



Episode 1,388: Abolish the CIA

Guest: Jacob Hornberger

WOODS: It's been a long, long time, but I'm really glad we've connected again. And I just love as a book title, *The Evil of the National Security State*, and then the subtitle very good, academic: *The CIA, Terrorism, and the Cold War*. How could you not want to read that, *The Evil of the National Security State*? And I'd love to do a podcast episode on precisely that, so you seem like the person to do it with. I've been reading you for a long time. I've read your columns, and now I've read this book. So I want to start off, because this was one of these kind of topics that I was always afraid somebody would ask me, that I'd be doing an Ask Me Anything, or I'd be on stage in a Q&A, and somebody would say: all right, I can go with you even as far as abolishing the IRS, but for heaven's sake, when you start talking about the CIA, look, the US government, like it or don't, it needs eyes and ears. It needs to know what's going on around the world, and you're throwing out the baby with the bathwater. Now, by the way, I know you can say that, well, initially, the CIA was an intelligence-gathering institution, and then it became an institution that wanted to affect the flow of history. But apparently there's no way to confine it to the initial task, so what would you do with the CIA and why?

HORNBERGER: Well, I'd abolish it. I'd abolish it immediately, along with the NSA, and along with the Pentagon, the military industrial complex, the whole empire of foreign military bases, the empire of domestic military bases. And what we're talking about is two separate governmental structures here: a limited-government republic versus a national security state. Now, we've all been born and raised under a national security state. We've been taught that this is a free society. We were pledging allegiance to a country where there's liberty and justice for all.

But it's all been a lie, and when I discovered that lie, I realized that it's actually a much bigger lie than the welfare state way of life. You know, we're all taught that this system of mandatory charity is freedom and that the drug war is freedom. We learn as libertarians that that's been a lie from the very beginning, and a free society entails keeping everything you earn, deciding what to do with it, ingesting whatever you want. But the conversion of the federal government from the founding principle of a limited-government republic to a national security state after World War II was a much bigger lie and a much bigger destroyer of American freedom and well-being than even the welfare state and the drug war. This is how we have ended up living under really a totalitarian type of governmental system. North Korea is a national security state. The Soviet Union was a national security state. Cuba was a national security state. This is a government that has omnipotent powers: the power to assassinate Americans, to torture Americans, to put Americans into military dungeon, have the military take them into custody. That's the kind of regime we live under now - a lot of Americans don't realize that — all fully confirmed by the federal judiciary.

So what I'm saying is that, in order to have a free society, a genuinely free society, a necessary prerequisite is not just dismantling the mandatory charity, the drug war – that a necessary prerequisite to a free society is dismantling the national security state governmental apparatus and restore a limited-government republic. So notice, I'm not an anarchist, which a lot of libertarians are. I simply want to dismantle the illegitimate functions of government and leave the legitimate functions of government.

WOODS: All right, now I know people are going to be saying, *All right, now Woods, get him.* But that's a separate episode that maybe we could do some day. Because people might say: but the thing is, the illegitimate functions seem to flow from the legitimate functions. How do you keep that thing limited? That's a tricky question. Of course, how do you keep a stateless society stateless, is a tricky question on the other side. But what I guess I want to know is, suppose I were not a Rothbardian libertarian, but I was just a Tea Party Republican, and I love what you're saying, or at least I profess to love what you're saying about the welfare state; not quite sure about your view on the drug war. But when it comes to this, I would just say: but Hornberger, there are all these people out there who wish us ill, and without these tools – and we admit they're crude tools, and they can be misused and abused – we're going to be flying blind fighting against them, and our enemies are going to have a field day.

HORNBERGER: Yeah, well, there's an easy response, that the primary reason there are so many people hating America is precisely because of what the national security state does. Because it's not just a passive national security state or one that limits its role to domestic operations, like say, the North Korean regime does, mostly, in terms of oppressing the North Korean people. This is a national security state that also has combined with it a foreign policy of interventionism. So you've got military bases all around the world. You've got coups, regime change operations, assassinations, torture, invasions, occupations. That's the crux of the anger and the hatred. Now, of course, this flies in the face of the popular mythology after 9/11, that they just hate us for our freedom and values. And it's a myth that Ron Paul pierced in that famous presidential debate, where he said, they came over here to kill us, because we're over there, referring to the federal government, killing them.

