too tough on you. I know you're still reeling from the debate loss. But I definitely want to get you on more often. I'm going to link to that column of yours with the – it really is a good headline. If somebody else had to write a headline for you, you could do a heck of a lot worse than that one. A lot of people have done a lot worse than that one for my columns.

MALICE: Oh yes.

WOODS: But TomWoods.com/659 is where you can find that column, and of course you can find out about *Dear Reader*, which I mentioned in the beginning, I told you all about Michael Malice – what's the website for *Dear Reader*? I'll have it up.

MALICE: KimJongIlBook.com

WOODS: That's pretty good. That's a pretty good one. Okay, all right, thanks again, Michael. We'll talk again soon.

MALICE: Thanks, Tom.