

## RALPH NADER RADIO HOUR EP 311 TRANSCRIPT

**Steve Skrovan:** Welcome to the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*. My name is Steve Skrovan along with my co-host David Feldman. Hello there, David.

**David Feldman:** Good morning, everybody.

**Steve Skrovan:** And the man of the hour, Ralph Nader. Hello, Ralph.

**Ralph Nader:** Hello. The program is going to focus on action on a very serious problem.

**Steve Skrovan:** That's right. Today, we're going to take a close and disturbing look at Donald Trump's relationship with women. Our guest today is journalist Monique El-Faizy. She has written a book. It's called *All the President's Women: Donald Trump and the Making of a Predator*. In this account of Trump's relationship with women, they uncover 43 new accusations of sexual misconduct of various kinds. That goes, I believe, with the over 20 previously revealed. This puts him back in the lead over Michael Bloomberg in the one horse race I don't think either of them wants to win. The book uses firsthand interviews, transcripts, prior reports, and court records.

So far, the President has managed to avoid the consequences of these and many other actions, and it remains to be seen whether the public really cares enough about this type of stuff to vote him out of office. We will talk to Ms. El-Faizy about all of that. But, before we get to all of that, Ralph, you wanted to talk more about the pardon power that President Trump is exercising.

**Ralph Nader:** Yes, this is part of his statement that, under Article II of the Constitution, he can do whatever he wants as President. He actually said, "With Article II, I can do whatever I want as President" last July. And he's been proving it, and he has now been enthralled with the pardon power that the President, under the Constitution, can pardon people who've been convicted and sent to jail. He can commute sentences, or he can engage in clemency of people who have served their sentence and then gone back into civilian society, and he, in effect, erases the record of the conviction. And while constitutional law scholars disagree with one another on the extent of the pardon power, Trump has mused that it doesn't have any limits and that he could pardon himself, which is of course not constitutionally permissible. There are restrictions on the pardon power, and you cannot override the constitutional rights of people, the Bill of Rights of people. You cannot do it for a bribe. You cannot do it in order to advance obstruction of justice, and you really can't override the Justice Department's charter in enforcing the law. But, he doesn't see it that way. So, I can see him going into a huge expansion of the pardon power as 1) to reward his campaign contributors. He's already done that with someone who gave him a large contribution. And 2) he can do it to try to

get re-elected, and use it for political purposes, all of which would--in an ordinary Congress that wasn't run by cowardly Republicans in the Senate--get him into trouble under the impeachment clause of the Constitution. What we have seen recently is, he is post-acquittal by the Senate, inebriated with his own power and he's heading for his own cliff because the Democrats aren't going to bring him to justice. They only control the House and they're backing off. And so, the scene in the next few months is going to be a totally out of control Trump firing all kinds of people because he doesn't like their law enforcement integrity--cleaning house, as he put it, in the Justice Department. And some of you may remember that Senator Joseph McCarthy was drunk with his own power, until he went after the Army and accused it of being infiltrated with communists. And that's when he headed to his own cliff. And what I think Trump's cliff is going to be, is when he starts firing people [and] interfering with ongoing prosecutions in the Justice Department. He has already accused the Justice Department of harboring a dark state, a conspiracy inside the Federal Bureau of Investigation. So, he's going off the charts here, and so he bears watching very closely because things can change very, very rapidly. And in one area that we're going to discuss is his savage sexual predatory activity towards many women who've come forward in detail under oath; some of them have sued him in court for what he did to them. That one may have a lot of potential because the House of Representatives is controlled by Democrats. It can be the subject of a serious House investigation, which we'll discuss later in the program. But, I wanted to ask you, Steve and David, are you noticing that he's going off the rails, even for someone like Donald Trump?

**Steve Skrovan:** Well, sure. I mean, I don't even know that it's even for someone like Donald Trump. He reminds me of more of a Shakespearean character who is, like you say, their biggest strength ends up being their downfall. And his biggest strength is his ability to just deny reality and push forward. I'm encouraged by you thinking that he'll go too far at some point. I guess it just remains to be seen how far that is, because he does have a tremendous number of enablers, in the Senate especially, who like their money.

**Ralph Nader:** But, you know, it's the Justice Department situation that is his greatest peril. If Attorney General Barr quits on him, there'll be others who will quit on him, and that will create the biggest crisis of his tenure. Because, remember, Nixon got into trouble that way; he was about to be impeached and convicted. The votes were there. When he fired the attorney general, the deputy attorney general, and the special prosecutor looking into the Watergate Scandal. It used to be said you really don't mess, at that level, with the Justice Department. And a lot of Senators who are Republicans in the Senate will agree with that. So, there's always a line that even someone like Trump can't cross, but he doesn't see it that way. He calls himself the chief enforcement officer like he's the attorney general. It's like Attorney General Barr is his personal lawyer,

which is not the case. He doesn't see it that way, and nobody can reach him. His family can't hold him back; no one can hold him back. If you listen to his rambling speech in Arizona a few days ago, he's even losing control of the audience. I mean, he spent 20 minutes mumbling about the 2016 campaign, and what they said he couldn't do, and how he did it, and Hillary, and Wisconsin, and this, and that. And you know, that was a partisan audience, but it was pretty quiet at that time. You know, what's going on? That doesn't particularly excite them. And then he went into a whole series of fabrications about everything good he has done for the American people during the last three years. I mean, he even accused the Democrats of wanting to diminish Social Security, but he's going to increase it! And he's going to increase wonderful healthcare, wonderful manufacturing jobs, and he goes into a rant. And then the next 20 minutes or 30 minutes, it's all the things he's going to do. That's one of his techniques, "We will do this, we will do that," and so someone can say, "Well listen, you've been in office for over three years. What do you mean 'we will'?" So, he's beginning to ramble, even by the standards of his partisan audience, and he's giving one big arena speech after another in recent days, and it's exactly the same thing. And then of course, he attacks, by name and nickname, people he doesn't like, including the presidential candidates. I can't help but think this is going to start to sour after a while, and his incredible leash that the media and others have given him, and Congress has given him, is going to run out. What do you think?