So if you dismantle this foreign policy of foreign interventionism, and you dismantle the ability to intervene in foreign countries, and you restore not only the founding governmental structure of a limited-government republic, but the founding foreign policy of not going abroad in search of monsters to destroy, as John Quincy Adams put it, then all the anger and hatred that people have around the world disintegrates, diminishes, at least to a point where you're not worried about it anymore. Now, might there be a murderer in France or in Peru or whatever that goes and kills an American? Of course, but nothing like major that we see today as a result of foreign interventionism. So if you want to get rid of the anger and hatred, that's the way to do it.

I mean, people love Americans. This is the thing that we have to keep in mind. You can travel all around the world as a private citizen, and by and large, foreigners love Americans. They just really hate the US government and what it does to people overseas. So you get rid of the foreign interventionism, then you all of a sudden, you restore a sense of harmony with the people of the world, and you're not living in this paranoia, this world of catastrophic things that, *Oh, my gosh, the communists are coming to get me; oh, the terrorists are coming to get me; the Muslims are coming to get me.*

Here's the irony, Tom: that we live under a government that has the most powerful government in the world, a country where the government's the most powerful in history; we have the most fearful people in the world. I mean, Americans are scared of everything, that, *Oh, who's going to come and get me? The Muslims are coming to get me*, and so forth. That's a direct product of the indoctrination and propaganda of the national security state. In any national security state – North Korea, Cuba, or whatever, Venezuela – they always need a bigger enemy to keep people afraid. And so they want to make people fearful and paranoid, so that they can present themselves as the last bastion. They're the ones keeping us safe from the barbarians. And of course, they're the ones that are destroying freedom and prosperity, especially with the out-of-control spending and debt that they're largely responsible for.

WOODS: So would you say that the national security state apparatus, the people who make it up, the people whose nine-to-five job is in the national security state – are these people, are they all liars? Are some of them dupes? Is it all a big propaganda enterprise? And if so, what function does it serve? I mean, from their point of view, how does it help them to have this apparatus?

HORNBERGER: Well, I give them the benefit of the doubt. I think they're very well intended. But you know, you look throughout history, and the people that have destroyed the freedom and well-being of people the most are the ones with zeal who really have good intentions. I think they really believe that they're protecting America from the terrorists or the Muslims or the communists, and that America needed to be converted to a national security state. I mean, if you look what happened after World War II, here, the Soviet Union is America's partner and ally during the war to defeat the Nazis. As soon as the war is over, Americans are told, *Oh, well, we just beat the Nazis, and we've got bad news for you: we've got now a bigger enemy than even the Nazis. You can't rest. That's the Soviet Union, our former partner and ally. They are hell-bent on coming to get us. There's a worldwide communist conspiracy based in Moscow, and so we have to convert the US to this national security state.*

And in actuality, the CIA, when Congress enacted the law, the National Security Act that brought the CIA into existence, while Truman intended it to be purely an intelligence-gathering vehicle, somebody slipped a nebulous phrase in there that the CIA seized upon to do operational things too, like assassinations and regime change operations. So from the very beginning, they have been an operational vehicle, not just intelligence-gathering. But it was all based on fear that, oh, well, we're the only ones that can protect you, and oh, we have to become like the communists by adopting their methods, that we can't just sit back as a limited-government republic with a free society. If we do that, we're going to fall to the communist threat. And so this is going to be a temporary phenomenon. As soon as the Cold War's over, and maybe some hot wars like Korea, Vietnam, you can have your limited-government republic back.

Well, it was all a lie. But these people, they don't see it as a lie. Now I'm sure there are some people that are in there just for the power and the money, but I think most of the people that are in this apparatus mean well. They convince themselves that they're protecting America. The army of contractors, the military industrial complex that are making a killing off all these wars and all this interventionism and this militarism, I think they have truly convinced themselves that they are serving America, they're protecting America. It's really up to us libertarians to expose the lie for what it is.

We saw the same lie with the welfare state, where we were all brought up thinking, *Hey, this is compassion. This is caring for people with Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. This reflects that we're a good people.* Well, I think most people that are operating within the Social Security Administration and the DEA really think they're doing something good. Well, it's irrelevant. What matters is reality. These welfare-warfare agencies have destroyed our freedom, and they're continuing to destroy our freedom, as well as our well-being.

