



**Episode 1,429: Scott Horton on the Police, the Military, and Other State Institutions
People Make Excuses For**

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: I'm very glad to be talking about Will Grigg. Not very glad that we have to be doing it in his absence, of course, and losing Will Grigg was a terrible blow for a lot of reasons. In fact, there have actually been times when I will admit, I have judged certain libertarians on the basis of whether those people like Will Grigg or not, because he's one of those people, you can tell a lot about a person based on if they like Will or not. And he did such great work, and he has such an interesting story, because he came from a background where I wouldn't have expected him to wind up where he wound up in terms of his writing. And here I'm thinking particularly about his days in the John Birch Society, which for all their merits, have generally been more pro-police and kind of flaggy in some ways. And Will really just wasn't going for that.

HORTON: Right. Well, so yeah, that much happened in about 2006, was they made their real break, and it was over immigration and the police state. It was a big popular topic among the Republicans in 2006 for the midterms, and Lou Dobbs was kind of leading the charge on his CNN show and all this kind of stuff. And the Birch Society, as he explained it to me, had sort of been taken over by some new corporate PR overlords who were going to turn things around and this kind of thing. And so they said: listen, this is what's popular on the right, and so this is what we're going to do. And of course, Will was a principled guy and refused to go along with it and got fired over that. But and the Birchers, I mean, who knows? Without Will, who even cares? But at least in the time of Will Grigg at *The New American*, the idea of "Support your local police" was — and I know that he came later. The John Birch Society had always had that as a slogan for very long time, I think. But the idea was to keep the feds out —

WOODS: Right.

HORTON: — make sure that you have a strong local security force so that no one can say that you need the feds' help, that kind of thing, you know. Although that should only go so far, obviously [laughing].

And Will ended up — he didn't change his ideology other than to become more libertarian, less conservative and more libertarian. He certainly never became any kind of leftist or anything like that. And yet, he picked up the cudgels on this fight that is typically considered to be the domain of sort of ACLU types, civil libertarians and minority rights activists and this kind of thing. And Will, of course, was an individualist, so forget all those distinctions. Anybody unfairly at the receiving end of state violence, he was their champion. That was his thing. And particularly he picked up, as you're saying there, kind of the exact opposite take from

that Birch stance – certainly not bring the feds in to help. Not that part. But there's nothing to support about your local police if they're nothing but a bunch of criminals. And that's what we see, of course, is, across the country, police are just absolutely unleashed against the American people. It's not the deputy sheriff anymore; now he's a law enforcement officer. And even when he's doing street patrol, he's wearing his SWAT gear, less the helmet maybe, but otherwise all in black with all of his little pockets.

WOODS: Yeah, no kidding. But you know, also Will would do onsite investigative reporting about people who were being screwed in one way or another. He would tell stories no one was hearing about except if you lived in that little town. No one else heard about them. And Will would be the champion of these people, and that is how we found out about stuff like that.

HORTON: And especially false convictions, where innocent people would get railroaded on some murder charges.

WOODS: Right.

HORTON: And he knows better and sees right through it. Christopher Tapp actually was finally released, but he had to go ahead and plead out, but they let him go. And then just a few months later, one of the major witnesses recanted and said that the cops, of course, had extorted her and forced her to lie at the trial. And then just a little while after that, the 23andMe guys narced out the real perpetrator, who was tied to the DNA and who had no tie to Chris Tapp or his buddy, who had also been railroaded with him, I believe. And so it turned out Will Grigg was right about that one all along, only vindicated a little too late, is all.

WOODS: I've got to ask you something that I probably shouldn't ask, but what the heck? Where would be the fun if I didn't ask? There's a handful of names that come to mind. I don't want to mention them. A handful of names that come to mind in the libertarian world when you're talking about police, and those people get a lot of attention. But Will didn't. Certainly in the mainstream, big, big libertarian institutions, it was like he didn't exist. He would be featured on LewRockwell.com, because Lew doesn't care. But he wouldn't be invited to such-and-such institute or such-and-such foundation. And yet these other handful of people who are sort of known to be the libertarian experts on the police would always get invited. Do you have any speculation as to why that was?

HORTON: Well, I mean, honestly, I think – I was going to say at the beginning there that I don't think I've ever heard of anyone disliking Will Grigg. I've known people who have never heard of him before, but I've never heard of anyone who had bad things to say about the guy, really, that I can think of. I think his biggest problem was simply he just didn't have the notoriety. Or if he did, that unfortunately it was tied up with the John Birch Society.