**David Feldman:** Well, you know, Michael Jackson proved that a medical professional is out there who will step up and do the plastic surgery regardless of the protocols, and I think the same applies to the Justice Department. I think that Bill Barr resigns, somebody else will step forward, and eventually the Justice Department will start looking like the Republican Party because there's always going to be somebody who is ambitious enough to put ambition before country. You know more than I do, but I don't see any end to this.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, you'll see mass resignations of district attorneys around the country, of key people in the Justice Department. That's the only thing that will wake up the legal profession sitting on the sidelines, you know, over a million practicing lawyers--and the American Bar Associations, State Bar Associations. That's the one thing that represents a red line for them. As Trump says, "We'll see what happens."

**David Feldman:** I don't want to belabor this, but we had an independent prosecutor who wouldn't offer up a criminal indictment based on the Department of Justice memo. Mueller wouldn't recommend an indictment. Do we know about the pardon power? I mean, is this based on -- is it stare decisis? There are no Supreme Court rulings on pardon power. It's just norms that he can trample on, right? There's nothing to stop him

from pardoning 2 million Americans, is there? Is there a law or a Supreme Court decision?

**Ralph Nader:** Well, the only thing that could stop him would be an impeachment. That's all. He ran roughshod over constitutional rights of people in the process and engaged in obstruction of justice. But, I think the best thing going for Trump is that speaker Nancy Pelosi and her top supporters in the House who backed away from confrontation with him. They've actually said so, "We don't want any more confrontation. We're just going to talk about healthcare, healthcare, healthcare, Social Security." That's what she says. And I'm trying to tell them that they can't do that because Trump is looking for a confrontation. He's on the attack. He's on the offensive, attacking people by nicknames, firing people, lying about things that are going on regarding the Democrats, and there's no option. In politics, he's around the offense or defense. And if the Democrats are positioning themselves to be on the defense, that's going to protect Donald Trump.

**Steve Skrovan:** Ralph, I would say you mention how Trump goes to these rallies to say, "I'm going to do this; this is what I've done," whether it's true or not. "And this is what I'm going to do," whether it's a con job. And that is the toolbox of the snake oil salesman, and what he's providing is a vision, a positive vision. So, I could see the Democratic strategist saying, "You know what? We've got to, instead of fighting him and fighting this intransigent Senate, we need to say, 'This is what we're going to do. We're going to provide healthcare; we're going to do this, and that, and the other thing, public education.'" I can see that being, Let's just offer up our alternative vision as opposed to trying to impeach him again.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, they haven't done that. They're piecemeal. They don't have a coordinated pledge to America the way Gingrich did in 1994. He had a Contract for America. Some people called it other things, but --

**Steve Skrovan:** Contract *on* America.

**Ralph Nader:** He got away with it. The Democrats, somehow, not only don't they have slogans the way Trump does, but they don't have coordinated program saying here's how life is going to be like in America if you elect a Democratic Congress, a Democratic president; here's how it's going to be for a living wage, and universal healthcare, and [the] environment, and trying to plan for the climate disruption, and housing; here's what we're going to do for public transit, and here's what we're going to do for rebuilding and remodeling the schools, and the bridges, and the highways, and the sewage, and drinking water [systems]. And here's how we're going to give you a voice and clean up our elections and let you band together to protect your own interests, because we can't do everything for you. They just haven't put that together. It's really

remarkable. There's no intellectual giant that's strategically planning with the Democrats. They're in complete disarray.

**Steve Skrovan:** Isn't that because they cannot decide on what they are? I mean, right now, this primary battle--we were talking about this off the air--is a battle for the soul of the Democratic Party. And on the one side, you've got the corporate Democrats; on the other, you've got the progressive Democrats and each trying to have people unify around their vision. One is a soaring vision, I think, in a positive way. The other is a limited vision, and right now, for the first time in my lifetime, the soaring vision of the progressives seems to be holding sway and trapping the corporate Dems, and it's always been the other way around. It's always been the progressives are trapped and have nowhere to go. If Bernie Sanders is holding sway, then it's the corporate Dems who are going to have to make a decision.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, that's the fear in the Democratic Party; it's going to split. And while they'll have a unified candidacy in terms of their speeches at the Democratic National Convention, if it isn't, for example, Bernie. If Bernie comes in with a plurality and they plot against him and marginalize him, and nominate someone else, then the Bernie voters are going to stay home in sufficient numbers to trigger the Electoral College in those same old states: Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin. That's the danger. In fact, in 2016, the more Bernie voters stayed home because they felt that Hillary stole it from Bernie in the primaries, they stayed home in greater numbers than the 76,000-vote differential between Hillary and Trump in the combined states of Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Michigan. See, so, it already happened.

**Steve Skrovan:** That's why I'm saying that it's the right wing that's got nowhere to go this time. It's usually those progressives that have nowhere to go and they say, "Get on board."