WOODS: Why don't we look at a couple of specific examples that maybe some people in the libertarian community know about, but the average American might have learned about them in school, but maybe not. And so what I'd like to do is think about, first, what the CIA has done in foreign affairs and take a couple of examples of places where the CIA has intervened and see what the consequences have been what they were up to; but then also, what they've done to our own people, as well, which is, I think, much less known. So which ones – because you in your book, you talk about a number of coups and interventions of various kinds that the CIA has had his hand in? What do you think are the ones that just jump out to you the most, in terms of being, I don't know, either the activities they were involved in were the most objectionable, or the long-term consequences were just grotesque?

HORNBERGER: I think that premier one is the Iran regime change operation, and it really goes back to what you were just saying a few minutes ago about good intentions. This is a classic example of good intentions gone awry within the national security state. In 1953, you have this regime change operation that the CIA institutes in Iran. Now, what had happened was, Iran's legislature had elected a man named Mohammad Mosaddegh to be prime minister, a highly respected man, revered in Iran. He was *Time* magazine's Man of the Year. He was world renowned. But he nationalized the oil industry, which, of course, was mostly British-owned. The British were outraged over this, naturally enough. And so he kicked all the British officials out of the country so they couldn't do anything about it.

So the Brits went to the CIA and said, *Hey, can you help us get our oil back?* The CIA presents it to President Eisenhower, and this is in '52, and Eisenhower says no – no, I'm sorry, Truman. Truman says, no, we're not going down that road. So then Eisenhower comes in, and the CIA presents the plan to him, and he says, yeah, let's do it. And it was sold on the basis that Mosaddegh was leaning toward communism. So here we have this fear of communism now, the worldwide communist conspiracy that was supposedly based in Moscow. So this was the justification. We'll remove Mosaddegh to protect America from the potential communist threat.

So they go in there, and they institute this ingenious scheme, the coup that brings protests in the streets. People are killed; normal, regular people are killed as part of this thing. But they succeed in ousting Mosaddegh from power, and they install the Shah of Iran or reinstall the Shah of Iran, who had actually escaped the country. And they install this guy, and he's a brutal dictator. I mean, unelected. The CIA helps to train and support and structure his secret police force, which is sort of a combination CIA, military, paramilitary, FBI, very oppressive force. The CIA helps train them. They are oppressing the Iranian people. They're torturing, indefinite detention, targeting dissidents. This goes on for 25 years under one of the most brutal tyrannies. But what are Americans told? Oh, that the Shah is our friend, that he's a friend of freedom, that he's a friend of America. Well, meanwhile, the Iranian people are suffering under this brutal, CIA-supported tyranny.

And so finally, in 1979, they revolt, and they're angry. They take American diplomats hostage, because they thought the CIA was going to try to bring the Shah back. He was getting treated for cancer in New York. And so they were using the diplomats as hostages to make sure that the Shah could not come back. Well, the perverse irony of this is that the Iranian people end up with arguably an even worse situation with the ayatollahs and this religious theocracy, which is just as much tyrannical as that of the Shah. They're never able to restore their genuine democratic system or their experiment with democracy with Mosaddegh. And then you have this long history of Iranian-US relations, in which – you can see it today. The US is threatening to war. You've got brutal sanctions that are actually killing Iranian people, and those if they're not killing, they're squeezing the economic lifeblood out of them.

Now, at the time, the CIA, of course, kept this thing secret. They're rolling this thing secret. But internally, they celebrate that this is a great victory. They passed out the medals. I mean, just think: they effected a regime change without invading a country. I mean, Eisenhower thought this was fantastic. Boy, what a great way to go around the world and change the world. Well, look at the long-term consequences. We're still living with these consequences, with the bad relations with Iran, the sanctions, and possibly even war. Classic example of how the US national security state has irreparably harmed not just the Iranian people, but also the American people.

WOODS: You know, I was reading about the Church Committee not too long ago. This is the mid 1970s, and the Church Committee investigated a number of claims, and what it ended up finding was intelligence agencies had been trying to collect information on US citizens' political activities, or they found out about the US Army spying on the population, or they found out for the first time about some of the operations the CIA had been involved in, whether involving assassination attempts or other types of activities. And although today, it's true we did find out about the dragnet NSA data collection and surveillance activities, I still wonder if there would be a Church Committee today, because it seems that the two parties have both gotten themselves so invested in and devoted to the agencies that would be investigated that it just wouldn't happen. Do you think I'm being too cynical?

HORNBERGER: I think you're absolutely right on. I think back then, there was still some principal people in Congress who were terribly concerned about the power of the CIA and how it was destroying freedom, and that as powerful as the CIA was, it still wasn't all-powerful like it is today. I mean, no member of Congress dares touch these people. I mean, you can see what Schumer said, what Congressman Schumer said –

WOODS: I know.

