



Episode 1,393: Trump, Mueller, and “Obstruction”

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: I want to talk about what's happened with this Mueller Report, because it seemed as if, well, the media is just going to have to admit they were just wrong, and the collusion story has fallen apart. And meanwhile, Bob Murphy and I – and we're going to be talking about this in this week's episode of *Contra Krugman* – we even started a tongue-in-cheek little segment in which we ding a little bell for each column since the report in which Krugman has ignored the existence of the report. Now, he finally did mention it, so we have to retire that segment. We'll do that this week. But the point is, if the report had said the opposite, well, you better believe it would have been the very first column from Krugman.

But then the message came down from the Kremlin, so to speak, that the official party line was: all right, we got him on obstruction. So now everybody knows – the way they're spinning it is – now Krugman feels like, well, I can write about it now, because we've all decided that, in spite of what it clearly says, we're going to more or less say that it says the opposite. It's a bizarre, Orwellian thing. And I've been reading Glenn Greenwald's Twitter feed, and I just keep retweeting him and retweeting him and retweeting him. Also, Michael Tracey, I've been retweeting and retweeting, because they just are looking around saying, I can't believe that it could get this Orwellian. It is unbelievable. You think, okay, the report is right out there in black and white, and yet you have the Democrats saying, well, maybe we should impeach him, even though it says the opposite of what they said they were going to deliver on this.

So they've shifted gears now over to obstruction. I did have an episode, at least one, where we talked about the collusion side of things. So what I want to do now is move over to this obstruction thing. And I know that you've been reading the document carefully, and I'm just curious about your general take on this. Because I mean, my gut instinct is, if there's no underlying crime – which, some of them are still saying, well, they just couldn't get to the root of it. Oh, really? With that many hundreds of interviews and full subpoena power? I mean, if they can't get to the bottom of it, then nobody can. But if there is no underlying crime, there's nothing to obstruct. It's just a matter of: look, this is a witch hunt, and no, you can't do this. But people would say, oh, but he was asking people to lie this and that. So I'm hoping that Scott Horton can help make sense of this for us. Can you, Scott?

HORTON: Well, you know, I'll give it a shot.

WOODS: [laughing] Okay, that's why you're here.

HORTON: Yeah. Well, first of all, so let's talk about the collusion thing for a second, because they say, well, you know, collusion isn't really a term. I saw one bright tweeter pointed out

that the reason the media chose the word collusion is because, if they had used the word conspiracy, it would have been too obvious that this was just a conspiracy theory. They didn't really have any truth, so they made it a collusion theory instead, so it be a different animal of some kind.

But so Mueller says: look, collusion is not in the law, but conspiracy is, so we're looking at that. But he also said: but not only that; we're looking at coordination. So instead of collusion, we're going to use coordination as our other overly broad, sort of extra-legal term. So in other words, he wasn't just looking at what he could prosecute. He was looking at any story he could tell, essentially. And then what he came up with was that the whole thing was a hoax. When you go through, Carter Page was not a traitor. Papadopoulos, not a traitor. Jeff Sessions, not a traitor. Michael Flynn, not a traitor. The changing all the Ukraine part of the Republican Party platform was done by a low-level nobody in the party, who was not acting on instructions from even Trump, much less from Russia. There was nothing to it. The whole thing was fake.

And not only that, I'll go you further. And this is not exactly proven yet; this is a conspiracy theory, too, but it sure seems pretty clear to me that what was really going on here, was there was a CIA/FBI putsch against the nominated, major-party candidate for president of the United States, then the president-elect, and then the president himself, carried out by these guys. And I think, actually, they were really just trying to stop him from getting elected, and then it became CYA, big time. We'd better drum up a reason to pretend that we believe this stuff and that there was a reason for doing this.

But look, the whole FISA warrant to spy on the Trump campaign in the Trump Tower was based on Carter Page and accusations in the Steel dossier, which is totally bogus. You know what they said in there? They said that if Page could arrange —which he obviously could not. He was nobody. If Page could arrange to get some sanctions lifted, he would get a 19% ownership stake in the Russian state-owned oil company Rosneft. Okay, that's stupid and ridiculous. And the day it came out, we were laughing about that. That's not how that works. Give me a break. The whole thing was fake.

So that is important, because I think that — you know, you sent me Judge Napolitano's new column, where he goes, *Hey, I got obstruction here and obstruction there*. Hey, he's the judge, and I'm just the law-talking guy, so I guess he must be right about that. But it does seem important, not just that there was no underlying crime, but that this was an anti-democratic putsch attempt by the secret police against the democracy itself, against the republic and the Constitution and the right of the people to choose itself. They had no right to do this at all.