**Ralph Nader:** Yeah, and I think Bernie's right when he says, "The only way the Democrats are going to win, given the Electoral College, is a huge voter turnout in those key states."

**David Feldman:** Does he have the political chops to create coalitions? Because, it felt like that watching the debate that he's got --

**Ralph Nader:** Yeah and he doesn't talk enough about his record in Vermont. Let's face it, for almost 200 years, Vermont was the rock-ribbed Republican state. In the United States they made jokes about Republican Vermont. And then they started electing Democrats. They elected Pat Leahy to the Senate, and they elected Bernie Sanders to the House and then to the Senate with huge margins. So, he should talk more about his coalition-building and some of his compromises as a Representative and then Senator from the State of Vermont. In fact, if I was him, I would fill a couple buses with all kinds

of Vermonters to go around the key states and say, "Yeah, he's really a radical. Look what he's done. He's nothing more than a Franklin Delano Roosevelt new dealer, and he didn't particularly challenge the military budget because he has military contractors in Vermont."

But, he doesn't like to do that. He really wants to stay with his brand name as a Democratic socialist. I think he has had his fill of progressive Democrats over the years, backing and filling and oohing and aahing, and compromising themselves in their identity.

**David Feldman:** If he's the presumptive nominee after Super Tuesday, and it looks like he might be, can't you see him going to somebody like Amy Klobuchar or certainly Elizabeth Warren and say, Get on board. I need you. There's a role for you in my administration? You know, George Herbert Walker Bush called it voodoo economics, and so Ronald Reagan asked him to be his vice president. Ambition, Trump's ideology, doesn't it? Can't you see him being like Roosevelt?

**Ralph Nader:** Yeah, I can. I've said, I think the smartest ticket, if he comes out at the top in a multi-candidate race to the Democratic National Convention in Milwaukee, his best choice would be Elizabeth Warren, if she wants to be vice president, because they're going to need all those delegates combined to fight off the corporate Democrats.

**David Feldman:** And a vice presidential candidate, that role as attack dog, and she is -- I mean, especially on Wednesday's debate, she was fantastic, wasn't she?

**Ralph Nader:** Yeah, she knows how to get under Trump's skin. He'll take the bait and he'll go wild.

**David Feldman:** Does Bloomberg, is he done or does he need to put in another half a billion?

**Ralph Nader:** Well, he's going to play a very important role if he doesn't get the nomination. He will put a lot of money in key congressional seats, Senate seats, try to get a Democratic Congress, and he's already said that. That's going to be his main value, because he can relieve all these Democratic candidates in those states from any monetary deficiency with their Republican counterparts, and he'll get a huge standing ovation at the convention because he'll pledge that at the convention.

**Steve Skrovan:** Do you think that somebody like Bloomberg could endorse Bernie's vision of Democratic socialism and pitch it as a boon to Wall Street?

**Ralph Nader:** Yes, in fact, he's already adopted some of Elizabeth Warren's controversial positions. He's done what nobody ever thought he would do. He just came out in support of a financial transaction tax, a sales tax on Wall Street transactions,

sales and purchases of stock, bonds, derivatives. I mean, that would have been unheard of for Mayor Bloomberg, and he's also come out for other progressive positions as well. So, I think he won't be trouble at the Democratic National Convention because he really is terrified of Trump for a lot of reasons, and he wants a Democratic Senate, House, and White House. And he's got the money to make sure that the Democrats are not in a disadvantage in that area.

**David Feldman:** Democratic Socialism just may be good for business. It might be good to have 20% of your board of directors union leaders - on the board.

**Ralph Nader:** It's good also because they won't have to pay those high insurance premiums and deal with all the bureaucracy and the denials of their workers' health requests put forth by the physicians. And then the U.S. corporations will be more competitive with Western Europe, Japan and Canada because none of these corporations have to pay for health insurance, and that's a big deal. I mean, when General Motors doesn't have to pay for health insurance, which costs them more than what they're paying for steel in manufacturing their cars, they're going to be more competitive. Now, there will be a higher tax to pay for, but it won't be as much as what they're paying now, the uncertainty of hikes in insurance premiums, and all the bureaucracy of having to deal with the application of health insurance to the ailments or injuries of their workers. I mean, that's a huge, meddlesome problem that always crops up in union/corporate negotiations.

**Steve Skrovan:** That's a great argument that should be made. Now, another aspect of the Medicare for All argument is the business argument.

This has been a great discussion. Now, let's take a short break and check in with our corporate crime reporter, Russell Mohkiber. When we come back, we'll speak to Monique El-Faizy about her book, *All the President's Women: Donald Trump and the Making of a Predator*. You're listening to the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*. Back in a moment.

**Russell Mohkiber:** From the National Press Building in Washington, D.C., this is your Corporate Crime Reporter Morning Minute for Friday, February 21, 2020. I'm Russell Mohkiber. Massachusetts, Attorney General Maura Healy, last week, sued JUUL Labs for creating a youth vaping epidemic by intentionally marketing and selling its e-cigarettes to young people. Based on multiple depositions and hundreds of thousands of pages of company documents, Healey's lawsuit reveals new facts that have not previously been made public about JUUL's youth-oriented advertising campaign in 2015. Healey alleges that the company illegally advertised and sold nicotine products to underage youth and created an epidemic of nicotine addiction among young people. The lawsuit demands that JUUL pay for the costs associated with combating this public health crisis affecting young people across Massachusetts. "JUUL is responsible for the

millions of young people, nationwide, who are addicted to e-cigarettes, reversing decades of progress in combating underage tobacco and nicotine use," she said. For the Corporate Crime Reporter, I'm Russell Mohkiber.

