



Episode 1,454: Scott Horton Week: The Full Truth About Iraq

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: Third day of Scott Horton Week. We've done a an overview of where things stand in the war on terror and maybe half a dozen countries. Yesterday, we looked in detail at the situation in Somalia. Today, we're going to talk about Iraq, or so-called Iraq War II. And as we were finishing up yesterday, we realized we hadn't said anything about Trump. We talked about Bush; we actually talked about Clinton. Actually, no, we talked about the first George Bush, then Clinton, then the second George Bush, then Barack Obama, but we did not get to Donald Trump. So I want to finish off there on what has Trump's policy been in Somalia, and then we're going to transition from that into a discussion of Iraq. So just give me the quick two-minute summary. What has Trump done in Somalia?

HORTON: Well, he's escalated. And it's another one of the wars where he has outright said on the record that he doesn't believe in it, and he doesn't know why we have to be there at all. And you don't have to be Ron Paul. You could be just a rich, old, right-wing, golfing, Fox-News-watching nationalist type like Trump and say, What are we doing spending money killing people in Somalia when that couldn't possibly be helping anything, and what is the point of that? And that's his point of view on it.

And then according *The Washington Post*, he had a big fight with James Mattis, his previous secretary defense over this, and Mattis lied and said, "Well, we're trying to prevent an attack in Times Square, Mr. President," when in fact, it was the CIA drone war against al-Qaeda in Pakistan and against the Tehrik-i-Taliban there that caused the Times Square attack, attempted attack of 2010, as immediate blowback from Obama's drone war in Pakistan. So, what a nonsense argument. And then according to *The Washington Post*, James Mattis told Donald Trump, "You have no choice." And then Trump, instead of saying, "You're fired," said, Okay, here's a few thousand more troops, and in fact sent not just special operations forces, but infantry to go and I guess participate in the training and in the fighting against Al-Shabaab, as though they're ever going to be able to defeat them and declare some kind of victory for the government in Mogadishu. We all know already it could never achieve anything other than give SOCOM something to do for a while longer.

WOODS: Yeah, it's unbelievable what a marshmallow the guy turns out to be when – you're right when you say that his instincts are the instincts of any businessman or any normal person looking at the pros and cons and the pluses and minuses and saying, *It's all minuses. Why are we doing this?* And then they say, Well, you've got to keep doing. *All right.* Like, what is wrong with you?

So now here's my ham-handed segue into the discussion of the topic we have today. He did say some sound things about the war in Iraq – and we're talking about the one that started in 2003 under George W. Bush. He did say some good things about that, and he said that in South Carolina in front of a heavily pro-military state, which I thought was a good thing in and of itself. So now let's go back and talk about that. I mean, I guess people feel like, at this point, they know the story, that there were trumped up charges of weapons of mass destruction, that we had the anthrax attacks, and people tried to link that to Saddam, or that they said that al-Qaeda met with, whatever, there was a meeting in Prague with Iraqi intelligence, whatever the heck it was. And you knew that they were throwing out whatever they could to see what would stick. And I mean, none of it mattered to them. It was entirely cynical. But what can you tell us about this that kind of isn't what we've already heard?

HORTON: Okay, so there's so much that we could talk about, about how they got us into it. That could be the whole half hour, so we don't want to do that. But let me suffice it to say this: Junior and Rove and Cheney and Rumsfeld all had their own reasons for doing it. Junior, his dad; Rove, the election; Cheney, paying off his Halliburton cronies; Rumsfeld, his transformation of the military. And of course, then most importantly, really, the neoconservatives had their plan, which was all centered around the "clean break" for Israel, a policy they had come up with for Benjamin Netanyahu when he was originally the Prime Minister of Israel beginning in 1996. And it was written by David Wurmser, and it's so stupid, Tom. There's a companion piece with it called "Coping with Crumbling States." You can find both on my website, "A Clean Break" and "Coping with Crumbling States."