And, you know, they're saying that, oh, well, this all started with Papadopoulos running his mouth to the Australian ambassador to England, I guess, or the former ambassador, that, *Oh, yeah, this Russian-connected guy told me he has some emails*. And then two months later, when some completely unrelated different emails came out — this was in regard to Hillary's emails. When the DNC emails came out, all of a sudden, this guy got the idea to call the FBI on it.

But that's not how this started. We already know that this Bush family fixer and FBI informant going back to at least the 1980s, the very early 1980s and spying on the Jimmy Carter campaign — this guy, Stefan Halper, was already being sent to investigate these guys, as well.

And then, I'm pretty sure it's Stockman who points out in his new piece, there was an *Intercept* piece that says that Sater, the guy – oh, this is another thing that never happened, the big Trump Tower deal – that Sater, who was working with Michael Cohen on that, that he was an FBI informant too, and that apparently he was the one who brought this up. *Hey, you know, we ought to start looking again at that Trump Tower deal that we'd forgotten about from back a few years ago, and maybe we can make a big thing out of that.* And that at least is suspicious right there, where that came from. And so the entire Steele dossier is debunked. There's nothing in there of value, whatsoever. Michael Cohen didn't go to Prague to meet with the Russians to plot how they were going to do this and that leak, and this and that spying and hacking, and this and that. None of it was true. None of it happened.

So now, the way Mueller writes the law on obstruction or, you know, assesses the law in the report, is he says that, first of all, just because he's the president doesn't mean anything, because we know we can't indict him. But what we could do is prepare an indictment for when he's not the president anymore. He's not the king. And he goes through the statutory basis and the constitutional basis to say, first of all, the law does apply to this guy, and any argument that, oh, no, we're talking about Article II powers here that are unreviewable and this kind of thing, that's nonsense. Of course, he can fire the director of the FBI, but if he fires the director of the FBI with a corrupt intent, then that could be obstruction of justice, even if it is an Article II power. That's what Mueller says his interpretation of the law is. And then that the law itself is broad enough that it does not necessarily require corrupt intent, even, and that something could amount to obstruction, when really it wasn't based on corrupt intent. So in other words, he interprets the law very broadly here, and then he still doesn't make a real case for obstruction.

He ends up saying, *Well, geez, you know, essentially, if we had more time* – in fact, maybe let me page down to read this to you. He says, essentially, if the investigation went on forever, maybe we would find something. Which, you know, that's not the way a no-bill is usually written. It's kind of prejudicial and unfair. Now, we're talking about the president of the United States, and so it's not like it's a matter of personal sympathy, right. But, you know, when you're no-billed or when charges are dropped, they don't announce your innocence. They don't give you a certificate of innocence, right? But they either charge you, or they don't. They either indict you, or they don't. And so in this case, they don't have a sealed indictment. They're not recommending that the Congress look into impeaching the president based on these charges. They're not even trying to do that. They say:

"Because we determined not to make a traditional prosecutorial judgment, we did not draw ultimate conclusions about the president's conduct. The evidence we obtained about the president's actions and intent presents difficult issues that would need to be resolved if we were making a traditional prosecutorial judgment. At the same time, if we had confidence after a thorough investigation of the fact that the president clearly did not commit obstruction of justice, we would so state. Based on the facts and the applicable legal standards, we are unable to reach that judgment. Accordingly, while this report does not conclude that the president committed a crime, it also does not exonerate him."

And so then that's where they leave it. A perfect ending to a perfect hoax. He may or may not have instructed the investigation into the absolutely ridiculous charges that he was guilty of high treason, at least in the common understanding, that he had conspired not just with a foreign power, but with the Kremlin, to overthrow and hack and steal and attack the election of 2016 and usurp the rightful throne of Hillary Rodham, and all of this stuff. That was the

accusation. They did this whole thing – he even quotes a tweet of Trump that I had missed, where Trump goes, "Oh, great" – yeah, because of *The New York Times* report – "Oh, great. So you drum up this whole fake case, and now that your whole fake case on collusion falls apart, now you go for a case on obstruction of your big fake case? Sure."