**Steve Skrovan:** Thank you, Russell. Welcome back to the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*. I'm Steve Skrovan, along with David Feldman and Ralph. You would think that Donald Trump would be the poster boy of the Me Too Era, but he has so far been able to avoid paying any real price for his well-documented sexual misconduct. Well, our next guest has taken a close and disturbing look at the allegations and uncovered a lot of new evidence. David?

**David Feldman:** Monique El-Faizy is a freelance journalist and a fellow at the World Policy Institute. Ms. El-Faizy has written for a variety of publications, such as the *New York Times*, *The Guardian*, *The Washington Post*, *GQ*, the *Financial Times*, *Marie Claire*, and *Glamour*. She's the author of *God and Country: How Evangelicals Have Become America's New Mainstream*. And along with co-author Barry Levine, she has written *All the President's Women: Donald Trump and the Making of a Predator*. Welcome to the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour*, Monique El-Faizy.

**Monique El-Faizy:** Hi.

**Ralph Nader:** Yes, welcome indeed. Monique, when this book came out, *All the President's Women*, it was foreshadowed as a real blockbuster, and then it was going to rev up the opposition to Trump's savage sexual predations, his boastful abuses of women, his denunciation of all the women who accused him under oath of committing physical violence against them, his denunciation of them not only saying lies, but them slandering him further. There are dozens of cases in the courts by Trump's victims. They're suing him under civil law for wrongful injury. He still hasn't been deposed under oath, and therefore, he can make all kinds of wild statements denying what these women have described in great detail under oath. And then the book came out. It had a good spread in the *New York Times*, reviewed in other publications. Both of you went on TV and radio, and very little happened. I called up the reporter in the *Times*, and she said they got a remarkably mild response from the MeToo people and other readers. So, I'm asking you what happened? Is he too terrible against women to be held accountable compared to Al Franken and John Conyers?

**Monique El-Faizy:** I think there are a number of things at play here. I think the infamous *Access Hollywood* tape in which he boasted of being able to assault women in time for voters to make their decision about what that meant to them, and they clearly, for many voters, that didn't matter. They didn't care. So, I think there are a few things; I think that his base will excuse any behavior. You know, he boasts of being able to shoot someone on Fifth Avenue. That may not have been an exaggeration, unfortunately. And



I also think that, sadly, crimes against women are not taken as seriously as other crimes, and the book came out against the backdrop of impeachment hearings. And I think people discounted -- they had already discounted Trump's behavior with women. They knew who he was; they knew that's how he behaved. And those who support him are willing to accept it, and those who don't support him, I think, sort of shrugged and said, "Ah, we know that about him." And I think that's a real testament to the acceptance of rape culture in America and the acceptance of these kinds of crimes against women, which we've seen happen over and over and over with very little accountability.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, let's look at the situation here. In late November, there was a CNN National Poll, and 61% of the women wanted him impeached and removed from office, not just impeached. That's over half of the voters, 61% of over half of the voters. So, the public opinion is still against him. The lawsuits are proceeding. There's no criminal indictment, of course. He keeps rubbing it in, raising it from time to time as if he's being persecuted. And it's not just what happened before he was President; you can be impeached and removed from office for things that you've done before you were President and were revealed after you were elected. It's that more and more is coming out, And your book, *All the President's Women*, more women came forward, by name, more and more will come out in depositions as these cases drag along. His lawyers are delaying and delaying, obviously very adroitly because they don't want to have him testify under oath or be deposed under oath. Do you think he's going to get away with it?

**Monique El-Faizy:** I would hope not, but all indications are yes. In fact, just earlier this week, another woman came out and said that he had groped her, a WWE Star named Eve Torres. We have literally scores of women, and because he is the Teflon President in the way that Reagan never was, these allegations aren't sticking at all. And so, we have a real structural problem with very short statute of limitations. And you talked about the lawsuits in the court. Some women have tried to work around the statute of limitations on sexual assault by suing him for defamation. So, there are two lawsuits that are going through the courts: one by E. Jean Carroll, who was an *ELLE Magazine* columnist, and one by a woman named Summer Zervos who was a contestant on *The Apprentice*. And they are both suing him for defamation, and those two suits have been allowed to proceed. So, one can hope that he will be held accountable through that vehicle. It's still a bit too soon to see, but I think that, in the long run, there's a saying "truth will out". I think, in the long run, we can hope that, eventually, this will catch up with him. But, it's not clear that it's going to do so anytime in the near future, and certainly not before the November election.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, on January 30th of 2020, the three co-chairs in the House of Representatives of the Democratic Women's Caucus--Representative Jackie Speier,

