



Episode 1,510: Syria, Trump, and the Kurds: Scott Horton Tells the Story

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: All right, obviously, we've got to talk about the Kurds and Syria and Trump and the neocons, and not just the neocons, but like all respectable people. We've got to talk about that, because I've seen a variety of opinions here, even from people who have by and large supported Trump because they thought he might be a noninterventionist. I've even seen like John Zmirak having some difficulty with this decision. So I want to get to the heart of it. As far as I can see, the only at least outspoken senator supporting Trump here is Rand Paul, and otherwise it's crickets. So what I want to know is, we've heard about Trump is – well, the way it sounded at the beginning, was Trump is moving troops out of Syria in such a way that he's going to endanger the Kurds at the hands of the Turks. But then it turned out people were saying he's not really taking them out of Syria, he's just shifting them around, such that instead of being helpful, they're going to be useless. Can you just tell me what the hell is going on?

HORTON: I think that's mostly right. I bet if you go back to last December and January when we talked about this, it's pretty much the same thing. Trump says, look, we're done defeating ISIS. Now I want out of there. But the neocons say, no, we want to stay to mess with Iran, and staying to protect the Kurds from our allies the Turks is the best excuse, essentially, to stay there. But it's true that he didn't pull them out of Syria. He pulled them out of northeast Syria, but they still have a base down in southeast Syria at Al-Tanf. And I'm not certain whatever other small basis they may have in eastern Syria at this point, but the reason they have that Al-Tanf base down at the border of Jordan and Iraq is because there's a highway that runs through there, the infamous "land bridge" from Iran through, ahem, Baghdad, and then on through Syria, through Damascus, and to southern Lebanon. The idea is that Iran has gained because America helped the Kurds defeat the Islamic State. And so now who's going to keep Iran out? So that's basically the deal.

Now, a year ago, Trump said, I'm getting out of Syria and out of Afghanistan. We're going to pull everybody out of Syria, and we're going to pull 1,000 troops – or was it 5,000 troops – out of Afghanistan or something. And it was funny, Bob Murphy interviewed me just a few months ago, and I had already completely forgotten that Afghanistan was even part of that promise, because he had dropped that part of it so quickly. And I had forgotten that that was part of it, but he backed down on Syria too, and the generals essentially just said no way.

And see, here's the thing of it. He is leaving the Kurds high and dry. And we can go back to – let me say real quick, Obama, essentially, to boil it down, created the Islamic State.

America's policy and our allies' policy was to back the jihadists in Syria to weaken Assad. But they didn't all just focus on Assad. The ISIS guys, the al-Qaeda-in-Iraq-dominant guys, they

were more focused on carving out a giant piece of eastern Syria and declaring it the Islamic State. And of course, in 2014, they invaded and conquered all of western Iraq in about a week, just rolled right in there. And that was then the real Islamic State caliphate and the Caliph Ibrahim and all this that led to Iraq War III, the war again for the Shia against the bin Ladenite Sunni jihadists who had taken over. And that also included in Syria allying with these Kurds against ISIS.

So we had created – "we" – the Obama government had created the ISIS problem for the Kurds and the Iraqis, the same ones that then he turned around and allied with to help fight against them. But then when Trump wanted out a year ago – it's the same thing now – the policy could have, should have been, *Okay, Kurds, we're leaving. Thanks for helping us fight ISIS, but what you should do if you want to live is you should make a deal with Assad.* Because in that whole so-called civil war, which is really a foreign invasion more than anything, but during that whole conflict, the Syrian Kurds, they essentially had autonomy up there in the northeast of the country. But they never went to war against Damascus. They never fought against the Syrian Arab Army. And at times, the DOD-backed Kurds and the Syrian Arab Army were fighting against the CIA-backed jihadist terrorists. You can read all about it in *The LA Times*.

So there's no reason why the Kurds shouldn't be able to go ahead and make a deal with Assad that allows the Syrian army to come in, occupy that border territory, and then be able to tell Erdogan, the leader of Turkey: See? You don't have to invade and attack these Kurds, because the Syrian Arab Army is on this border, and we are the safe zone, and so the state monopoly has been recreated here, and so you guys don't have anything to worry about. And deprive turkey have a reason to even want to invade in the first place.