Now, here's the thing, too, about this. This is the guy who just said the other day that he thinks America ought to be more like China and execute drug dealers, right? Here's a guy who tells cops: hey, go ahead and smash their head on the top of your cop car when you're putting them in the back of your cop car, because why are you playing nice and this kind of thing? This is a guy who's, you know, a right-wing nationalist. He's no kind of libertarian. He's got no kind of respect – he never even pretended to run on freedom and liberty. He never says those words at all. He's running on him being in power and choosing right.

And so he's the kind of guy who absolutely – pretend this had never happened, and he and his attorney general were getting along. They'd be cracking skulls. They'd be happy to lock people up for decades on these same kind of charges. So it's not like he deserves some kind of extra break here in that sense. I just think that, because – oh, and I should say, too: he does seem to be guilty of obstruction in the letter-of-the-law sense on at least a couple of cases, particularly on Michael Cohen, where he's calling him a rat – his former lawyer, he's calling him a rat on Twitter, and then saying, "Oh, what about your family's crimes? You think they're going to continue to get away with those too?" and this kind of thing. Anybody else did that, the Justice Department would nail him to the wall, on a case. And then the same thing with Manafort, too, where he's praising Manafort to high heaven, as Manafort is flipping, or supposedly flipping or whatever, and talking to the grand jury. This is the kind of thing, where if you or I ever tried that, absolutely we would go down in flames.

But I just think that, geez, since the entire FBI and Justice Department should be abolished forever, based on their attempted coup against the elected president here, who's going to prosecute? And this is the whole thing that I think Napolitano misses. He's bogged down in the letter of the law and saying, look, Trump's guilty of obstruction and all this. Yeah, but the Justice Department is guilty of conspiring with the CIA to try to bring down the elected president based on what they knew were a bunch of lies. So who do you prefer at the end of that? It's a political question; it's not a legal question.

WOODS: And so that's really the point of all this. That's really where this ends up. I was looking around to see if Glenn Greenwald, whom I've been following very closely, had written specifically about the obstruction stuff, and you see little hints of it here and there and his outrage that they're moving the goalposts now, that suddenly, they just dropped what they've been saying for years about what Trump had been up to, and suddenly they latch onto obstruction – which, okay, fair enough. But what if the obstruction charges, what if there's something to them? That's really not a full-blown response.

HORTON: Right.

WOODS: And I haven't really been able to find one, but I do think that what you're saying –

HORTON: Oh, you know what? I'm sorry, I should have thought of this before, man. It's Peter Van Buren is your man, man. He's the guy wrote the thing, "Mueller Time Is Over," at *The American Conservative* magazine, which is almost exclusively on the question of obstruction.

WOODS: Ah, okay. All right, maybe –

HORTON: This is what you're looking for, is Van Buren. And he's great. He's the former State Department whistleblower.

WOODS: Oh, I love him. Yeah, I've had him on a couple of times. I'll link to that.

HORTON: So he's your guy.

WOODS: Well, TomWoods.com/1393, I'll link to him on that; I'll link to the stuff that you've been doing. But I think that point of, it really comes to – in a way, it's kind of analogous to the whole when Trump wanted to get out of Syria, and the generals were telling him that, well, you can't do that and this and that. And people were saying, well, you know, he really shouldn't be going against the generals. But that was a political question: I don't think the US should be intervening. It wasn't a military question of what is the best way to get out, and where should our troops be instead. That's not the question Trump was asking. It was: should we be there in the first place? That's a political question. And likewise, this thing here, even if you look in this document, and you say, okay, these things that Trump did, he shouldn't have done, or this certainly doesn't look good for him. Well, okay, but in the real world, it's Trump versus somebody. And in this case, it's Trump versus the spooks. And I just can't imagine –

HORTON: Right, and a bunch of false accusers.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: Yeah, I mean, look, if they had if they'd done this the whole time, and then the Democrats and the cops – because, you know, John Brennan got a job on NBC, MSNBC, being the advisor, the guy who pushed for the FISA warrant in the first place and all this stuff, is the guy commentating on all this. And they've been telling us, essentially, that the Steele dossier was right, that the Trump administration was up to their eyeballs in conspiring with the Russians on this thing. And so they've spent two and a half years on this, in pushing this thing. So if they had said all along, *Hey, look, you know, Carter Page may or may not have met with anyone nefarious. We don't really know. Maybe not, but we have a real problem with Trump intervening in this investigation and obstruction. We think he may be guilty of obstruction.* If that was the case the whole time, then, I guess, you know, it is a felony. They'll certainly put you in prison for it. But the thing is, they accused him of all of this stuff, so now we're talking about climbing down 99 rungs on the ladder to now, well, he's under arrest for resisting arrest, when resisting arrest, the original charge, there never was probable cause.