And essentially what they believe is what Ahmad Chalabi told them, that if they would get rid of Saddam, that that would, yes, empower the Shiite super majority of the country – 60%, the Shiite Arabs – and then America would have total dominance over them, the same way Saddam, essentially, I guess. And that they would be so grateful, though, for their liberation from Saddam and the birth of their new democracy and everything, that they would be totally compliant with us. And the original plan called for a Hashemite king, like a cousin of the King of Jordan to come and be installed, like in the days of the British Empire in the '20s, which is completely crazy. And then they ended up replacing that with Chalabi himself, was the plan, to be the new Shia leader, and then that was going to put so much pressure on Iran, that the people of Iran will rise up and overthrow their own government and install a pro-American one so that they can have wonderful democracy too. And that was at least the premise for the war.

Now, of course, I think some of the neo-cons really believe that kind of garbage. I think also, many of them, the policy simply was to spread chaos and to smash Iraq, one way or the other, to see what would happen. As Jonah Goldberg wrote in "Baghdad Delenda Est" in the *National Review*, that this is all about reversing Sykes-Picot the hard way. Let's just, as Ledeem put it, turn the whole region into a boiling cauldron here. But of course, the thing of it is, they did think that they would have dominance. I mean, we're the USA, so they thought everything would just go their way. And of course, that was crazy and stupid and wrong.

In fact, what happened instead was Iran was empowered, and their very best friends, their most favorite groups, the Dawa Party and the Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq, SCIRI, these were the Iraqi traitors who had fled from Iraq to Iran back in 1980 when Jimmy Carter had given the green light for Saddam Hussein to invade Iran in the aftermath of the Iranian Revolution. We talked about this before a little bit in previous episodes. Saddam was afraid that the super majority Shiite population of the country would identify more with the

Shiite revolution next door than with their nationalist and ethnic Arab identities. And some of them did. And that was one of the reasons that he launched the war, was to try to overthrow that Iranian Revolution as fast as he could to nip that whole thing in the bud. Of course, it turned into a horrible World-War-I-type war, trench warfare and chemical weapons, backed by Ronald Reagan and all that, as everyone knows, I hope, and was a was a horrible catastrophe. Half a million people killed on each side in the 1980s and all of that.

But so you can understand the reason behind that. I'm not saying it was okay or whatever, morally, but I'm saying you understand his reasoning there, was the fear that an Iraqi Shiite majority would be completely dominated by Iran. And in fact, these very factions, those who had fled Iraq and taken Iran's side in the Iran-Iraq war and fought on their side in the war, they came in on George W. Bush's heels in 2003, and they took over the government.

In 2004, the Ayatollah Sistani went outside, and he was favoring the Supreme Islamic Council, obviously – SCIRI, obviously. And he came out and he said, *If you believe in God* – that is, Allah is the same Yahweh, one god of the Hebrews and the Christians. I hope your audience all understands that. I'm sure they do. *If you believe in God, I want you to go outside and tell George W. Bush that you want one man, one vote.* And they did, all of them. Every Shia came out and said to Bush, essentially, *Ultimatum. You want to start this war all over again, pal? You're going to turn this whole thing over to us.*

And then that was it. From that point on every US Army and Marine and Air Force and Navy officer and SOCOM and everyone who ever fought in that war, CIA – everyone who ever fought in that war, they were doing the bidding of the ayatollahs the whole time, of Khomeini and Sistani. And they called it the El Salvador option, where Donald Rumsfeld hired the Badr Brigade from SCIRI's militia to hunt down and murder the leaders of all the Sunni insurgency. But of course it was like Somalia. They just go after all their enemies, whoever they want to fight, and fought a civil war, a massive sectarian cleansing campaign that killed approximately a million people. I mean, you had thousands and thousands of people killed every month throughout 2005, '06 and '07 and into '08. Sunnis just stacked like cordwood on the side of the road in the morning, as America fought the sectarian war for the Shiite Arabs to kick all the Sunnis out of Baghdad. It's the first time the Shia have controlled a capital city since they ruled Cairo, Egypt a thousand years ago.