WOODS: Oh, yeah.

HORTON: I mean, people just assume that John Birch was some jerk or some – [laughing] you know what I mean? It was just built in, when the origin of the name of that was he was an American missionary who was murdered by the Communist Chinese. And so this right-wing group invoked his name to say: this is the danger of communism. This guy was like a diplomat

or a pseudo-diplomat, and he said, "Take me to your leader," and they took them and shot him on the side of the road. And so this was an example that they were using about communism, this kind of thing. But it's just the name is tied up with, *Impeach Earl Warren for letting black people into my kid's classroom*, and this kind of really bad name from back when, and all their kind of crazy Illuminati conspiracy stuff, saying that even the fall of the Soviet Union was just a trick and the Russians are still going to come and get us. They were sticking with that through the '90s, you know?

WOODS: Yeah, yeah, yeah, there's some problems. Yeah.

HORTON: Yeah, so they're tied up with kind of old, white, reactionary-type politics from the '60s, and then more like conspiracist-type kookery from the '90s. And so they should have changed the name of the thing a long time ago anyway, but it was the kind of thing that being a former guy from them – I mean, I've got to tell you, I never had anyone say to me, "Oh, no, he was a former Bircher." I never heard anyone say that. I guess I kind of imagine that may have been on some people's minds. But I think you know – I don't know. I'm not sure to what degree his name became a household name, you know what I mean? It's just people didn't really know him very much, I think.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, I have a theory I'll share with you later.

HORTON: Okay.

WOODS: But I want to talk about this book. You guys at the Libertarian Institute put this book out, where you took a whole lot of his stuff and organized it chronologically so that we could go back and have it as a reference. He did tremendous work, and he deserves to be remembered. I mean, he was taken from us so – how old was he when he died?

HORTON: 54.

WOODS: I mean, that's ridiculous. We should have had him for 30 more years anyway. So tell me about this project.

HORTON: Okay, well, I don't get any of the credit, really. I mean, Will did the book. Will put it all together. And there's a guy named Darren Williams who had the project for a little while, and then after Will died, our friend Thomas Eddlem, who's really Will's former protege at the John Birch Society for many years in the 1990s and I guess early 2000s, he had it. And I'm not sure how long after Will died, he sent it to me, because I had founded the Libertarian Institute, essentially, to try to figure out a way to get Will Grigg a job. And maybe I'll just make one, and both of us sound like such jackasses, kind of begging for donations and this kind of thing; we should go ahead and make our own institute. And with me and him and Sheldon Richman, this is kind of the perfect team for the three of us to get together and go ahead and create our own thing, and this and that. Of course, he died about half a year later, unfortunately. But he was really the whole purpose of the of the Libertarian Institute in the first place.

And so Tom Eddlem brought it to me and said, "Hey, you should publish this," and I was in the middle of working on and publishing *Fool's Errand*, and then the audiobook and all of this, so it took me really too long to get back to it. And other people, I guess, had promised that they

were going to do some work they never did and whatever. So I finally picked it back up. But I mean, Will did all the editing. I think Tom Eddlem did one good pass on the editing. I did one good pass, but I didn't change anything. The only thing I did was decapitalize war in Antiwar.com in Tom's introduction, which the introduction – the foreword, I should say – by Tom is really a biography of Will, and it's perfect. It's just great.

WOODS: I love it. I love it.

HORTON: Yeah, yeah, it tells the story of this man so well.

WOODS: And it also tells the story of what happened with the John Birch Society.

HORTON: Right, right, yeah, all that's in there.

WOODS: Which Eddlem had been with. Eddlem had also been with the Birch Society, so he also made a break with it.

HORTON: You know, I'm not sure about that part. I think he still may write for them from time to time, but he certainly doesn't work there anymore.

WOODS: Yeah, if he does, they must be very open-minded, because he's very, very firm about what went wrong with the society and the new leadership was terrible.

HORTON: I may be out of turn on that. I may not know the truth of that, of where he is with them actually.