In fact, even go back to Bill Clinton and Lewinsky. Bill Clinton, first of all, this is just the ironic part. It's not exactly relevant, but Bill Clinton was the one who signed the federal law that said that a sexual harassment case is a federal civil rights issue. So Paula Jones took him up on that, because she was a government employee in the state of Arkansas when he was the governor and propositioned her and made her feel like her job depended on it. Well, that was fair enough for a civil lawsuit for the jury to decide. And then he perjured himself in the civil deposition, which is a crime. And that became the predicate for the rest of the investigation. Now, we all know Bill Clinton should have been in prison for war crimes in Iraq; for the mass murder of the Branch Davidians, using the Army Delta Force to kill them all, and

all of this stuff. But at least when it came to that big fake Starr investigation on him, there really was a crime there, and then he made it worse by trying to offer her a job and by perjuring himself again before the federal grand jury.

So in this case, you don't even have that. In this case, there is no predicate. In this case, it was a counterintelligence investigation that turned into a criminal investigation of the president not to see whether he was guilty of the crime that they had discovered had been committed, but to see if he had committed any crimes, and to see if they could find any crimes in the administration. So it's just exactly the difference of the best detective and the worst detective in your town, right? A bad detective is going to try to build a case and see if he can make it seem like something's true. He's going to take it to the DEA, and the DEA is going to say, I guess we'll let the jury decide. Whereas the real, good detective, assuming there is one at all, is going to try to debunk and disprove and falsify everything that seems like it makes sense until only one scenario is plausibly left, to solve exactly who's behind the crime that took place.

So in this case, they didn't even have a crime at all. They just built, quite literally, a conspiracy theory. And if you listen to the way they talk about it, even to this day on the *New York Times* website right now is: here are the dots, here are the connections, here's the graphical interface of the web of whatever. It doesn't mean anything, right? It's like, I know you, and you know Lew, and Lew knows Gary North, and so now, like, I'm ready responsible for Gary North's taxes. It's just nonsense. If you're on the outside, then you can build whatever web of connections you feel like making up to and including Kevin Bacon and everybody who was ever in a movie with him, right? But it's not logic, or it's a kind of logic point, but it's not deductive, and it's not rational, really.

WOODS: But it does work with people, namely most people, who have lives and don't follow all the details. And all they hear is a bunch of names and a data dump dropped on them. *Look at this guy who did this, and that guy did that.* They don't have the time to look into, *Yeah, but what this guy did has nothing to do with Russiagate, or, What this guy did, he did before he was even connected to Trump, or whatever.* So you realize that, as you look closely at it, it starts to fall apart. But the assumption, correct assumption, I think, is that most people won't look at it in that much detail.

Let me read you – obviously, you've already read it, but for the sake of listeners, a passage from the Peter Van Buren article that you mentioned, because here he hits it head on. He says: "The report suggests is the Trump's post-Comey actions (broken down into ten episodes) would have constituted obstruction *if* seen as a pattern of behavior, not as the discrete acts the law focuses on, and *if* they had included the critical element of corrupt intent. Those "if" words are doing all the work because there was no corrupt intent. Mueller said so.

"So if Trump could not take his obstructive actions to cover up his crimes with Russia because they did not exist to be covered up, i.e. corrupt intent, why did he act in ways that appear designed to disrupt the investigation? Muller answers the question. Volume II, page 61."

Here's a quotation from the report: "Evidence indicates that the President was angered by both the existence of the Russia investigation and the public reporting that he was under investigation, which he knew was not true based on Comey's representations. The President complained to advisors that if people thought Russia helped him with the election, it would detract from what he had accomplished. Other evidence indicates that the President was

concerned about the impact of the Russia investigation on his ability to govern. The President complained that the perception that he was under investigation was hurting his ability to conduct foreign relations, particularly with Russia."

That's directly from the report.

HORTON: Right.

WOODS: And then back to Van Buren. He says: "If you believe Mueller, Trump was concerned about his ability to govern, about as far from corrupt intent as you can get. At the pre-release press conferences, Barr agreed with this assessment. Trump knew, and Mueller came to know, that he did not collude with the Russians. To show corrupt intent, Mueller would have had to prove Trump was trying to stymie the process that would ultimately clear him. And while there can be obstruction without an underlying crime, that requires even clearer evidence of corrupt intent, because in such cases obstruction on its face is counterproductive."