And so this is key, okay? So Iraq War II wasn't just wrong to start for cynical reasons and this kind of thing, but it turned out to be total catastrophe, because by shifting the balance of power so far toward the Shia, that meant tilting the balance of power that far away from all of our allies, the Sunni kings of Arabia. And also, of course, this is Israel's policy backfiring and blowing up in our and their face and empowering Iran, by thousands of percents, however you measure it, giving their closest friends and allies control of all of south and eastern Iraq, and in alliance with the Kurds in the north, as well.

And so then this is why, and it's in the WikiLeaks, that Cheney traveled to Saudi to apologize to the king, and that the king gave him a dressing down and said, You were supposed to put the next Baathist in line, essentially, the next Sunni general behind Saddam Hussein in line, and instead, look what you've done. You've put Iran's friends in there, you schmuck. And so Cheney says, I'm sorry, I know.

And this is then the birth of the redirection. And guess who: Elliot Abrams led the thing. And the idea was, essentially, without ever admitting it to anyone else, oops, we just bought a

whole war for the Shiite ayatollahs, that especially the neocons hate so much and were trying to spite with this policy in the first place. So now what do we do? We tilt back toward the Sunni side, the Saudi king and his allies, Israel and Turkey, as well. And but what does this mean in practice? This means backing al-Qaeda suicide bomber terrorists, head-chopping lunatics, the al-Qaeda from Iraq enemy from Iraq War II that America fought on the Shiite side against. And they were the worst part of it. You can read in *The Washington Post*, CIA said it was the Saudis, our allies, the Saudis, were backing the Sunni insurgency against our guys the whole time. Approximately 4,000 out of the 4,500 Americans who died in Iraq War II died fighting against the Sunni-based insurgency that had as its worst part of it was al-Qaeda in Iraq. Famously Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's group.

But then, what does the redirection mean? It means that Bush, beginning in 2006 and '07 started backing al-Qaeda terrorists. The Saudis don't have a land army. They weren't going to somehow invade and take Baghdad back for the Sunnis. They just can't. It took the US Army and Marine Corps to give it to the Shia, to kick half the population, the Sunnis out. And so that can't be reversed with anything short of another Iraq War II in Baghdad, which no one's going to do. So instead, they start backing al-Qaeda groups in Lebanon, al-Qaeda groups in Syria, and al-Qaeda groups in Iran, namely Jundallah, who, get this: they kidnapped a bus full of Iranian generals and cut all their heads off.

Now, can you imagine if Iran had backed some terrorists that did that to a bus full of American generals in Virginia somewhere? What that would do to the American population? We'd carpet bombed the entire Middle East with H-bombs or some crazy thing. That was the kind of terrorism that America and Israel, and with Saudi help, of course, were sponsoring against Iran and their allies in Syria, and Hezbollah, of course, in southern Lebanon, beginning in '06.

So when Barack Obama, the worst traitor since Benedict Arnold and I think far surpassing Benedict Arnold, when he comes in and starts backing al-Qaeda in Libya and then al-Qaeda in Syria, Jabhat al-Nusra and leading to the rise of the Islamic State, all he's doing really is continuing that policy that he was left by George Bush, the redirection. Oops. There's no way to take back what they did in Iraq War II. The only thing they can do to make up for it is back the Saudis' al-Qaeda terrorists wherever they want it done. And that also meant supporting the military dictator in Egypt, when the Muslim Brotherhood overthrew the first dictator over Saudi's dead body and Israel's dead body, and an Obama let it happen finally, although he tried to appoint the head of the secret police to replace the guy. But anyway, after the Muslim Brotherhood was elected, the Saudis backed the military, the secular military dictatorship in overthrowing the Muslim Brotherhood, because they don't like Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. And so it's all about power. It's not all just about ideology. El-Sisi is just like Mubarak, right? Just like Saddam Hussein, a mustache, no beard. Olive green, you know, he's a field marshal in the military, in the western style, in the Mubarak, sock-puppet-of-the-Americans style.