Representative Lois Frankel and Representative Brenda Lawrence--sent a sharp letter to Trump basically assailing him for his "continuing derogation of women in your rhetoric and policies". Then, they quoted some of his worst comments, which were made while he was President as well as before he was President, including one which says, "I can do whatever I want." And then they took him to task on other matters relating to his mistreatment of women, and didn't get any press other than Common Dreams, to our knowledge. It's quite a remarkable letter, and the White House didn't even acknowledge receipt. So, basically when I say money, it's not enough to write a book. When I wrote *Unsafe at Any Speed* about unsafe automobiles, I didn't say, Well, I hope the Congress will make them safe. You have to mobilize the women who are really concerned about this and go to Congress and do what I just did earlier this week. I took an open letter to the women in Congress that I drafted. People can get it by going to Nader.org, an open letter to women in Congress. And I personally delivered it to every woman Democrat in the House of Representatives, 89 of them plus some men Democrats, and I said, "This is a very serious matter. Nancy Pelosi is your speaker. You have women in powerful positions in the House, and what will history say if you let him go?" and someone said, "What do you think we should do?" [I said] "You should have a House Judiciary Committee investigation from top to bottom having the victims testify under oath and inviting the President to come and testify under oath, and set the historical record. Whether it leads to impeachment would remain to be seen. It would not be an impeachment initiative because Nancy Pelosi is moving away from that, but it could just be a normal House investigation on a very abnormal situation. This letter didn't start "Dear Women of Congress". Here's how it started; it's my letter, "Think of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Sojourner Truth, Susan B. Anthony, Angelina Weld Grimké, Alice Paul, and Jeannette Rankin. Recall their courage and leadership in comparison with the courage needed to request an investigation of President Trump's treatment of women." In other words, what these women displayed in terms of courage, 100, 150 years ago, was massively greater than the courage that we're asking the women of Congress to demonstrate. The men in Congress basically passed it over to the women, which they shouldn't do, but that's what they've done. They've deferred to the women. About a quarter of the House of Representatives is composed of women. That's about the highest in American history. And what do we see? Silence. We see excuses. You go up there and you present the letter, and they say, "Oh, he's like Teflon. He gets away with it. We can't do anything about it." Nonsense. If millions of people see the testimony on television, under oath, by these women, it will change the entire atmosphere, the entire aura. What do you think?

**Monique El-Faizy:** I think you're absolutely right. And I think that letter, it's an incredibly important first step. I think it's, frankly, a shame that it had to come from you and didn't come from the women of Congress without prompting, but be that as it may.

I also think, as you mentioned, we have a historical number of women in Congress. I think that gives us hope that perhaps things can change. Because until the levers of power are held equally by men and women, it's going to be hard to effect change. But, you also raise an important point in that, yes, women should be engaged in this fight. It's their own self-interest, but it shouldn't just be women. It should be men also. This is an issue of right and wrong and law, and shouldn't just be seen as a woman's issue. You know, assault is illegal. That is black and white. So, I think it's an important first step. I think, as you know better than anybody, it's important to continue those pressure points. Change is incremental; change is difficult. And it requires constant pressure. And I think you're right. I think it's been very easy, you know, there's a Trump fatigue; there's an ick factor with these kinds of allegations. And it's very easy to avert your eyes. And in averting your eyes, averting our eyes, we become complicit, and I think it's very important that we keep pushing it, and keep demanding accountability and change. And you're right, I think if these very, very credible women all testified, and we corroborated many of these stories with people they had spoken to at the time of the assault, I think if the American public could hear these women for themselves, they might have a very different view of this.

**Ralph Nader:** I think more than might. I think it would be transformational, number one. Number two, he would goad the public with his fulminations as he reacts to the hearing, and I think we'll revive this issue where the Democrats have evicted a lot of their own elected officials. But then they give the worst predator of all a pass? You remember Governor Spitzer was caught paying a prostitute when he was Governor of New York, and the Democrats in the Albany legislature said, if he didn't quit, they were going to impeach him. And he quit in two days and he expressed remorse. This was in 2008, and what he did was nothing compared to what Trump has done again, and again, and again. In my letter, I quote one of his victims, Natasha Stoyneff, who wrote an op-ed in *The Washington Post* on November 7th, 2019, and she says, "Two weeks ago when 43 new allegations of sexual misconduct surfaced in a new book, *All the President's Women: Donald Trump and the Making of a Predator* by Barry Levine and Monique El-Faizy, my sisters and I were not surprised. We suspect there are even more out there." And then she ends in a very plaintiff note, which I put at the end of the letter. She asks on behalf of her and other victims, "But, for us, the question remains, will this finally be the time when enough people care?" So, in addition to petitions and contacting your members of Congress, Monique, I think there needs to be a whole series of personal visits, whether with members of Congress back home for convenience or coming to Washington. I mean, what's the point of this Women's March where you had hundreds of thousands of people in Washington the day after Trump was inaugurated, and they're very proud of this huge turnout. But, to what avail? They keep referring to

it as a high point, and I respond and say, "Well, what's next here? He's laughing all the way to his next re-election!"

**Monique El-Faizy:** Yeah, I mean, the Women's March did spark a wave of women's activism that women's leaders tell me they haven't seen since the '60s or '70s and that it was more sustained than it was in the '60s and '70s. So, there has been this campaign of letter-writing and things like that. What's also true is that those campaigns tended to focus, after a while, on specific issues and not on this issue that we're talking about, not on Trump's assault and his attacks on women. And perhaps that definitely needs to be re-thought and re-calibrated because you're absolutely right, he must be held accountable, and that will not happen unless the public demands it.

**Ralph Nader:** And one way to start is to start getting some of the women in Congress to speak out and say, "We want hearings in the House Judiciary Committee. Now, I'm sure that Jerry Nadler, who's the chair, would be very, very responsive, but he's waiting to hear from Nancy Pelosi, who's the Speaker of the House and who calls the shots here. So, I think the focus should also be on Nancy Pelosi. She has told me and others in the following words about Trump, "He's a crook, a liar, and a thief. He should be in prison."