But the Americans won't do that. Of course, for Trump to say to the Kurds that they ought to make a deal with Assad, well, that's high treason. That's Vladimir Putin talking. Blah, blah, blah. All the kind of accusations. And his own government would never do that. And in fact, they spent the last year telling them: don't worry, we're here, and as long as we're here, the Turks won't invade. But then that promise can't last.

And the Syrian Kurds are crazy to have made this deal with the Americans and believe that the Americans were going to stay and protect them forever. Turkey's been our NATO ally for 70 years. They haven't. And at the end of the day, the Turks don't want an autonomous Syrian Kurdistan. So for the Americans to promise them, *Yeah, you can have one as long as you let us stay*, is them making a foolish choice, essentially, because now that America is leaving them high and dry, here come the Turks, pounding the hell out of them. And so they should have told the Americans, *You know what? You guys are going to have to go sooner or later. We're going to go ahead and take our lumps and sit down with Assad* – which is, in fact, what they tried to do a year ago, or almost a year ago when Trump first announced this. The Kurds went straight to Damascus, and said, *Are we going to be able to work this out, or what?* Obviously, that would be in Assad's interest as well, but the Americans half prevented it.

So yes, we should leave, and it wouldn't require staying in force one moment longer. It would just require a change of State Department policy, diplomatically, to switch to saying:

Whoa, whoa, whoa, Turkey, tell you what: you guys don't attack, give us a few weeks, and we're going to work out a deal to get the Syrian Arab Army back in here. And then we can go,

and you can stay out, and everything will be fine. And Kurds, you're going to have to settle for autonomy, just like you always had anyway.

And they'd probably have better autonomy than they had before, but they could still be part of the Syrian state. And that would be the most peaceful solution. But instead, Erdogan wants to take all the Syrian refugees who are not from Syrian Kurdistan and dump them in Syrian Kurdistan, and try to create a so-called buffer zone of a new population of Arabs on Kurdish land there, which is only going to be a complete quagmire. And I don't even know if they're really going to try to implement that, but that's what they say they're going to do. And so it's going to continue to be a crisis.

But if you listen to these hawks, Tom, you'll notice that they don't really care about the Kurds. What they're worried about is America staying in Syria to check Iran. Iran, which is again only there in force in reaction to Obama's effort to back al-Qaeda there in order to check Iran.

WOODS: Let me read you a passage from fellow named John Zmirak, and you tell me what's right and what's wrong about it. And this is a guy who has been more or less sympathetic to the good things Trump has at least spoken about doing.

HORTON: Okay, I'm not familiar with who this guy is. Who does he write for?

WOODS: That's okay. I just know him, and he's got he's got an audience. So he says this: "If Trump let's Turkey and its al-Qaeda jihadist allies invade the Kurdish heartland, the SDF [the Syrian Democratic Forces] won't waste its soldiers on guard duty. It has announced it will release the ISIS fighters." That is, the captured fighters. "Overnight, ISIS is back. It will likely stream into nearby Iraq and prove the last straw in collapsing that country's already fragile government." What do you think about that?

HORTON: Well, I mean, if the Kurds are doing that, some allies. That's their attempt to blackmail us? That if you leave, then we're going to let all the ISIS captives out of prison? And America has no influence with them to say, *Well, you better not. You think losing us as a friend is bad?* No? I mean, this is part of what Trump has been saying is that, hey, the Turks are going to move in there, and then these ISIS fighters are going to be their responsibility. And he says, the Europeans, I've been asking them all year, you need to take your guys back. Prosecute them, and put them in prison if you have to, but you need to repatriate your jihadis that America and its NATO partners sent off there to fight the holy war – as though 9/11 it never happened and as though Iraq War II had never happened – that you guys are going to have to deal with this yourselves.

And so then, what, this is the Kurds' blackmail, that we can never leave them or else they're going to release these guys? You know what? That's America's fault for voting Democrat in the first place. Barack Obama took al-Qaeda in Iraq, which was virtually dead, and he resuscitated them, brought them back to life and increased their power by 10 thousand. And so yeah, there's a problem there, but that necessitates us staying forever? Let me tell you something. The Middle East, especially now, after 20 years of Bush and Obama and Trump too, is lousy with angry armed Sunnis. And as long as there are some, people are going to say, *Well, geez, we can't cut and run now.* But I'm about tired of hearing that after 20 years. They're the ones who have created this crisis.

WOODS: Right. That to me is the point that sticks with me, is that there'll always be some reason that now's not a good time. It's just like, every four years, it's always *the* most important election of our lifetime. It's every single time.