And so that should be the template for your audience to understand all American foreign policy in the Middle East, essentially, from now on, is that Iraq War II was supposed to hurt Iran, according to Paul Wolfowitz, the brilliant genius and Richard Perle, the Prince of Darkness, as he calls himself and his friends call him. And instead, what happened is it empowered Iran by a thousand times, and that everything going on since then is America trying and, of course, mostly failing to make up for that fact by tilting back toward the Saudi kings and therefore their jihadist shock troops.

WOODS: All right, let me ask you this obvious question here, Scott. I'm not an expert on any of this stuff, but I knew that's what was going to happen. Ron Paul, his primary area is not foreign policy, but he knows an enormous amount about it. And he said, I'm pretty sure I can find him quoted as saying: if you're going to later be concerned about Iran, I'm pretty much guaranteeing you this war is going to empower Iran. So how is it possible that people who do this for a living, who were educated not in medical schools and not in what I was educated in, but who specialize in foreign policy – that's their thing. How can they honestly not have seen that? To the point where they make this major blunder, and then, as you say, they spend all their time now with all these makeshift approaches to try to put everything back together and solve the problem they first caused? I mean, could it just be stupidity? I mean, how do we account for this?

HORTON: Well, you know, the more cynical explanation is that they knew what was going to happen, and that the neoconservatives, because their primary allegiance is to the Likud Party in Israel and their doctrines, essentially supported the Yinon Plan, which is to sow chaos in as many places as possible in the Middle East, to separate as many warring tribes from each other within these nation states as possible in order to take all the heat off of Israel.

And I don't really think that – well, I guess I should say, I really *do* think that some of the neocons really did look at it that way. But I also think that, really, the most influential of all of them was the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Paul Wolfowitz. And I think that he really believed this stuff. And more than anything else, I think he really believed in himself, that, look at how smart I am. I got three things right before, and everybody knows that I'm Mr. Smart Guy that's always right about stuff – which is fine if you're sitting in your armchair, but it's not fine if you're starting wars, based on, *Trust me, guys. This is going to work out the way I say it's going to work out.*

Now, I have to say, I screwed up the Sunni and Shia side, but in 2002 before the war, I was saying, look, we have this problem at the end of Iraq War I, where the, as I put it on that show – getting it wrong, getting it opposite, but still correct, essentially – that the Iranians are the Sunnis and their allies, the Sunnis in Iraq, are the supermajority being kept subjugated by the Shia. And so once this war happens, you're going to have this new alliance of power in the new – whatever. So I had the names wrong, but I was just sitting in the KAOS Radio punk rock garage, man, and I was winging it, essentially.

In fact, I read a Tom Clancy novel in like 2000 or '99, where a secret agent of Iran assassinates Saddam Hussein in chapter one, and then automatically, the Iranians and the Shia come to dominate the south of the country. And then all the problems about how they are able to get along ruling over the Sunnis comes up as a constant agitation in the background of the story of how this is going. But essentially, they just automatically inherit the south as soon as Saddam drops dead in that story. And that's the kind of thing that people in DC read. I mean, you're absolutely right that everyone should have seen that.

But you know what too? You've got to remember the spirit of the time, which is that, *USA! Olive green army! And this is the most powerful military force in the whole wide world.* And no one can say anything to it. As Bush put it, when people said, "Hey, they're sniping our guys in Iraq, man. What's going on?" Bush said, *Bring them on. When it comes to this security situation, we have the force required to handle it.* That was what he said was his one regret of his entire presidency, was saying that, and deliberately baiting these guys into killing American soldiers, because parents had complained that, Thanks a lot, pal. Now my son's

dead for your brave talk from back here behind your wall, from your bunker deep underneath Nebraska, while America is being attacked.

But that was the attitude behind that, was that American soldiers are 12 feet tall, and therefore, they can do anything. And that includes rebuilding an entire society. That includes remaking an entire region in a way that's conducive to American interests. I mean, the idea was that Saddam's army was what stood in our way and that that would be over in two or three weeks, which it was. But if you remember at the time, was any saying that, oh, the Iraqi people are never going to stand for this? The idea was that they were like these sort of amorphous blobs in the background. They were extras in our movie, and they weren't supposed to have a say in this.