HORTON: Right. And so this goes really, I mean, right back to the conspiracy theory. If you read this report, you can see where even Mueller – it reads like, you know, like *Terminator IV*, it was written by a bunch of different people. So somebody, presumably, Mueller, is kind of taking pains to explain away Trump's behavior and say, you know, instead of just making the case, we really should bring up that there are other explanations, and it's the perfect case, right, of begging the question, where, if, as we all know, Trump is guilty of high treason and conspiring with the Russians to hack the election and blah, blah, blah, then all this stuff looks really bad, like he is trying to prevent – I mean, in there, he doesn't really follow through with the obstruction, because he's always trying to get his underlings to do it for him, and they keep refusing to carry out his orders and stuff like that. But he's really upset and going to lengths to try to call this thing to a halt somehow. Right, so if you know he's guilty, then it's pretty obvious why he's doing that.

But if you don't beg the question and if you just presume his innocence, like is a tradition in some societies, and you look at it that way, then you can see that, oh, yeah, no, what's going on here, actually, is a guy who just got elected president – it's hard to feel sorry for Trump; I really don't, but I can empathize in the sense of like, what if I had been elected president, and then the entire FBI and CIA tried to bog me down with all of these false, proven false – see Section I, Volume I of this report – false accusations of treason, of being in the pocket of a foreign power, the Kremlin in Russia, of all places, of all of all governments, that I would be pretty upset. And I could see why Trump would consider this a total emergency.

In fact, even when the report came out, *The New York Times* ran with these quotes of him when Mueller was appointed, saying, oh, now I'm effed, because now my presidency is over, and everybody says it's the worst thing that can ever happen to you. And they portray it like, see what a guilty conscience he has, instead of the obvious opposite of that, which is: see what a guilty conscience he hasn't, and then he's being saddled with all of this, which he knows is all not true. So he's saying to Comey, I need loyalty and all this. Man, you don't say to the FBI Director, "I need loyalty and all this." But what are they talking about? He's saying, Comey, you already told me that I'm not under investigation. You told me three times that I'm not, so why won't you tell the public that? It's not fair. And then Comey goes and testifies before Congress, and they say, is the president under investigation? And Comey says, I don't want to answer that. And Trump is like an H-bomb going off in his head. Are you kidding me with this guy? So he fires him. And then immediately, McCabe and the guys that take over the

FBI go, *Oh, my God, we think that the Russians may have had Donald Trump fire Comey as part of their treasonous collusion plot. We'd better open up an investigation into that now.* Oh, come on. This whole thing is a put-on. And you know, I mean, there should be a lesson for right-wingers in this, too, that this is the way our justice system works, day in and day out, against the powerless too.

WOODS: Thank you for making that point.

HORTON: If you ever know anyone who's been to prison, they'll tell you they didn't belong there. You know your friend. He didn't belong there. And many of the people in there with him, they didn't belong there.

WOODS: Yeah, thank you for making that point, because this is one of the areas where it really, really does help to be a libertarian, and where you do see the world a lot more clearly. Because for these conservatives, they'll say, *Oh, the federal government is such a bumbling institution. Federal, state, local, oh, they're bumbling people, and they make a lot of mistakes.* But then when it comes down to the most important things the government does, on that, they will allow no dissent, and they just wave their tiny American flags and go, *Rah, rah, rah.* And yet that's where so much of the damage is done. And so in other words, it's government employees are terrible when it comes to regulating agriculture or whatever it is, but when it comes to their disposal of people's lives, their authority over whether somebody's going to spend the rest of his life in a cage or executed, for some reason this is just a matter of singing patriotic songs.

HORTON: Yep. Well, I mean, and the thing is, too, is it's a matter of cognitive dissonance big time, because anybody who's ever dealt with a cop on any level, if you've ever been to jail at all, or even been down at the municipal courthouse or whatever, you can see how all these people treat us all mundanes, as Will Grigg used to say, like we are subhuman. And just think of the mindset of just a deputy sheriff at the jail, where most people that they're dealing with are guilty of some very low-level offence, right? Loitering or drug dealing or getting in a fight or, you know, maybe a stabbing or something worse or whatever, but they're essentially people who are poor and down and out and not worthy of much respect on the face of it. But then the cop's job is to treat them – you know, it's a job. It's like treating them like a stack of hamburger buns when you work at the Carl's Jr. or whatever. *I'm going to move you from here to over here and whatever.* It's a completely dehumanizing process in every way. And they have to think in a completely dehumanizing manner about their subjects every moment of the day that they're at work. That's just how it is.