HORTON: It's not like, *Hey, if you isolationists would give us a minute to tie up some loose ends, we're almost done fixing what we* –

WOODS: Yeah, yeah.

HORTON: No, that's not true. We give them the write to track down al-Qaeda, Osama and his 400 friends in Afghanistan, and what do they do? They knock off Saddam Hussein and kill a million people, and then go on to Libya and Syria and Yemen with regime changes and attempted regime changes against secular dictators in favor of jihadists, just because those jihadists are anti-Shiite, anti-Iran, which has nothing to do with protecting the American people from bin Ladenites at all, and in fact, is the exact treasonous opposite of that. So when we give them a writ to protect us in the war on terrorism, they end up fighting a war directly for terrorism. It's as simple as that. They've done it over and over again.

WOODS: Let me read you a passage you're likely to agree with and maybe see if you want to elaborate on. This is from a very recent – like maybe today – Pat Buchanan column. He quotes Lindsey Graham as saying, "This will throw the region into further chaos." And Pat says, "But if Trump's decision risks throwing the region into 'further chaos,' what if not wholesale US intervention created the president chaos?" And he says, "Consider. Today, the Taliban conduct more attacks and control much more territory than they did in all the years since we first intervened in 2001. 16 years after we marched to Baghdad, protests against the Iraqi regime took hundreds of lives last week, and a spreading revolt threatens the regime. Saudi Arabia is tied down and arguably losing the war it launched against the Houthi rebels in 2015. Iran or its surrogates with a handful of cruise missiles and drones just shut down half of the Saudi oil production."

And then he goes on talking about maybe Saudi Arabia wants to negotiate with Iran. He says, "Among those objecting most loudly to an American withdrawal from the forever wars of the Middle East are those who are the most enthusiastic about plunging us in. And yes, there is a price to be paid for letting go of an empire, but it is almost always less than the price of holding on."

HORTON: Absolutely. I mean, he's as good as any antiwar voice on the right, and he's a better writer than most of us. I mean, it's just about as simple as that. And then look at what's the opposite argument from that, is just a bunch of hogwash, or it's just a bunch of sloganeering. Lindsey Graham said this is all a failure of Barack Obama's libertarian foreign policy.

And Bill Weld has a new one in *Foreign Affairs*, saying this is all because of – he says Donald Trump hates and rejects everything about Barack Obama, except his isolationism. That's Bill Weld writing in *Foreign Affairs* this week. And so that's all they've got, essentially, is just an appeal to some slogan, some idea you're supposed to fill in the blank. Which isolationism of Obama's are they referring to? That he didn't go ahead and completely carpet bomb Damascus and put Ayman al-Zawahiri on the throne in Syria? Is that what makes it isolationism, is that he only adopted the Israeli strategy of letting both sides continue to hemorrhage to death, rather than help al-Qaeda win an outright victory against their Baathist enemies there? What example do they have of Barack Obama's isolationism, of all things?

And then this is what's wrong with Trump? Isolation? Ask the people of Afghanistan about how isolated from America they feel right now. He's escalated that war. He's escalated in Yemen, escalated in Somalia, escalated in Libya. We don't hear much about that, but we've got drone wars and Special Operations wars going on in Libya to this day.

And you could say that violence has come down from the peak in western Iraq and Syria from Iraq War III, but that's just because the Islamic State was defeated. I mean, when he came into power, they were on the ropes. Obama had helped to create their caliphate and then had down about half the job of destroying it by the time Trump was sworn in. But we're still fighting the Sunni based insurgency, Iraq War Three and a Half in western Syria against what's left of ISIS. And again, as you put it at the beginning in the introduction here, he's pulled some troops out of northern Syria, but only down to southern Syria. They're no longer human shields for the Kurds, but they haven't left the country yet.

And so, where's the isolationism? Sending arms to Ukraine? Which, Barack Obama, he did the coup there in 2014, but he was afraid to arm them. He sent trainers but no weapons. But Donald Trump has armed them. Donald Trump has increased troops to Poland, increased troops to the Baltic states. Are we going to go to nuclear war for Latvia, if it comes down to it? He's escalated. So sometimes he goes, *Well, geez, I don't know, I think the Germans should pull their weight more.* Yeah, their weight in what? Expanding America's Empire throughout all of Europe. Oh, okay. Bill Clinton, George Bush and Barack Obama's policy, that same one?