Paul Bremer, should be famously, asked a little blonde Republican daughter aide to his, who, she was only there because her father was rich and had donated to the Republican Party kind of thing, and so that was why she was his righthand man in running the occupation. And he says to her, "Who's this Muqtada al-Sadr guy?" And she says, only because she doesn't know anything about it, "Oh, don't worry about him. He's just some minor cleric." Except that, yeah, no, he's not. He's the second or third most powerful man in all of Iraqi Shiastan in the south and east of that country. His father and his father-in-law were both famously murdered and martyred by Saddam Hussein. And Saddam's city was immediately renamed Sadr City, the day George Bush invaded or the day Baghdad fell. And yeah, you might want to take note of that. This guy might have to be accommodated somehow or another. And instead, they just attacked him and demonized him and accused him of being the Iranian agent when they were the ones who were backing the Iranian agents, his rivals for power on the Shiite side. Anyway, I'm in the weeds here, but I think you hear me.

WOODS: I do, I do. Now, as we assess this, I mean, this is obviously the major piece of the war on terror. Obviously, there's the war in Afghanistan that still persists, but the scope and the scale of this thing and the propaganda that went into it. There are still people on the right wing, who – and you and I did an episode on this a long time ago – who will still to this day, say, "Oh, they did find WMD is in Iraq. They found some chemical weapons, and they found some missiles that went too far and stuff like that. So in other words, there are people who are defending propositions that the US regime itself abandoned a long time ago. Like George W. Bush doesn't defend any of them. So what's the deal with that?"

HORTON: I can explain that specifically. Okay, there's a *New York Times* story. It's from October 14th, 2014, and it's called "US Casualties of Iraqi Chemical Weapons." And what it's about is American soldiers who were exposed to chemical weapons that they found during Iraq War II. Okay, but here's what it also says in that article:

"The United States had gone to war declaring it must destroy an active weapons-of-mass-destruction program. Instead, American troops gradually found and ultimately suffered from the remnants of long-abandoned programs, built in close collaboration with the West. The discoveries of these chemical weapons did not support the government's invasion rationale." After the terrorist attacks of September 11th, Bush said 'active program' – that's a little redundant. The UN inspectors said they couldn't find them. Then they say, "During the long occupation, American troops began encountering old chemical munitions in hidden caches and roadside bombs, typically 155 millimeter artillery shells," etc., etc. "They were remnants of an arms program Iraq had rushed into production in the 1980s during the Iran-Iraq war." In other words, when Saddam's government was supported by the United States, and those arms

were being bought with your money from our European allies and being targeted against Iranian troops with American satellites and CIA intelligence, okay?

And again, back to *The New York Times* here: "All had been manufactured before 1991." That is, when George Bush Sr. betrayed Saddam Hussein and launched Iraq War I. Then it says, "Participants in the chemical weapons discovery said the US suppressed knowledge of the finds for multiple reasons, including that the government bristled at further acknowledgment that it had been wrong." They needed to say that they had found something from after 1991 from the time right leading up to the attack, and all they could find was from the pre-1991 era. And so that was why they covered it up.

So, perfectly good question. If they found chemical weapons, why didn't George Bush say, "See? They found chemical weapons." And the answer is, because his father and Ronald Reagan had bought those chemical weapons for Saddam Hussein back before his father had started Iraq War I in 1990 and '91. And at the end of that war, famously now, it should be, they tried to hide a little bit of chemical weapons, but the UN busted them and destroyed all of it by the end of 1991. And zero chemical weapons of any description were produced in Iraq after that date.

The entire rationale not just for Iraq War II, but for Bill Clinton's Iraq War One and a Half. For eight years, Bill Clinton bombed Iraq, provoking the 9/11 attack, because he was doing it from bases in Saudi Arabia, waging that blockade and bombing them routinely, as Ron Paul complained about numerous times that this was provoking terrorist attacks against the United States, such as when he called for Clinton's impeachment in December of 1998. You can check his famous speech on YouTube about that, which I saw live at a time.