And so, look, the worst person I know, the very worst person that's actually a personal friend of mine from my cab-driving days, he tried to become a cop. He really is kind of a scummy dude, dude. He tried to become a cop, and he couldn't handle it. Because they treat even just suspects, people who are just locked up – they're not convicted of anything. People are just locked up for drunk driving or for nothing, they treat them like they're – anyway, they have no regard whatsoever. It's just a process like flipping burgers. Their job is seeing if they can get you on something and get you into the system. This ain't *Matlock* or *Perry Mason* or something, where the prosecutor's happy to admit that you didn't really do it and let you go. It's more like *The Simpsons*, where Bart goes, "But Principal Skinner didn't kill me. Here I am." And then the prosecutor here goes, "Your Honor, we'd like that stricken from the record."

WOODS: [laughing] There's no situation that *The Simpsons* can't help illuminate further, has been my experience. All right, Scott, I want to reiterate here: I'm glad you actually went on that tangent, because as I say, that's the tangent that only a libertarian is going to go on. And it's a tangent that the conservative needs to hear, needs to have it drummed into his head. And yeah, progressives, yeah, they have their issues with law enforcement. The issue here, or at least one of the issues, it's not just that these institutions are generically corrupt, even if they are, but they're also not these impartial, platonic wisemen up on a mountaintop looking down impartially upon the affairs of the world. They have agendas of their own. And yet we're taught superstitiously to look at them as if they're above all that. They're like people running the Federal Reserve. They're like Supreme Court justices. None of those people have ever acted in any way other than purely impartially for the welfare of the country. I mean, come on. At some point, that is a second-grade superstition.

HORTON: I mean, just think, it's just like with the military industrial complex speech that Ike gave on his last day in office there. Well, we never did correct that, right? There never was the military industrial complex comeuppance event right around the time of the Church Committee or something. That never happened. Same thing with the FBI. Since J. Edgar Hoover created this thing, essentially, it's never been shrunk. It's never really been rolled back. Speaking of the Church Committee and those '70s-era reforms, they essentially amount to nothing. The FBI is a government unto itself. Lew Rockwell has a great piece today at the Mises Institute about the college bribery scandal, where he's like: of course, rich people bribe their kids' way into college. That happens all the time. Do you think Jared Kushner got into college on his grades and this and that? And so Lew says, what changed? What changed is the FBI has unlimited power to go on fishing expeditions against anyone and everyone, wherever they can, to just nail anyone to the wall.

And another example of one for conservatives. Look at these very wholesome Hallmark Movie Channel, very white, conservative people, "the best kind of image you want to see on TV" sort of characters. And they're not immune from this stuff. The FBI is threatening to put the lady from *Full House* in prison and the guy from the Target brand clothes, Massimo — used to be a skateboard brand, I think, years ago — threatening to put them in prison for decades. For decades.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: *Oh, you're guilty of six kinds of fraud for trying to get your daughter into USC, or whatever it is.* And it's because — it's funny to say it like this — it's a lawless police state. But oh, there are lots of laws. It's just that they're not really laws, right? They're just — what do you call them when they're simply excuses for government employees to persecute their American subjects? If they were laws, they would apply to the government to. Ha.

WOODS: Yeah, exactly right.

HORTON: Oh, wait, one more thing before you cut me off here then, too. We're talking about how, look at how far down the ladder they're climbing from high treason to obstruction of justice that never even really got accomplished, and all of this. Well, I got something to impeach Trump for. If people are really serious and they really want to impeach and remove Donald Trump from the presidency, which I've supported the impeachment of Bill Clinton, George Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump. I see no reason why he should be an exception to this.

And in fact, as I told you before, the war going on in Yemen is at least as bad as Iraq War II. It's just an absolute nightmare over there. And the convenient thing, Tom, is that they could impeach and remove Donald Trump from office and prosecute him and put him in prison. And they could do it in a way that doesn't make them look like pathetic, petty partisans, who are just upset that the Russiagate conspiracy theory didn't come true, and now they're just hellbent on revenge and scraping the bottom of the barrel for some obstruction charge. You go ahead and remove him and convict him of the very worst thing he's ever done. But, of course, you've got to prosecute and convict and imprison Barack Obama for starting this war. That's how you prove that it's not partisan; it's the law. They're not even pretending this is authorized under the AUMF. That's the war against al-Qaeda. This is the war for al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, against their enemies, the Houthis. Both houses of Congress have invoked the War Powers Resolution in order to make him stop, and he vetoed it. And Barack Obama and Donald Trump are – in fact, you know, it's April; we're almost exactly four years into the thing, just over four years, where two of the years were Obama and two of them were Trump. They're both exactly as guilty as each other for waging this medieval, genocidal siege, starvation campaign against these helpless people. And so there you have it.