He's continued with all the naval build up in Asia, Barack Obama's pivot to Asia. Very isolationist, trying to escalate dominance and alliance building against China in the Far East there. I know. He met with Kim. He's failed to make a deal to bring North Korea out of its isolation, but that would lead to a reduction in brinkmanship on our side, so that counts as isolationism, I guess. He started a stupid coup for some corrupt crooked loser, Guaidó, if anybody even remembers his name anymore, down there in Venezuela. And then when it didn't work, he quit instead of starting a war to finish the job. Yeah, pretty isolationist, that Donald Trump. No wonder everything's going to hell.

WOODS: All right, I know I shouldn't be trying to summarize people's views by reading their tweets, but somehow I spend more time on Twitter than I ought to. I think you had the right idea over there. But anyway, Justin Amash is saying: look, everybody stopped falling for it. He's not withdrawing troops from the country – we said this at the beginning of our conversation – he's just shifting them around. There are no wars being ended or anything like that, or interventions being ended. And then, on the other hand, you have Rand Paul saying, "I support the President in his attempt to implement an America-first foreign policy." How are the two of them looking at the same thing?

HORTON: Well, you know, Rand is doing here what Justin Raimondo used to do, which was to try to be very encouraging.

WOODS: Okay, that's what I thought. Yeah, elaborate on that.

HORTON: Yeah, I mean, look, Justin, he may have fallen too in love with Trump, but he always would say about any right-winger in power who would get anything right about foreign policy that, you know, good for you. You're *so* right. Even if it was Chuck Hagel saying, *Well, I think we could be a little a bit less warmongery,* Justin's like, *It's the revival of the Old Right!*

WOODS: [laughing] I remember that.

HORTON: But the point being, though, that from Rand's point of view, Trump is essentially ending one of our engagements in Syria. It's a pretty small country, but we have a few different wars and conflicts and alliances going on there. And it's true, the Islamic State is dead, and so our temporary alliance with the Kurds has now come to an end, as it was bound to one way or the other. And so it's true for Amash to say, *Look, he's only moving down to the south*, he's ignoring the fact that he really is disengaging from the temporary alliance with the Kurds, which is something, for what it's worth.

And then Rand is saying, *All right, now that's something. Let's see more of that. Let's get out of that place, and also other places. America first, ain't that right?* And I think Trump, I don't know – I make fun of him for not being able to read an even one-page article or understand anything beyond what he sees on TV, but it seems like he does have a certain craftiness and cleverness when it comes to politics, where he's got to see, as he said the other day: *Look, I was elected on ending these wars*. Yeah, he was. That was a huge part of his mandate. And it's true that he said hawkish stuff, too, but it wasn't the hawkish stuff people were voting for. Hillary was like, *We need a no-fly zone in Syria*, and Trump goes, *Yeah, did you hear that? She wants a no-fly zone in Syria. Take on the Russians, who are bombing a bunch of terrorists on the ground? Why would we do that?* And then he won and she lost.

And so the fact is, America has so many wars going on right now, if he was really serious – and especially, they're coming after him with all this impeachment stuff and the pressure is on – he ought to do the biggest, tallest, wealthiest, most successful, toughest macho Republican thing in the world to do, and that is end a bunch of wars and cram that down the Democrats' throats and see how they like it. And he could do it. He is the boss, period, when it comes to military forces. *I said pack your stuff, get on your planes, and fly home right now*. He can do that, and it'd be final. And he would have to be man enough to do it that way, to say, *Nope, that's it. I don't want to deal with the Taliban. Take all your Marines, all your Army, Special Operations, CIA, and all your money bags, guys. Get on the planes and come home. You have seven days or you don't get a ride. You're going to have to hitchhike home*.

And he could do the same thing with the troops deployed in Iraq, in Syria. That's it. *Admiral, I said these Marines need a ride home, and you're going to give it to them*. And if he did, that, he'd be Trump the Great. If he did that, the CIA and the Democrats and the media would go absolutely nuts and call it treason, and the American people would love it, and he would win. 20 years is enough of this. And everybody knows that by now. You don't have to have ever heard Scott Horton on *The Tom Woods Show* one time to look at the calendar and say this is crazy. How can it take 20 years to kill 400 guys? And then all we've done is make 40,000 of them?