HORNBERGER: I mean, that said it all. When Trump was at least presenting the appearance that he was taking on the CIA and the military at the beginning of his regime., Schumer says: *This is really stupid. These people have ways of retaliating against you from here till Sunday,* or something like that. I mean, he was saying that. That expresses the concerns, I think, of every member of Congress, that you don't tangle with these people. They are too powerful. And that's one of the biggest disadvantages of having converted the US to a national security state that there could possibly be. This is where the real power of the federal government lies.

There's a great book on this by a guy named Glennon, Michael Glennon, who's professor of law at Tufts University, and it's called *Double Government*. And he makes the case that the real

power of the federal government lies with the national security branch of the government. And it really is a fourth branch consisting of the Pentagon, the CIA and the NSA. And that it permits the other three branches to have the veneer of power, the appearance of power, but they don't care about appearance, as long as they've got the real power. And as we all know, government is force, and this is where the real force of government is, together with omnipotent powers. I mean, these are the powers to assassinate, powers to put people into dungeons, to torture them. It's difficult to find more power than that or more omnipotent power than that.

And your point about the Church Committee is very good too. I mean, there was also MKUltra, where the CIA got caught doing secret drug experiments on Americans and then destroyed all the records when it came to light so that we could never really see the full extent of what they were doing. In 1953, they already had an assassination manual. You can read that manual online. It wasn't discovered until the '90s, but you can see in this manual that not only are they specializing in the art of assassination, but also in the art of covering up their role in state-sponsored assassinations.

And that's very ominous, because in '54, the manual was actually being prepared for a regime change operation following the big success they had in Iran in '54, where they target the democratically elected president of the country, Jacobo Árbenz, with a regime change operation. And they had an assassination list, and they've never let us see who was on that list, but clearly, Árbenz had to be at the top. Now, here's a guy that has never done anything to the United States, and they're going to kill him. I mean, that just boggles the mind. And fortunately for Árbenz, he was able to escape the country before they got to him, but their regime change operation there was another brilliant, ingenious CIA operation, and it was successful. They put in a harsh military general and a succession of generals that precipitated a three-decade-long civil war in Guatemala that killed some hundreds of thousands of people, some estimate even a million people, all stemming from that regime change operation. Another example of what this national security state has done.

WOODS: First of all, I did not know that thing about the assassination manual, but I'm going to link to that, because I realize people listening, there have to be a few who say, "I'd like to flip through that. I just can't help looking." So if you can't help looking, I'll link to it at TomWoods.com/1388 for today's episode. I was going to mention MKUltra, so I'm glad you brought that up. And MKUltra is one of these things that when you find out about it, it makes you wonder: if this is one of the things we know about, you know, heaven help us, what are the things we don't know about? And then likewise, how about Operation Mockingbird? That's pretty shocking as well.

HORNBERGER: Oh, it's tremendously shocking. This was a program where they were courting mainstream journalists to be assets of the CIA, so that they –

WOODS: See, it was hard – in these days, you don't have to court them at all. They're gladly lackeys of the CIA. They had a little integrity in those days. You had to seduce them. If only they had *Washington Post* reporters in the old days [laughing].

HORNBERGER: Yeah, no, that's a fascinating question is, yeah, they're kind of like assets de facto, because they believe in all this junk.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORNBERGER: But yeah, here was a formalized program to get assets to get their positions out, so that whenever they needed a perspective done, they'd just contact their assets and say, hey – in fact, the term conspiracy theory, they came up with that as a strategy in the context of the JFK assassination, that anybody who's questioning the JFK assassination, let's call him a conspiracy theorist. That's how that term became used. It was a strategical device. And so they put word out to their assets: use this to describe people that are questioning that assassination.

But your other question about Congress is very interesting too in the context of Operation Mockingbird, because, look, the reason they want Operation Mockingbird is to expand their control over the nation. I mean, if you're controlling assets in the press, you're controlling the forms of communication, what the message is, the propaganda, and you're obviously trying to control events in the United States, namely events that you want America to move toward. So if you want to move into Vietnam, you've got assets that can support you there. Well, to me, it stands to reason that if that's your quest, to maintain control where nobody ever questions your existence, why would you stop with trying to get people in the mainstream press? Why not try get to get assets in Congress? Why not try to get assets in the bureaucracies? So to me, it's not surprising at all that today, you've got a compliant Congress or a compliant judiciary. I have no doubt that you've got people there, either that have been recruited as assets, or as you put it, just simply make themselves assets, de facto assets because of their false sense of patriotism and loyalty to the national security state.