But just for me to say it like that, it just goes to show how completely ridiculous and silly it is that there's anything like the rule of law in America. Can you imagine Nancy Pelosi and the Democrats, who are telling us that Donald Trump is the most dangerous person ever to hold power in world history – he could get us all killed at any time. And you and I and everybody knows, and Nancy Pelosi surely knows, that he's guilty of genocide right now. He's guilty of war crimes right now, and they could remove him from office and prosecute him for violating the War Crimes Act right now. But she won't do that, because in order to do it, she'd have to also do the same thing to the Democrats' number-one hero, Barack Obama. So not only are they willing to do that to protect us from the future nuclear war Trump is sure to get us into or whatever, they're not willing to do that to stop a war of genocide against a civilian population. Because guess what: they don't really care about anything except themselves and their own power.

WOODS: No, that really is what it is, and it just boggles my mind that occasionally I see – I don't want to mention their names, but there's a group of internet-only, social-media-only libertarians who strongly dislike me. I call them the loser brigade just to get under their skin. But every once in a while, they seem to kind of sympathize with the regime, or they sympathize with the spooks. So here, they're upset that I posted something saying that – I posted a thing saying, "We've reached peak Orwell," when the exact opposite of what the report said is being reported in the press. And they were trying to remind me that Orwell was a socialist, as if that has anything whatsoever to me to do with my point, or that, *The reporters are just reporting on what's going on in the government. What, does he not want that? I bet he wants a position in the Trump administration.* Somebody sent me this thread.

And so what I can't get about this is they treat the regime as if these are normal people like you and me, who think like you and me, and ought to be sympathized with like you and me. But these are people who would rather prosecute made-up crimes against the regime that hurt nobody, cause no physical harm to anybody. They would rather do that than spotlight what's going on in Yemen. And these are the people who, they portray themselves as these are the great champions of people of color. But yet these are the people of color, who at this particular moment in world history, need them the most, and yet, really not a peep out of any of them. So these are not people to be sympathized with or say, well, they're just doing

their job or whatever, and how dare you speak badly of the CIA, or whatever it is they're trying to say. It just doesn't make any sense.

By the way, we have to wrap this up, but I had Jacob Hornberger on the show.

HORTON: I heard. Great stuff.

WOODS: Oh, tremendous. I'm glad you did. I was sitting there thinking: what would be a good, nice, provocative episode title for that one? And I had all these big, highfalutin – you know, big, long, involved. But then I thought, no, we'll just call it "Abolish the CIA" and just leave it there [laughing]. And boy, I had such good feedback on that. I had some people say it was one of the best episodes ever. He came out swinging, and it almost made me feel bad, because when you were on last time, I was saying that, look, if he runs for president of the LP, you've got to make sure he's full of fire and everything. He came on my show, and he burned the thing down, he was so on fire.

HORTON: Yeah, he's great, man.

WOODS: I was going, okay, I guess I don't have anything to worry about.

HORTON: I know. Well, I guess this means I've got to join the LP after all now with the rest of you bums.

WOODS: Wouldn't that be fun to have Scott Horton causing trouble? Not causing trouble. Trying to do the right thing. We're just trying to do the right thing.

HORTON: Yeah, exactly. So I'm just sending him emails. I don't work for the guy or anything. We're just friends, and I'm giving him all the best advice that I can, and I'm just telling him focus on the very worst stuff. Never mind libertarianism, man; you need to run for president of the USA, dude. Look at what all is going on and run against that, and argue past the sale as far as libertarian – he's a solid libertarian on everything. Right-wing or left-wing or whichever libertarians want to argue about, immigration issues, fine. But, that's one that's so divisive for all libertarians anyway. But on every other thing, there's nothing for anyone to argue about on all of this stuff. So I'm just telling him: take on the empire. Don't stop, man. I'm telling you; you're damn right I want to abolish the CIA. Oh, I want to abolish them so bad, and let me tell you the following 17 reasons why and all that. And he's so good on that.