WOODS: All right, hold on a minute. This is why it really frustrates me that he won't do the obvious thing that I would do in his shoes. And maybe I'm just naive or stupid or missing something, but I would sit down with the American people, and I would give a speech nobody would ever forget. And I would give a speech where I lay out exactly how the war party functions, who's in it, it's bipartisan, and the way you can know I'm telling you the truth is: look at how hysterical they get about this thing, more than anything else. No matter what else I do, yeah, they get a little bit upset –

HORTON: Did I ever tell you I want you to run for president, Tom?

WOODS: [laughing] Ah, yes, I already told —

HORTON: Sorry. You brought it up. I've just got to say I —

WOODS: [laughing] Oh, you heard that? On Dave Smith Week, I did bring that up. But I mean, seriously, I would give that speech. And I would say: something is creepy about this, folks. I mean, remember, you don't have to trust me. Trust Dwight Eisenhower, who said at the end of his presidency, you better beware the military industrial complex. Well, look at this. You go near them, you breathe the wrong way, and they rain hellfire on you. There's something screwy about this. And look, I know there are a lot of people — you don't like me about this or that or the other thing, or I speak the wrong way, or I'm not your sort of person. But I know there are people out there, who in your heart of hearts, you're antiwar. I know there are still antiwar people out there, whose hearts are in the '60s. I know you're out there. And I know in your heart of hearts, you know what I'm saying about this thing is true. And I know you don't like me, but I'm right about this one thing.

I mean, you give that speech, why won't he do it? All he has to do — Buchanan will write that speech form for free there. There doesn't even have to be a paper trail. Nobody even has to know Buchanan wrote it. But it'll be a speech for the ages. It'll be one they can't suppress. And it would rally at least some people to him, and at the very least, it would expose these people. It would educate the public. Now, why won't the SOB do it?

HORTON: I don't know, man. I mean, honestly, it's because he's a bad person. If he really cared, Tom, then he would read things. He would pursue these angles. He would try to find out.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: Get me a list of guys with credentials who more or less agree with me about these wars and who are Republicans.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: We talked about this before. You've got one good bench worth of guys. Rand Paul could be the Secretary of State.

WOODS: Yeah, all he has to do is ask Rand, because Rand has to know who those people are.

HORTON: Sure.

WOODS: All he has to do is ask Rand.

HORTON: And there are plenty of them. And again, he is the president. He can have whatever cabinet he wants. That's the story of impeachment of Andrew Johnson. That's what they tried to impeach him for, was choosing his own cabinet, and they were unable to convict on that charge.

WOODS: Right, there's no rule that says you have to have a Pompeo and a Bolton. There's no rule. You can appoint anybody.

HORTON: And look, there are a good, solid dozen guys that could fit the position of National Security Advisor, Deputy National Security Advisor.

WOODS: Plausibly, right? With credentials, yeah. Plausible.

HORTON: Sure, no question about it. And the thing, too, is he's great, because he's so shameless. He just doesn't care, right? He will literally wrap himself around the flag rather than the flag around him. And he will go on and on in the most over-the-top kind of way about how the American fighting enlisted man is the greatest species of human who ever existed, and their bravery is greater than all of the bravery of humanity combined before them, and we honor them and we hold them on such a high pedestal, and that's why we want to end all that wars, so that none of them have to die in stupid wars anymore. He could phrase it that way. I mean, he does the first half of that, constantly, right? Or he just praises soldiers as soldiers in the most absolutely over-the-top terms, which is perfect for a Republican president to end the wars and claim that that's why he's doing it. And the thing is, if he really felt that way, that, *Man, I can't stand it that some dad is going to lose his 19-year-old boy fighting in the Nangarhar Province for nothing next week, and I'm just not going to have this anymore* – if that's how he really felt about it, then he would do it.

WOODS: Yeah. He would do it.

HORTON: And he'd be able to phrase it that way. He would say, "No way, man. I'm sorry. The life of one Green Beret is worth the life of over Afghan," or whatever, and right-wingers love that kind of stuff.

WOODS: And I mean, I would even forgive him the stupid B.S. language like that if it got us good results.

HORTON: Yeah, of course. Of course. Call it victory. Call it the sacrifice of anyone else's wants to the needs of our young, golden idol soldiers, who must be protected from irresponsible decisions made by Democrats and Republicans, that kind of deal. It's so easy. Again, you could give this speech in your sleep. There's nothing to it at all. You kill them with patriotism as you end the wars.