So, we don't have to persuade her. She ripped up the speech after all at the State of the Union address in the House of Representatives in front of millions of people, but she's backing off. And that's what he relies on; he's such a bully. He keeps pushing, and pushing, and pushing until people just back off. So, I think you have to focus with the delegation of women meeting with the leaders of the Women's Democratic Caucus. Number one, Nancy Pelosi and California Representative Jackie Speier, and others who signed this letter on January 30 that was totally brushed off, not even acknowledged by Trump and his people in the White House. So, what do you think the next step would be?

**Monique El-Faizy:** I think that what's happening right now is that there's a political calibration being made. I think that the House leaders think, Oh, maybe there's no appetite among the public for these kinds of hearings. I think this needs to be taken up by the public. It needs to become such a burning issue that they have no choice, that they have to put these women ahead of politics and these allegations ahead of politics. I think, right now, there's a political game being played. There's also another point that I would like to make is that we saw Christine Blasey Ford who came forward to testify in the confirmation hearings of Brett Kavanaugh for the Supreme Court. And she has been receiving death threats. She had to go into hiding. She's still not, last I read, that may have changed, back in her home. She still receives death threats. So, someone who comes forward does so at enormous personal risk. And we also need to protect those women. We need to make it safe for them to come forward and to testify, and that's something that deserves another look.

**Ralph Nader:** And that's a very important point that his intimidation is almost physical because he roils up his supporters around the country; they fill the social media with hate and slander, and people are scared. But, that's all the more reason why they should do something in the House of Representatives because it's not just his criminal behavior, his tortious behavior, his boasting about it, his constant slandering people like Maxine Waters, "low-IQ Maxine Waters", he has said 100 times. Look who's talking. I mean, he's got a low IQ. She does fight back and she answers him as much as she can, but the press just reports this slander without giving her a chance in the same article in the *New York Times* and [New York] *Post* to respond, which is not fair, journalistically. But, there is that fear, and that's all the more reason, Monique, why this should be brought to the forefront, made a campaign issue.

**Monique El-Faizy:** Absolutely, it needs to be aired out, it needs to be brought forward, aired out, and handled like any other allegation against any other president would be handled. And this has all been accepted and shot to the side and overlooked and that's not how democracy should work.

**Ralph Nader:** And worse, it's now affecting young boys and young men who think they can get away with this kind of talk and behavior, because after all, the President of the United States does this. *The Washington Post*, a few days ago, had a page 1 story by Hannah Natanson talking about how this has affected the way students behave in schools. They're citing the President not just on misogyny, but on racial and ethnic animosities. So, he's corrupting moral fiber of American culture and society, and you just can't sit around the way Nancy Pelosi did and said, "I've done my job. I've impeached him on the Ukraine issue." People don't have a stake in the Ukraine issue. They do have a stake in the President of the United States disgracing our country, and our society, and our religious and civic traditions before the world, boasting about it, no remorse, no apologies, and getting away with it.

**Monique El-Faizy:** He is arguably the most visible, the most powerful man in the world, and he's setting an abysmal example. You know, there are words that I wouldn't have allowed in my house that he's saying on Twitter and on the air. So, this is not okay, and when we don't do that as a nation, we are complicit. We are allowing it to happen, and that, to me, is the real danger of this is that, by not calling it out every time, by not being outraged and shocked every time, we normalize this behavior. And I think by not calling for hearings, Congress is normalizing this behavior.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, let's get David and Steve in on this. We're talking with Monique El-Faizy, author of *All the President's Women* with Barry Levine, subtitle, *Donald Trump and the Making of Predator*, very, very well-documented. What do you think of all this? We're talking action here; we're talking the House of Representatives.

**Steve Skrovan:** Well, I would like to actually focus on a little bit of a different aspect of this. Ms. El-Faizy, you kind of delved into his childhood and his background. What was it about Donald Trump's upbringing that has made him a predator. What did you find there?

**Monique El-Faizy:** I'm going to preface this by saying this is informed speculation. Donald Trump has never seen a therapist, as far as we know; none of the people that we spoke to treated Trump. So, they have professional restrictions, the people we spoke to spoke in general terms. So, this is somewhat hypothetical. But, there are a few things here. He was separated from his mother at the age of 2. His mother went into the hospital to deliver his younger brother, suffered severe complications, and she was in the hospital for a long time. There was an abrupt separation. An expert that we spoke to said that around a year, the child is learning to bond. They're learning their sense of security, like they're bonded to their mother, or their caretaker, and that a separation like that could prompt a detachment disorder. And somebody, there was a writer in Politico who we quote in the book who spent a lot of time looking because he was researching a detachment disorder, and he believed that Donald Trump has a detachment disorder, and that that is reflected in his lack of intimate relationships, his grandiose behavior--everybody in his orbit is the best, the biggest. So, that's number 1. And then his father--in his house, there were very traditional gendered roles. His father was the breadwinner and worked, and his mother, Trump described her as the ideal woman because she cooked and cleaned and darned socks. And to him, she was the perfect woman because she was silent; she was submissive. And she put her own concerns secondary to those of her husband. You know, Trump talks about when his father had an important meeting or an emergency at work, she never would complain if plans were canceled and he would have to run off. So, that's the second thing. So, when Trump was 13, his father sent him off to military academy, an all-male military academy. And his classmates there say because there were no girls there, the only way they could learn about girls, and women, and relationships with the opposite sex was through *Playboy Magazine*. That was kind of their bible and their guidebook. And when they graduated, we spoke to his classmate named Sandy McIntosh who talked about how he realized that that, in effect, was not an appropriate way to view women, to relate to women. And they matured, and they changed. Trump seems to have been stuck in that place. He seems to still be that 13-year-old boy, and we see this when he had *The Apprentice*, his TV show. He had episodes that were filmed at Hugh Hefner's Mansion. He seems to really favor a woman who conforms to that so-called Playboy ideal. He seems never to have changed his view of women from that Playboy view that he developed at 13.