WOODS: Well, who knows? Who knows? But he's not holding anything back on that. All right, so –

HORTON: Oh, wait, so I was going to say, so all I did, then, was I asked Will's family friend – there's this really good guy named Scott Watson, who's a friend of the family there, and he put me in touch with a guy named Scott Alberts, who did the cover art, which is this perfect cartoon of Will hammering away at his keyboard in righteous indignation, fighting the state with his little black flag and a kitty cat on his shoulder, and it's just – it was my idea. I'll take credit for that. This was my idea for Will at his desk – actually, maybe someone else had come up with that in the first place. But anyway, the way the cartoon came out was exactly how I had pictured it and had described what I had pictured to Scott. And he just did such a great job on the cover there.

And then Mike Gorski, who helps Mises on doing eBooks – you know, he did the eBook for *Human Action* and all this stuff; he is the guy that did the eBook and the Kindle version to get all those perfectly prepared for the electronic versions. And then the great Grant F. Smith from the Institute for Research: Middle Eastern Policy helped do the final formatting of the Word doc and transfer over to PDF file and all of that to be ready for the final printing and all that. So really, all I did was read it a few times and really enjoy it and really miss the guy. And then I wrote a little publisher's note at the end about his importance to me.

And it's such a good book. It's so good. I know you didn't have time to read very much of it since I sent it to you there, but it is just devastating and brilliant and perfect. And he had the

most advanced vocabulary out of anyone in our movement and used it with abandon and relish. He was just the best man.

WOODS: Well, I read a lot of his stuff as it was coming out at the time.

HORTON: Yeah.

WOODS: I mean, even going back to 2001 — in fact, even before that. I actually met Will Grigg in the 1990s.

HORTON: Cool.

WOODS: Because he was giving a talk about one of the books he had written all the way back then before he became Will Grigg 2.0, basically.

HORTON: Yeah, see, I never met him in person, honestly, but I've been reading him since the '90s. I mean, I was a total John Birch, new-world-order kook in the '90s. I mean, I wasn't ever a right-winger. I was like a Harry Brown libertarian, but as far as the conspiracy stuff — you know, I had learned from *Reason* magazine that "reason" means being skeptical about the Gulf War illness existing and being skeptical about whether the Branch Davidians really had it coming or not, or — you know, taking the wrong side of everything. And so I thought, well, I'd rather hang out with these right-wing kooks than a bunch of libertarians if libertarians are just — no offense —

WOODS: No, I get what you're saying. Were you a cab driver in those days?

HORTON: I was a cab driver from '97 through like '05, I guess.

WOODS: Were you the kind of cab driver who would share your nutty theories with your passengers?

HORTON: Oh, hell yeah.

WOODS: [laughing]

HORTON: I mean, but see — so hey, for a new-world-order kook, I was a pretty good one.

WOODS: I bet you were. I'm sure you knew the inside and out of everything.

HORTON: Yeah. I mean, I did learn a lot of great revisionist history that way. It's sort of like, you know, Gary North's bibliography. There's a lot of important stuff in there. Whether it all represents your take, necessarily, those are some serious footnotes about some things that happened, no question, you know?

WOODS: Right. All right, so let's — talking about Will, he wasn't just a police guy, though. He also did some great antiwar stuff.

HORTON: Yeah. And from the very beginning. This is what my publisher's note was about, was that immediately after September 11th, the very first issue was just: aren't firefighters and

cops heroes, and that kind of thing, of course. But then the second one was: did we know what was coming, or could we have prevented the attacks? Those are the names of the two – he was the very first one to write serious stuff – in fact, I believe he was the first one to publish the title of the president's daily brief from August 6th, 2001, that bin Laden determined to attack inside the United States and, you know, could we have prevented the attacks? So he was absolutely way out in front on that; no kooky stuff, but very sharp stuff.

And he wrote a thing where he went through the 14 – as I remember it, Tom. You help me out – the 14 standards for – or maybe it's like 7 standards for whether a war is just to get involved in, and then 7 for how it must be fought, something like that, by St. Thomas Aquinas, the just war theory. And Will Grigg goes through and says, no – and by the way, he was a Mormon-turned-Protestant, not a Catholic, but anyway – and he went through and he counted through the different qualifications. And what he came up with, as I remember it – because I didn't find it when I went back and looked. It wasn't anywhere. But he said: yes, we were attacked, so there's that, but on every other account, there are other ways to proceed here, such as: the Taliban have offered to negotiate. Let's try that and see if we can extradite the guy and try him. Because after all, it wasn't a state that attacked us. It was a group of bandits, and they committed a crime, and I'll bet you there's a jury in New York that'll deal with them good and plenty, and it'll be fine, and we'll do that instead of having a war.