WOODS: Or they just want to be part of it. I mean, regardless of the ins and outs of the rights and wrongs, if you're not on the team, then you're by definition some kind of crazy person. Like, for instance, when we would hear all these complaints that Trump's problem is – and there's so many ways to finish that sentence, "Trump's problem is," and they never finish that sentence correctly. It's things like, "Trump's problem is he doesn't trust the intelligence agencies." Well, I mean, of all the problems he has, I'm not even putting that in the top 500, especially given – not to say that everybody in the intelligence agencies are liars. I think there were some people who were trying to get the truth out about what was going on in Iraq, for example. But I think we should take with a grain of salt what the – and yet, the universal consensus among the media is that the intelligence agencies all say X, and you're crazy to have a different view from that. So they all act as if they're in the back pocket of these agencies. I don't know that they are, and I'm not suggesting they are. But it's one of those things of, why buy the cow when you can get the milk for free? If the journalists are going to act like this, you don't even need Operation Mockingbird.

HORNBERGER: No, you really don't, because as you say, they make themselves assets simply out of this perverted sense of patriotism, and they end up supporting things and believing things that really are unbelievable. Because the CIA is an organization that's built on lies. They have to be built on lies. Their whole operation is secrecy. They've got to keep things secret. Well, if you're going to keep things secret, you've got to lie about them, especially if you're confronted, if you're asked, "Well, are you involved in this?" and, "Well, no."

I mean, the classic example of this was the regime change operation in 1973 with respect to Chile. Again, they go in there, and they present this communist threat from a democratically elected president, Salvador Allende, and they say that he presents a threat to national security so that they effect a regime change operation. But when the CIA director, Richard Helms, he's called before Congress, and he's asked, did the CIA have anything to do with this coup and the build-up to the coup, and he said, oh, no, no, not at all, he just committed

perjury. I mean, he just lied about it. And he later got caught, and so they summon him back and they indict him for perjury. They gave him a slap on the wrist. I think he pled to a misdemeanor. But when he returned to CIA headquarters after they gave him some token fine, all his fellow officials there at the CIA clapped for him. They applauded him. They praised him, they glorified him, because in their minds, he had done the right thing. He had lied to protect national security.

So this is their mindset, that there's nothing wrong with lying, as long as it's protecting national security. The bad guys are the Congress who are trying to get the truth. We see this with Clapper. Clapper goes in there and says, oh, no, we don't have a surveillance scheme in the United States, and then Edward Snowden comes out soon after that and discloses that that was a lie. Well, they don't go after Clapper. But everybody knows that they're built on lies, and yet they continue believing them. That's what's really fascinating about this whole thing.

WOODS: Yeah, no kidding. Now, as I wrap up with you, let me ask you a completely different question. And now you already know what the question is, but there's been some talk that you have been contemplating the possibility of seeking the Libertarian Party nomination for president in 2020. Do you care to comment on that?

HORNBERGER: No, that's really the extent of it. I'm contemplating the possibility, and I really have nothing more to say than that.

WOODS: That sounded like a slamming door. Let me see if I can stick my foot in there before it clicks. Well, for example, let me just ask you this: why this year as opposed to '16 or '12 or '08?

HORNBERGER: Well, I used to be actively involved in the LP, some 20 years ago. And I walked away from politics. I found politics to be a rather negative process, a lot of negative vibes and negative feelings and a lot of extraneous stuff to the advancement of liberty. And I really love the educational foundation world. I mean, as you know, there's disputes here, but most of them don't turn personal. Some of them do turn personal, but it's mostly just hard-hitting debates, arguments, and so forth. In the political arena – and that's not just the Libertarian Party, but just politics in general – there's a lot of maneuvering and posturing and all this stuff, which I really hate.

But I've thrown my life into this battle. I love libertarianism, Tom, just as you do, and I've gotten to a point in my life where I said, you know, this work is very satisfying and very rewarding at the Future of Freedom Foundation. I absolutely love what I do in my life. I love coming to work. I love battling these people in the federal government to restore our liberties. I believe that it is possible to restore our liberty. But I am at a point in my life where I said, you know, I'm thinking about throwing myself totally into this fight, and that means possibly returning to the political arena.