And you know, they talk about that – I hate that Overton window. I don't know who Overton is. But that three-by-five index card of allowable opinion, I think that Jacob Hornberger can make that index card a little bit bigger in the overall conversation in American politics, about just what it is that we all supposedly have to buy into. And, you know, here's the thing, you know – I'm sorry, I know you got to go. But look, the neoliberals – that is the horror movie version of us, right – the liberal Republicans and the conservative Democrats, the moderate centrists, they've ruined everything, man, since the end of the Cold War. They've had this entire era, the Bush-Clinton family centrist consensus, and they blew it completely. And so everybody's moving further to the left and further to the right.

So now is the time where no, this is the time for the libertarians to say no, no, no, man. See, it's like what Ron Paul said. If we put freedom first, then we can all agree about that. We

don't have to fight about everything. The only reason we're fighting about everything is because government turns everything into a political football. So let's just depoliticize American life so that we can all be friends again, man. That's what this is about. And the essence of libertarianism, the whole "man acts," all of that, that comes straight out of the USA, Declaration of Independence. That doesn't just belong to libertarians. All men are created equal. That's right there, the natural rights thing, right there. So that's for all of us. And so libertarian candidacy can do so much to show the American people that, since Ron left, we don't have that national leadership anymore. I think Bumper can do a real good job on that, on helping anyway.

WOODS: Yeah, no kidding, without a doubt. And I just sent out an email to my newsletter folks – everybody listening to this should be on my list. I've said that a million times. You'll enjoy getting it. You can hop on – let's see – OurEnemytheFed.com. That's a good way to get on, and get a nice eBook about the Fed and why all the apologetics for it are not right. But I sent out an email talking about – maybe you saw this the other day – Bernie Sanders really stumbled on the campaign trail when he was asked about what is he going to do to expand his appeal among women of color. And he couldn't really give a good answer. I mean, he couldn't even say, well, look, I think the principles that I'm advocating for would help everybody. I think we would all benefit from these different – I mean, he couldn't even say that, because first of all, that would not have been acceptable answer. But then they said the same thing to Tulsi Gabbard. The Women's March Twitter account said, "Tulsi Gabbard didn't even use the term 'women of color' in her answer about women of color." So I said, all right, has the Women's March Twitter account ever congratulated Tulsi for opposing the empire? Has it ever used the word "empire"?

And then I pointed out: see, Ron Paul wouldn't have had this problem, because – you know my favorite Ron Paul story. He goes to this Arab American group, and they say, "Dr. Paul, have you prepared a special speech for our group?" And he says, "No, it's the same speech I give everywhere." Because he says: you know, ending the drug war, ending the Fed, ending the empire, we all benefit from this. Nobody wants a housing boom and bust that destroys his financial situation, and nobody wants his kid ground up by the war machine and blowing trillions of dollars for no reason, and nobody wants all of the negative consequences of the drug war. I mean, these are things that bring us together. I don't have to say, "Well, this is for you, and this is for you." That, no, this is for everybody. That's the beauty of it. And yet, unfortunately, for poor Bernie, he either can't think of that answer, or that answer won't be considered acceptable.

Anyway, all right, now we're – you thought you were on a tangent earlier? We've completely forgotten the topic of the episode. Let's tell people, first of all, I am a big booster of Scott Horton. I support Scott every month with a contribution, and you should do the same too. You can do that over at ScottHorton.org. Do you have Patreon now? I can't remember.

HORTON: I do, at /ScottHortonShow. And wait, let me keep talking right here, because or else I'll forget, and I didn't get a chance to say last time. I really appreciate all you've done in having me on the show and recommending my show to your people and all this the way you do. I have huge proportions of my audience come from my appearances on your show, including I have this great coauthor named Robert Gaines. And we've written together about four articles – and he's a former Air Force guy, Afghan combat vet. And we've written four articles for – I think three for Breitbart, and one is coming out in the *National Interest*, attacking the right from the right and essentially supporting Trump on his positions against

staying in Syria and Afghanistan and these kinds of things. And he came to me from you, and just my email box is full all the time of people saying, you know, I found you, listened to you on *The Tom Woods Show*, and this and that. So that's listeners and supporters and coauthors and all kinds of things, and so I really owe you one for that, man.

WOODS: Oh, no, look, I mean, giving Scott Horton a platform is one of the things that makes me the happiest about this show; to get more people over to *The Scott Horton Show*, that makes me happy. All right, thank you, Scott, for – thank you for your service, my friend. I appreciate it.

HORTON: Hey, I've got a big book of Ron Paul interviews coming out in a couple of weeks, so everybody keep your eyes peeled to the Libertarian Institute site.

WOODS: Oh, man, that's going to be great. Thanks so much, Scott.

HORTON: Thanks, Tom.