And this is essentially the most right-wing publication in America, the most patriotic, George-Washington-worshipping, flag-waving, US-Army-supporting, kind of super patriots you could ever find. And here's their editor, saying: hey, I'm sorry, but Jesus outranks George Bush by a million, and this is what we believe, not what these guys say. And I already knew that anyway. I went and wrote Antiwar.com in shoe polish on the back of my truck the day of the attack. But it was nice to hear it from Will, that like, oh, yeah, no, you don't have to believe in this stuff for a second. You don't have to get carried away with the rest of society for one minute. And here he is showing it by example. And I'm not exactly sure if that was the second or third or fourth issue or something, but it was in '01. It was either before the attack on Afghanistan or right coinciding with it at the very beginning of October. And so that meant a lot to me.

Oh, and he also explained – and I memorized the phrase – the action is in the reaction. So bin Laden wasn't stupid. He didn't think that America was going to run away. Bin Laden was trying to make you angry and do something stupid, trying to give your corrupt, evil, nefarious, imperialist leaders a crisis to cynically exploit. And that, they will. And he got that straight right off the bat, too.

WOODS: Yeah, so he's one of these guys who doesn't have to look back on his career and say, "Well, I sure wish I hadn't made that major blunder [laughing]."

HORTON: Right.

WOODS: "I sure wish I hadn't been dead wrong on the key issue of our time [laughing]."

HORTON: Yeah, I think me and him both kind of dropped the whole new-world-order thing and the one-world-government thing right around the same time, at the beginning of the Iraq War, when we both should have been over it at the Kosovo War. I mean, if we're going to war against Serbia over Russia's dead body, then what does that say about the one-world, white army of the north and NATO and the UN and whatever? That's dead. That's not happening.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: And we should have known that then. But anyway, certainly by that time, Dick Cheney was invading Iraq, it was clear that this is not about bringing France and China and Russia on board and making this a UN protectorate and building up the UN Security Council as a – all that whole G. Edward Griffin, grand design stuff, definitely not panning out. Oh, and you know what it was, too, that got me? This is the one that finally got me – and I admit this is like spring of '03. That's pretty late in the game.

But Richard Perle, one of the major ringleader neoconservatives who lied us into war with Iraq, wrote a piece called "Thank God for the Death of the United Nations" and about how much he hated it, and about how we don't need international law and the UN Security Council; we have American law, or at least the will of our president, and the National Security Council, and that'll be good enough. And we will do what we will, and you guys will get the hell out of our way. And he mocks what he called "the liberal conceit" of a new world order, run by these homos in Brussels, or however he put it – sorry. Essentially, that was the argument. And I thought, *Wow, yeah, that's certainly not G. Edward Griffin's grand design right there, is it? No.*

WOODS: Yeah, and I too went in for that in the '90s. But I remember, really, it was Lew, Lew Rockwell, who kind of got me away from that by saying: look, Tom, the one-world government is the US.

HORTON: That's right.

WOODS: Like that's what you should be worried about. Don't worry about this feckless debating society where nothing ever happens. Keep your eye on the ball.

HORTON: Right, see, that's my story too, is I found Lew and Justin Raimondo both at that very same time, right at the beginning – well, I'd been reading Raimondo for a little while, but I found Lew Rockwell also right at that time. And actually, that was one of the things that really struck me about Lew, was he knows all about Carroll Quigley – oh, and same thing with reading Murray Rothbard, *Wall Street, Banks, and American Foreign Policy*. It's like, this is the John Birch conspiracy theory history of the 20th century, only without the kooky stuff. It's pure Rothbard. It's perfect. And he'll tell you: yeah, JP Morgan's daughter married the guy from the law firm that did the thing. And he does it perfectly in the best revisionist way, but none of this Illuminati stuff and none of this "ultimately all at the expense of the USA in order to build a world government" and all of that. None of the goofy stuff, but all of the best stuff. And Lew was the same way. He'd read *Tragedy and Hope*, but he didn't think it said what the Birchers thought it said, that kind of deal. So that was how I knew I was home when I found Antiwar.com and LewRockwell.com back then.

WOODS: Do you remember the whole Chris Kyle story?

HORTON: Yes.

WOODS: There's a chapter in here, "The Pseudo Coverage of Chris Kyle." I don't expect you to recall every wrinkle that that you would see in Will's treatment of it, but that headline caught my eye. Can we revisit that, just in the honor of Will?