So a year or so ago, I rejoined the Libertarian Party. Right now, I'm giving lectures at different LP conventions on – the title of my talk is "Adhering to Principle is Everything," and I really believe that. I think, you know, this is the party of principles. The Libertarian Party, that's the label it prides itself on. It's a great label. It's a great position to be in in the political arena. But there's also a tendency to abandon principles, and if you're going to abandon principle, then I don't see how you could call yourself the party of principle. It's got

to be one or the other. If you're going to be the party of principle, then you've got to adhere to principle. If you're not going to adhere to principle, then you've got to drop the label. Well, I believe the label is invaluable, and I believe adherence to principle is invaluable.

And so I'm coming back into the party, and that is my message, that what we need in this party is candidates at all levels that are presenting the principled case for liberty, not the Republican-light position, not the Republicanesque position. None of this reform type of claptrap. That we are libertarians, and we've got to fight as libertarians. And there's nothing to apologize for. The people that need to be doing the apologizing are Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals. And I put the Republicans right in the same category as the Democrats. They are just as responsible for the destruction of our freedom and well-being as Democrats are. So I reject all this Republican-light and Republicanesque claptrap, and I think what we need to do as libertarians at all levels in the Libertarian Party and in the libertarian movement, is we need to be fighting as libertarians, not as quarter-libertarians, half-libertarians; 100% percent as libertarians. I think that's the way we're going to restore freedom to our country.

WOODS: Well, I'll say this, and maybe this will help; maybe it'll doom you [laughing]. I have no idea. But if you were to throw your hat into the ring, you would have the 100% Tom Woods seal of approval, for what that's worth. I would 100% be behind you, as would our mutual friend Scott Horton, whom you know is very enthusiastic at this particular prospect. And in fact, he came on here proselytizing for you a couple of weeks ago, so we're on Team Hornberger, for sure.

The book we've been talking about, which you folks should definitely read – it's not very long, but boy, does it pack a punch, just like this episode – is *The Evil the National Security State: The CIA, Terrorism, and the Cold War*. We're going to link to that at TomWoods.com/1387. And if you need more Hornberger, then the Future of Freedom Foundation is what you need to check out, and it's got the privilege of having one of the easiest to remember URLs in the universe: it's FFF.org. What more could you ask for, right? That's beautiful. It's great that you guys – you must have been on board the internet very early to grab that.

HORNBERGER: We were. We had a guy that loved our work right when the internet was starting, and he started telling me about .com stuff, and he says, "Do you mind if I go out and buy FFF.com?" And I said, "I don't understand it, but go ahead and do whatever you think's necessary." So we were really lucky to have that guy.

WOODS: That is great.

HORNBERGER: And Tom, let me say in response to what you said, thank you. Your kind words mean a whole lot. I hold you in the highest esteem, as I'm sure you know, and so it's an honor to receive that vote of confidence from you, and thank you very much.

WOODS: Well, my pleasure, my pleasure. I think it's fff.org, isn't that your – I just want to make sure –

HORNBERGER: Oh, yeah, I'm sorry. Yes, yes, yes.

WOODS: Okay, I just want to make sure people go to the right place. And by the way, I think that's how Antiwar.com got started too. I mean, that's a great name to have for a website. Somebody who just knew the internet said, "Hey, you want me to grab this?" And they said, "Yeah, we don't even know what you're talking about, but okay." You know, and then they're really glad that they did do that.

HORNBERGER: Yeah, no, as a matter of fact, when you said that it reminded me that he said, "Should we get fff.com, or should we get fff.org?" And I said, "Well, we're an organization, so I guess you should get the .org." I didn't know what I was doing.

WOODS: Yeah, right, who would know? It's great either way. All right, I'll link to that also on our show notes page, and whatever you decide to do, best of luck, because everything you do is fantastic, and I'm a huge fan.

HORNBERGER: Thank you, and I might see you at the Florida LP convention. I see you're speaking down there. I'm tentatively planning to go down there for that.

WOODS: I didn't know that. I would absolutely love to catch up with you there. Yes, we'll see you then. For anybody listening – I believe there are a few – that's in Tampa, May 3rd through the 5th. I've got the details at TomWoods.com/events. You don't have to be a member of the LP to attend. You can't vote on personnel and stuff like that, but you can attend the talks, and there'll be a lot of wonderful people there., so that'll be a lot of fun. Okay, thanks so much again, Jacob. Best of luck.

HORNBERGER: You're welcome. Thank you, Tom.