And so the chemical weapons, supposedly, the continued presence of these weapons of mass destruction were the excuse for that continued war by the Bill Clinton government against Iraq all through the 1990s and leading up to Iraq War II, in the name of the idea that even Clinton's Iraq War One and a Half and limitless weapons inspections hadn't quite gotten the job done, and so we had to go and finish it. And the whole thing was a big, fake pretext. And Scott Ritter, the former chief weapons inspector back then, told me on the show that they knew for a fact by 1995 that every bit of that stuff had been found and destroyed or at least declared. None of it was being hidden, and certainly none of it was being manufactured. And they knew that for certain by the end of '95. And that's a whole other story I could get into about Hussein Kamel, but people can just Google that.

WOODS: All right, so this is really an exercise in showing – I hate to say unintended consequences, because half the time they intend the consequences, these SOBs, but let's say unanticipated? I mean, I don't know. But they did one thing, and the consequences are *staggering*, across a huge array of areas and peoples and the radicalization of peoples and the – I mean, this was supposed to yield a wave of democratization in the Middle East. We may even have forgotten that that was the propaganda, because it's so removed from reality. We may have forgotten that that's what they were saying. But that's what Bill Kristol told everybody.

HORTON: See, this is so important, because the neoliberals – that is, the conservative Democrats and the neoconservatives, the liberal Republicans. These centrist extremist kind of kooks, they are essentially the funhouse-mirror, horror-movie version of libertarians. They're not communists, and they're not fascist. Irving Kristol wrote a book called *Two Cheers for*

Capitalism. They're moderate centrists, which means extremists on a lot of things, including imperialism. And what they've done, Tom, is they take our good name, that was the true heritage of the American Declaration of Independence, natural rights theory for one and all, and they say that that's what they're doing. They go, "Look at me. I'm Tom woods, spreading liberty." And then they invade Iraq and kill all these people. And they make it look like it's our philosophy of freedom.

Look at all the liberals who try to beat us over the head with Somalia. *Oh, yeah, freedom works so well. Look at Somalia.* Well, look at your ignorance. It's the most powerful government ever that has done that to the people of Somalia. You think it was freedom that hurt them so bad? Imagine if you were really stuck thinking that. That, *We see what happens when people are free. Their land turns into Somalia. We need good Democrats to tell everyone what to do.* I mean, that's just horrible. And that's what they've done. They told the whole world, "This is what freedom looks like." An American 19-year-old whose boots are soaked in blood, carrying a rifle, killing people who never —

Look, that list is seven countries we talked about that Somalia was on in the last episode? Of all these countries that the neocons targeted for regime change. Seven countries in five years, that was the plan, and we've attacked one and all of them, at least in some sense, ever since then, and some of them in full-scale wars regime change. None of those countries had any tie whatsoever to the al-Qaeda terrorists that attacked the United States. None of them. And not one of the people who died in any of those wars, in Iraq, in Somalia, in Yemen — maybe a couple in Yemen — in Syria, none of these people had any — Libya. None of these people had anything to do with picking a fight with us. None of them did anything to us at all. It's America is completely on a rampage here.

And you know what? The die was cast on the first night. Bush didn't say, "We're declaring war on al-Qaeda, because the CIA says bin Laden did this, and so that's who we're going to go get." He said, "We're declaring war on terrorism." And then later, terror. Your reaction to, who knows what? Maybe terrorism, maybe something else, I don't know. Until you're no longer afraid, we're going to wage war anywhere in the world, wherever we want. And they were writing themselves a writ. They were exploiting our anger and fear in order to get away with blue, bloody murder, the kind of thing that if any other country in the world was doing it, our country would be using it as an excuse to attack them.

And it really has taken the very good name of freedom back, huge amounts. George Bush was talking essentially like us. Bill Clinton would do this too. What we're doing, we're spreading free markets and democracy. In other words, self-government and private property ownership. Libertarianism, is what he called it. But it was imperialism. It wasn't Murray Rothbard; it was Thomas Friedman. And Thomas Friedman famously says, "The velvet glove of the market must cover the mailed fist of the American Empire to enforce it." You can't have capitalism without an empire, which is what the communists would say, too. And maybe they're right, because look at us. Because the business interests buy off the Congress for a dime a dozen, and then they'll kill people all day long for 50 cents.