**Ralph Nader:** David?

**David Feldman:** Do we know if there are any recent allegations that may have taken place inside the White House?

**Monique El-Faizy:** We do not have confirmation. We have heard rumors. We did not have the time to report out those rumors in the time frame that we were doing the book. So, we did not have any confirmed allegations. I will say though, that when you look at all these allegations in the aggregate, and that was something that was pretty striking to me when I was doing the book, there are patterns of behavior that emerged that started as far back as the '70s and that continued well into this decade; I guess the last decade, well into the 2000s, and they are consistent patterns that are repeated over and over and over. It does defy logic to think that suddenly one day, because he was elected, those patterns stopped. So, while we do not have confirmed stories of these kinds of things while he was in the White House, there are rumors--and again, common sense. He has been engaging in this behavior for decades. People who have habits and patterns don't generally stop them very easily or very quickly.

**David Feldman:** Is the Secret Service obligated to report a crime, a criminal crime committed by the president?

**Monique El-Faizy:** I think Ralph would probably know that better than me. I don't think so, but I actually don't know the legality of that.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, they don't interpret that behavior. Obviously, if he robbed a bank while they were guarding him, they would have to report it, David. But, I think it's worthwhile asking, "Where is the religious community here?" He's a repeated boastful adulterer, to begin with. What he said on television was so shocking, years ago. But, you know, he was viewed as an entertainer, and they gave him a pass. In October 2016, 700 Christian women condemned his sexual violence and misogyny, in no uncertain terms. It was like water off a duck's back. But, there's got to be a time when he's held accountable because women and men go to that next effort, and we know the place where it can happen, and where tens of millions of Americans, regardless whether Trump voters or not, and witness this sworn testimony by his victims and dig deep into their own ethical, cultural, and religious roots and say, "I don't care that I voted for him. It's unacceptable; he should resign." We often just talk about impeachment, but Governor Spitzer resigned, Al Franken resigned, and it's not beyond the realm of doubt that resignation can happen with Donald Trump. Although, people think he'd have to be carried out of the White House; even if he lost the election, he'll call it a fraud and remain there. But, that doesn't mean we simply give up, and that's what I hear in the House. You know, when you talk to the staff, and this letter, which I wrote, applies to the staff as well as to the members of the House, is they keep pre-judging defeat. They keep recounting how nothing matters with him; nothing can affect him; nothing can hold him accountable. Nonsense! History shows that if you don't succeed, you keep

trying again and again, and he'll goad. He'll be the worst foil for himself if he knows the spotlight is coming back onto him in this area. And I can't understand how the lawyers have been delaying the depositions. All this would come to forefront if enough organized women go to the House of Representatives in and out of every office, meet with Nancy Pelosi, and say, "We must have an investigation." You don't have to pre-judge the result, but it has to be an investigation where the victims come forward under sworn testimony, and they're protected from retaliation by the cover of Congress.

**Monique El-Faizy:** Yeah, I think that's right. I think, as we said before, accountability is key, and it seems to me that this Congress is so -- they're sort of stunned by Trump's audacity and his maneuvers and stunned in the literal sense--they can't move, they can't react. He's changed the rulebook so dramatically that they don't know how to respond, and they are sitting back and allowing much of it to happen. They are not taking decisive action to stop this President, and I think when the four prosecutors resigned over his tweeting about sentencing, you thought, Oh surely, this is the high-water mark, right? Yet it's just nothing seems to provoke a really decisive reaction among our elected representatives, and that needs to change. It is their job to stop this. We have checks and balances that are only as effective as the Congress and the courts are willing to make them.

**Ralph Nader:** Well, we have the American people, the majority of them on the side of holding him accountable. He's still a minority President in the polls. When it comes to his personal behavior, he is a really minority President. Look at the 61% of the women, just on general observation of him, want him removed from office. I've been told if you took a private poll in Congress, there'd be a majority to remove him from office, but the Republicans obviously, are afraid of his intimidation. Well, we'll have to leave it there. If you want people to contact you, you can give them any contact number or that of Barry Levine. Do you want to do that, Monique?

**Monique El-Faizy:** Yeah, they can contact me through my website. There's a contact form. It's [www.MoniqueElFaizy.com](http://www.MoniqueElFaizy.com), and I respond to any message I get there. I'm also on Twitter. Same username, Monique El-Faizy on Twitter.

**Ralph Nader:** And the open letter to the women in Congress is on [Nader.org](http://Nader.org) for those of you who want to read it in its entirety. Thank you very much. We've been talking with Monique El-Faizy, the co-author with Barry Levine of *All the President's Women: Donald Trump and the Making of a Predator*. And on the back of the book, there's a quote by Trump, October 15th, 2016, in a tweet. And he says "Nothing ever happens with any of these women, totally made-up nonsense to steal the election. Nobody has more respect for women than me!", Donald Trump. Thank you very much, Monique.



**Monique El-Faizy:** Thank you to the three of you having me, and Ralph, to you for sending that letter and for continuing to fight this fight.