HORTON: Sure. And yeah, you know, that was a brave thing. I don't know how much he took for that, but he was certainly putting himself out there to take a lot of heat –

WOODS: That's not a popular position to take, yeah.

HORTON: Yeah, I mean, Chris Kyle was held up as this demigod of Iraq War II, and a great kind of after-the-fact justifier – after-the-worst-part-of-it, I should say – justifier of it, that, *Look at this brave guy, doing this brave thing*. And he's a sniper, which you might think of in a negative way if you want to spin it that way, but it also can be spun, of course, like in the bumper sticker, *God bless our troops, and especially our snipers, because they are kind of the guardian angels, watching over the infantry that are out advanced ahead of them, and keeping those guys safe from threats they can't see*, and that kind of thing. So snipers are held up in a certain way, by certain factions. I don't know what different guys in the Army think of them. Probably more like that, you know?

But so in the book and then later in the movie, everything this guy does and everything that he said – never mind in the book, but in all of his propaganda and appearances, and I guess he wrote articles, but he certainly was interviewed all the time and stuff like that, when he was making his big splash, was all just about the heroism of our guys in battle over there. And all the questions about what they're doing there, and what makes them the good guys and the other side the bad guys, and these kinds of things, all that is just presumed. No one ever shows or proves any of it.

And so Will Grigg, of course, just isn't having that. So Will Grigg wrote that, look, you're the trespasser. You're the aggressor. Someone breaks into your house in the middle of the night, you are the one who has the right to defend yourself. If you're the one kicking in that door, you are the one who does not. And it's true, though, of course, that soldiers aren't really supposed to be asking all of these higher political questions, necessarily. Their job is to follow the chain of command. And in America, the civilians rule over the military, and it better obey them or else we're all really doomed, right? So there's this kind of apolitical ethic inside the military that: hey, we're not Republicans or Democrats; we're just serving America, and all this kind of thing. But again, it's just baked in. It's just begged that this is all justified. It has to be because we're the USA and the red, white, and blue, and somewhere in there, George Bush and Dick Cheney said we had to, and this is what we're doing. And it doesn't have to be justified; it's simply self-justified.

And so Will said – and this is one of the things that he talks about in his book – is that he killed a woman who he said was about to throw a grenade at some of his fellow soldiers, and so he shot her. And then he said, something like: well, she was a savage barbarian, less-than-human type person, and so it was perfectly fine anyway, and she was going to hurt my guys, and so I had not just the right to do it, but felt good doing it too, and this kind of thing. And Will Grigg's saying, no, that's wrong and you're wrong, and I'm an American and I'm as patriotic as anyone – hell, we're talking about William Norman Grigg here – but that's just not right. You don't start a war. That's what made the Japanese the bad guys at Pearl Harbor, right? They started the war. That's how you could tell that they were the bad guys. And so just because we are from here doesn't mean we have to believe in this stuff. Just because we're from here doesn't mean we're justified in what we do and that we have to sit here and pretend these things are true.

And in the movie, the Chris Kyle movie by Clint Eastwood, who I would have thought would have known better, maybe, but instead just made a soldiering, fun kind of movie out of it, they show that Chris Kyle is saving a captive from Iraqi torturers who are torturing and killing him with a power drill. But in the actual history of Iraq War II, the guys with the power drills? That was the Badr Brigade. They worked for Donald Rumsfeld — or Donald Rumsfeld worked for them. That was the side that we were on, torturing and murdering Sunnis by the hundreds of thousands, their bodies stacked like cordwood on the side of the road in the morning with power drill holes in their eyeballs, in their skulls, in their shoulders, their chests, their parts, their knees. That was America's war there, was the power drill war. Chris Kyle was providing sniper cover for those men, not rescuing people from them.

And good old Clint Eastwood doesn't have to figure out the difference between al Qaeda in Iraq and the Badr Brigade. What does he care? It's these guys versus those guys or something or whatever, and look at the white guy hero in the middle doing the right thing, and blah, blah, Hollywood narrative. When in reality, as, in fact, the entire Washington, D.C. establishment now agrees, we never should have done that war. Very centrist, important, powerful people point at John Bolton and say, "He still stands by the Iraq War. Can you believe that?" Because he's one of the last ones left who would dare to, because everyone knows now that I was right all along, that Will Grigg was right all along. You don't start a war, especially against a guy with a clean-shaven chin and a beret, who is obviously an enemy of Osama bin Laden, under the pretext that, oh, he's going to give some poison gas he doesn't have to bin Laden to attack us with. Are you kidding me?