WOODS: All right. Scott Horton Week's pretty demoralizing [laughing], I'm sorry to say.

HORTON: No, you know what? I'll turn this around. This is a great opportunity for real libertarians to say, no, we don't need to go further to the left and further to the right. We don't need to abandon freedom, what we all believe in as the source of our problems,

because it's not the source of our problems. It's doing all these things that we're not supposed to be doing that's built up our debt to \$22 trillion, that's got us all soaked in blood and the resentment of the whole world. All we've got to do is stop acting wrong and start acting right, and we'll be fine. So how's that?

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: All we've got to do is be libertarians, not socialists and not brown shirts. Come on. It's freedom that works right. Ask Rothbard and Mises and Ron Paul, they'll tell you. Ask Tom Woods.

WOODS: And there are things that – you were talking about mistakes like this and reminded me, you and I have a mutual friend, that you may not know, her mother doesn't quite get libertarianism. She knows that her daughter's a libertarian. And so she says – but she thinks she understands it. So she said, "No, I do know what a libertarian is, like Donald Rumsfeld." I thought, oh my gosh, are you kidding me? You think Donald – but the thing is, Rumsfeld has apparently on one occasion, he described himself as a libertarian. I mean, it's just makes me insane.

HORTON: Yeah, to him it means that he's in favor of capitalism. Groovy, dude. Just the most general definition that you could, the kind of thing that you hear like from Drew Carey, the guy from *The Price Is Right*, who says, Yeah, we're fiscal conservatives and social liberals. This is like the most kind of dumbed-down definition of a libertarian, that we're not hardcore born-again-Christian Pat Robertson types, and we're not Cortez social democrats either. Well, geez. And we're not Hillary Clinton Democrats, either. But there's got to be a tighter definition of libertarianism than that, but a lot of people don't realize it.

WOODS: Yeah, and you notice – Right. And that whole fiscally conservative, socially liberal, shorthand definition, notice that – I mean, I object to that characterization anyway, because I think it makes it sound like we don't really have a philosophy; we just borrow from these people and we borrow from those. No, no, no. We have a philosophy more than they do.

HORTON: Well, and ours is the original philosophy of the Declaration of Independence. They're the ones who are deviationists from the true American way.

WOODS: Right.

HORTON: How do you like that?

WOODS: But you notice also that "fiscally conservative, socially liberal" leaves war out. You don't know where the person stands on war on the basis of that. And given that I think war is the most important thing out there, that is a deeply unsatisfactory definition.

HORTON: Well, it's anti-imperialism. And you know what? I know that word can make people kind of react, especially on the right. People aren't used to hearing somebody who's not a communist call America an Empire.

WOODS: Right.

HORTON: But Pat Buchanan calls it that. It is what it is, pal. And the Empire is treason to the Republic. That's the deal. You can't have it both ways.

WOODS: Right. Yeah, no kidding. All right, look, we're going to wrap it up here. I'm going to remind people: Scott is working on the definitive work here on the war on terror, for libertarians, but for the whole world. And there's nobody better to do it, so we want to support this project, help Scott along as he works on and finishes it. And this week – this is July 24th now as we're speaking to you, we've got a gentleman who is going to match everything donated to Scott and to this project. He's going to match it, so you're going to get twice the bang for your buck, if you help Scott out this week. And remember, I'm not asking you to do something I don't do myself. I support Scott every single month. You can do this over at TomWoods.com/Horton. Everybody, let's all be a part of this. We're all going to be proud that we were part of this. So TomWoods.com/Horton –

HORTON: And you can write it off on your taxes.

WOODS: And you can write it off on your taxes, because it's going to redirect to the Libertarian Institute, and that's a 501(c)(3). You can write off on your taxes. Thank you for reminding me that, because that's a really great aspect of all this. All right, that is it for this episode. Scott, we're going to pick up in Episode 1455 tomorrow, so thanks again and we'll talk to everybody then.

HORTON: Thank you.