WOODS: Scott, before we wrap up, I want to ask, I haven't heard anything from Gene Epstein, but for anybody who somehow has managed not to find out about your debate with, amazingly, Bill Kristol coming up in May of 2020, they had to move the event to a different venue because it sold out immediately, faster than any Soho Forum debate, New York City debating society, has ever sold out.

HORTON: No pressure.

WOODS: Do you know if they've actually settled on a venue now?

HORTON: No, I haven't talked with Gene. I mean, I'm sure he's taken care of that stuff.

WOODS: All right, all right. So folks, look, I want you to – this is an amazing thing. Scott, the guy you just heard in this episode and you hear regularly on this program and, of course, on *The Scott Horton Show*, Scott is going to be debating like the king of the neocons, Bill Kristol, in 2020. And you can see that in person at a venue I guess yet to be decided on, but in New York City. So if that appeals to you, and I can't imagine why it wouldn't, TheSohoForum.org is where to go to find out about that event.

And then, of course, ScottHorton.org is your go-to place for Scott. And remember, I donate to Scott Horton every month. And look, I've told people about this before. I mean, yeah, I want you to support *The Tom Woods Show*. That'd be nice. But really, I can't support *The Tom Woods Show*. I do the episodes. That's my way of supporting *The Tom Woods Show*. So what I do for Scott Horton is I send him money, because that's what he needs, right, to keep Scott going. So ScottHorton.org, you'll find a way to contribute to what he does. Is it better for people to go to the Libertarian Institute to donate to? What's the best way? I want them to do the best thing for themselves and for you.

HORTON: Either way is fine. If they donate at LibertarianInstitute.org, that's a 501(c)(3), tax-write-off of an organization there. If people prefer to do it that way, no problem.

WOODS: Yeah, so that's another option. But I realize this is a little awkward and weird, but I'm just going to tell people. I contribute 100 smackers a month to *The Scott Horton Show*, and I am glad about every penny of that. So if you want to imitate me in that, I'm sure Scott would not be unhappy if you decide to do that. But it doesn't have to be that much. Whatever you can spare. Obviously, Scott is doing important work. He stays informed for us. He knows what's going on. He fights the bad guys. I don't know how much more you can ask for from one guy. So I do hope you'll check out ScottHorton.org and help Scott out. And of course, read his book *Fool's Errand* on the war in Afghanistan. All right, as always –

HORTON: Listen, let me say real quick, I really appreciate your generosity there, and especially you're saying so like that and all that. You've recruited quite a few regular donors for me. But let me mention, too, that the Libertarian Institute has just put out two new books.

WOODS: Oh, please do mention this, yeah.

HORTON: Yeah, it's *The Great Ron Paul: The Scott Horton Show Interviews, 2004-2019*. It's 38 interviews of Dr. Paul and then plus a speech I gave all about the greatness of him. And I know everybody's going to absolutely love it. It's really great, and it's got this really great art, this pencil sketch drawing of Dr. Paul on the cover that Sarah – I don't want to say her last name wrong, I don't have it right in front of me – DeYong, I think it is, this great artist – did. I'm so sorry, Sarah, for getting your name wrong. But anyway, and then Sheldon Richman, the great Sheldon Richman, at the Libertarian Institute, we put out *Coming to Palestine*, which is this excellent collection of essays that he's written about Zionism kind of in two big phases, '88 through '94, and then 2014 through '19. It'll knock your socks off, case closed, the libertarian case about truth and justice and freedom and human rights in Palestine, by the great Sheldon Richman. So all those are available, along with *Fool's Errand* and Will Grigg's book *No Quarter* that we probably earlier this summer – all those are Amazon.com and at LibertarianInstitute.org.

WOODS: All right, so check all that out. I'll link to those books too at TomWoods.com/1510. So the Scott Horton stuff, the books you just heard –

HORTON: Did you get yours yet? I sent you one.

WOODS: It just arrived – I can't remember it was to my house – oh, I know what it was. I was out of town for a week, and when I came home, it was waiting for me.

HORTON: Oh, great.

WOODS: So yeah, so thank you very much for that.

HORTON: Absolutely. Okay.

WOODS: All right, now I'll let get going. Thank you, Scott, for the very last minute. I emailed you yesterday, and I said, "Hey, you" – and I called you a name – "are you going to come on my show or what?" And we made it work. So thank you, Scott.

HORTON: Happy to do it, Tom. Thank you.