WOODS: Yeah, I mean, this stuff makes me speechless, because I get so angry about it. Because especially, especially now — this has to be a separate episode, Scott. But especially when they have tried to repeat that narrative with Iran. For years and years now, they've tried. They tried it in the second Bush term, and that didn't go anywhere. And then it kept reappearing, and now they're trying it again. I mean, and they just feel like — you know, the question must come up: are people going to fall for this when we've pulled this trick on them before? And the answer must be: *Well, they always do. Don't worry about it. They always do. They always fall for it.*

HORTON: I think the other part of the answer, though, is less and less — I mean, the Japanese said, even though it's the Americans making the assertion, we would like to see more evidence [laughing] — which is very polite of them. I read a post at Mondoweiss this morning by James North, their *New York Times* critic, who talked about their pro-war, pro-escalation editorial, and how every single one of the comments is denouncing them and saying, *Oh, yeah? That's what you said about Iraq*, and all of these kinds of things.

And part of it is because of Trump. First of all, he ran on being a tough guy for peace, kind of, which is what people liked about him. But also, every word out of his mouth is hyperbole, always, so even when he correctly accuses John Brennan of treason, nobody cares, because he accuses everybody of treason every day. He calls anyone who criticizes him a traitor, and so everybody just laughs. So then John Brennan is actually guilty of treason in a few ways, supporting al Qaeda in Syria, the entire Russiagate scam, this kind of thing — it's not exactly treason, but lowercase T, at least, certainly in the first case — but nobody cares.

And so the same thing with Iran. *Ah, we know Iran did it. We're going to have to attack them. Yeah, they're a threat to us.* And everybody goes, *Meh, I don't know. It's Donald Trump claiming it. That doesn't really sound right. And then John Bolton says so too? That makes us*

extra suspicious. And then Adam Schiff, Jason Ditz was making a joke in the email to me last night, that: well, I don't know, man, Donald Trump and Adam Schiff are both in complete agreement that Iran must be guilty here, so I'm going to go ahead and place my bets on the field in this case.

So you know, I don't know. And after all, hitting a couple tankers and not very hard is hardly a real attack on the battleship *Maine*, you know what I mean? It doesn't quite add up to a North Vietnamese assault on the *Maddox* out there in the Gulf of Tonkin.

WOODS: But it's what they've got, you know? It's what they've got.

HORTON: Well, maybe. You know, I should say that I'm very suspicious, and certainly the case is not proven, so I'm the last one in the world to push the propaganda. I don't believe it, and I don't recommend anyone believe it. However, I should say that there are three important people that I respect who think that Iran may very well have done at least some of these tanker attacks, probably the —

WOODS: Oh, okay. Who are these people?

HORTON: Okay, so first of all, it's Bernard from Moon of Alabama, which is a great blog.

WOODS: Oh, it is a good blog, yeah.

HORTON: And then I think part of that is based on the reporting of another great reporter named Elijah Magnier. And Elijah Magnier is, I think, a Belgian reporter, but he was really, really good on Syria. I've interviewed him a few times about Syria and about Iraq War III and this kind of thing, and he's very plugged in. And he says he has a source close to Iranian decision makers, I think is the way he put it, that say — I mean, the quote wasn't, "Yeah, and we'll do it again," but it was like, "And we'll do it again," right? Not the first "yeah," but, "This is a thing that could keep happening," or something like that, you know what I mean?

And then there was Peter Ford, who I interviewed on my show, who, he's the former British ambassador to Syria and has been really good on Syria and a few other things. And he was on my show on Friday and said that — admittedly, he said he wasn't really questioning the Americans' claims. He didn't think they'd be lying about it. But he did go on to explain why Iran might do it and do it in that way, that essentially, this is the most inexpensive pinprick-type attack that they can launch, but with the effect of causing millions of dollars in damage and calling the entire system of oil exports from the Persian Gulf into question, insurance rates and all of these things, and that, essentially, they're making this statement, that under American maximum pressure and sanctions and blockade, that they can push back in asymmetric fashion, in very inexpensive ways that alert the Americans to the concept that we can do what we want but not without cost. And so it does make sense.