**Ralph Nader:** All the best. Well thank you very much, Monique.

**Monique El-Faizy:** Thank you very much.

**Steve Skrovan:** We've been speaking with Monique El-Faizy, author of *All the President's Women: Donald Trump and the Making of a Predator*. We will link to that at [RalphNaderRadioHour.com](http://RalphNaderRadioHour.com). Alright, let's take some listener questions. This first question comes from listener, Chuck Augello, and he says, "Hi guys, I love the show, but Alan Grayson's description of Nancy Pelosi's ripping up a copy of the State of the Union address as one of the great acts of civil disobedience was an insult to all those throughout history who've faced violence, persecution, and death because of their political beliefs. Pelosi is a privileged, powerful, protected political figure who faces no personal consequences for her petulant act. To compare her actions to the courage shown by civil rights protesters, union organizers, and others who have faced beatings and imprisonment, every time they spoke out, is inappropriate and indicative of Grayson's own privileged position. In general, he was a good Congressperson, but his comment was false and disrespectful. Chelsea Manning committed a great act of civil disobedience; Nancy Pelosi committed a boorish act of political theater." Ralph?

**Ralph Nader:** Well, I think former Congressman Grayson probably meant that it was a great act of civil disobedience for an elected official or a politician, because he's very aware of the great courage that Chuck described people in the U.S. and around the world who really put it on the line. That's the way I took it, that he was talking about a politician. And for a politician, that was an act of civil disobedience that was unprecedented. In front of a national TV audience, she rips up the President's speech, casts it aside, and then explains it as being full of untruths.

**Steve Skrovan:** Alright, very good. David, take the next question.

**David Feldman:** This one comes to us from Mark Erickson. "Ralph, after what happened with the Iowa caucuses, it seems natural to think that ranked choice voting would have solved this problem. It would have been so easy. It's like a virtual caucus with the exception of the people are not in the same building. Instead of cookies, or peer pressure, making supporters of non-viable candidates choose a different one, people would have to do their homework, and have multiple choices ready to fill out on voting day. Yet, I haven't heard single media report mention ranked choice voting since Monday, February 2nd. It's disappointing that this easy solution gets no play in the media."

**Ralph Nader:** Well, that's been a problem because it's hard for the advocates of instant-runoff voting, or what you say is ranked choice voting. The problem they have is they can't describe it in 22 seconds on TV, because reporters have no patience to see a three-minute description of it. The problem in Iowa was they had a wrong app. They had a defective app, and they couldn't even count the votes to begin with on the first round. There was no ranked voting there, of course. I'm not a supporter of caucuses. I think caucuses are a form of voter suppression. The only people who can participate are people who can take four hours, or five hours, or more to participate, and if there's going to be a vote of the citizenry to determine who the candidate is going to be, it should be a primary vote. I'm also in favor of open primaries, not closed primaries to only registered voters who are Democrat and Republican. As long as primaries are supported by tax dollars, people should be free to vote in whatever primary line they choose.

**Steve Skrovan:** Alright, very good. This next question comes from Carolyn Kourdache. I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly. "Hello, Mr. Nader. What is the latest news regarding the disgraceful detention of immigrant children held in concentration camps at the U.S. border? Have most been released into more humane care? Why wasn't Trump impeached for crimes against humanity? What is being done to relieve their suffering?"

**Ralph Nader:** There's no way the Republicans are going to impeach Trump for what he's done to these new arrivals. There's a lot of disastrous situations, one by one, on the border. He created this problem. The number of crossovers that were unlawful was at a record low under Obama. And then along came Trump, and he made a big issue out of hordes of immigrants, invasions coming, and that he might close the border; he might block asylum-seekers. So, obviously this really freaked out poor families in Honduras, in El Salvador and Guatemala oppressed by U.S.-supported military and oligarchic powers who treated them miserably and exploited them. And so, they said, "We better head north while we got a chance to get over the border, over the Rio Grande." And so, he created his own crisis. Now, he's bragging that, with Mexico's cooperation, the numbers are going down. But, there's terrifying conditions separating children from their parents. I mean, just imagine how terrifying that is, even if you were in your own community, never mind a foreign country. The language is foreign, and they don't know what their rights are. A lot of religious charities have been trying to help; a lot of non-denominational charities are trying to help. But it's going to continually be slandered by Trump in his speeches. He's already talking about people who are vicious gang members, and contraband, and smuggling, and drugs. And while that happens, there's a huge number of innocent people who are being caught up in this.

**Steve Skrovan:** Thank you for your questions. Keep them coming on the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* website. I want to thank our guest again, Monique El-Faizy. For those of you listening on the radio, that's our show. For you podcast listeners, stay tuned for some bonus material we call the Wrap Up. A transcript of this show will appear on the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* website soon after the episode is posted.

**David Feldman:** Subscribe to us on our *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* YouTube channel, and for Ralph's weekly column - it's free - go to [Nader.org](http://Nader.org). For more from Russell Mohkiber, go to [CorporateCrimeReporter.com](http://CorporateCrimeReporter.com). The producers of the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* are Jimmy Lee Wirt and Matthew Marin. Our executive producer is Alan Minsky.

**Steve Skrovan:** Our theme music "Stand Up, Rise Up" was written and performed by Kemp Harris. Our proofreader is Elisabeth Solomon. Our new intern is Michaela Squier.

**David Feldman:** Join us next week on the *Ralph Nader Radio Hour* when we talk with David Michaels about his new book, *The Triumph of Doubt*, about the manipulation of science. Thank you, Ralph.

**Ralph Nader:** Thank you, everybody. If you liked this program, listeners, try to get your radio station to carry it.