And Trita Parsi, I should say, another great Iran expert, he cast doubt on the whole thing and says: don't anybody jump to conclusions here. Everybody hold your horses here. But yeah, I mean, as long as we're at it, sure, it makes sense that possibly they could do that with this purpose. And there's a lot of reasons to disbelieve it, too. Although one of them was that they would do this — well, there's two things about him sitting down with the Japanese prime minister, Abe. It wasn't the president; it was the Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah Khomeini,

who was sitting down with him. So the idea that the IRGC would do something drastic to embarrass the president, Rouhani? Oh, yeah, they hate him, and they love undermining him, and so they might do something like that. But for them to do that to the ayatollah, attack a Japanese ship while he's sitting down to meet with the prime minister? That means either the ayatollah, as Pompeo put it, *Wowie, what a jerk. What a horrible demonstration of what horrible people these guys are.* Or they just didn't do it, is the more likely explanation, that the ayatollah would have never allowed something like that, and that the IRGC would have never thought to do something like that against him.

On the other hand, I did read, I think it was Moon of Alabama who pointed out that the Japanese tanker was actually flagged as Panamanian, and that whoever attacked it may not have known that it was a Japanese tanker. Although, of course, even if it wasn't known, even if it was flagged Panamanian, still attacking anything while the ayatollah is sitting down to meet with the Japanese prime minister, who's come with a peace, sort of, offering from Donald Trump would seem to be a pretty drastic thing to do. I don't know. And if you read all the experts on it, there are those who just believe the US government, and then there's everybody else saying: I don't know. There's not too many people who you could put in a category like Moon of Alabama, who is not one – Bernard is not one to fall for some propaganda, but he is broad-minded enough to say, hey, if the ayatollah did something, he did something, or if the Iranians did something, then the truth is the truth. Most people just pick a side, you know?

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, no kidding. Scott, as we wrap up for today, let me get back into this book. And in particular, you have a very nice note from the publisher at the very end about the respect you have for Will Grigg, and your interaction with him, including over 70 interviews with you over the years. And I think I had him on twice, but 70 is pretty darn good. And you say this, among other very nice things:

"Will's later specialization in stories about local police violence and false convictions in state courts was some of the most important work done in the libertarian movement in the early 21st century. He set such a great example and represented our movements so well, that he made us all look good by association with him."

That's a very, very good and stirring way to put it. And I want to make sure listeners understand that this is not a book that's primarily filled with stories from the past that nobody talks about anymore and that you'll feel like it's all dated. There are so many perennial themes and issues in this book that were discussed and thought about and debated and that were just so beautifully expressed by Will, that it will be very much to your benefit to read this book. And also, all the proceeds from the book are going to Will's family. Will had a big family, lots of kids, so you're also doing a good deed. But you should do this primarily for yourself. The book is *No Quarter: The Ravings of William Norman Grigg*, published by the Libertarian Institute. Scott, give me your final words on this.

HORTON: Hey, like I say, he really was the best of us: the most eloquent writer, the most eloquent speaker, and principled as could be on every single thing, as you can see in that book, on whatever you've got. And as Tom Eddlem emphasizes, just absolutely a master with all of his own turns of phrase, all of his own clichés that he could make up on the spot at any moment, and just absolute mastery of the English language, and in the service of fighting for freedom. That was it. I mean, all of his children are named after Sophie Scholl and Thomas Jefferson and William Wallace.

WOODS: How do people get it? Is it on Amazon, or do they have to go to the Libertarian Institute, or what?

HORTON: Both, yeah. Well, it's on Amazon.com, Kindle and paperback, and all the links are there at LibertarianInstitute.org. And by the way, we're putting together the, as complete as we can, archive of everything he ever wrote, including newspaper articles from the '90s, stuff that he did for the John Birch Society. I don't know about *New American* magazine articles, but some of the latest stuff for the Birch blog, everything from Pro Libertate, his *Freedom Zealot* and *Liberty Minute* radio spots, and everything he wrote for the Institute, of course. And all of that is that LibertarianInstitute.org/Will. And whatever is not there yet will be soon, and that'll be the permanent Will repository there.

WOODS: Wow, tremendous. All right, well, I'll have the link to the Libertarian Institute, and I'll also link to the book at TomWoods.com/1429. We should talk again soon, Scott, about what the heck's going on in the world one of these days, but thanks for doing this. Thanks for being part of this project. It's a fitting tribute to a very important man.

HORTON: Great, thank you Tom.