



Episode 1,455: Scott Horton Week: The Whole Truth About Syria

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: What I'd like you to do in this episode is, before we get into the details, let's start off with you giving us like a three-minute story arc of where we start and where we wind up, so that as you're filling in the details, people will know the basic story.

HORTON: All right, the three-minute version is, remember, Bush had screwed up by empowering Iran in Iraq, and so then he realized that and launched the redirection, which was tilt back toward the Saudi kings, and this meant backing them and their jihadists allies. Now, that first of all meant for the war in Libya in 2011. But then Hillary Clinton said this was her bank shot, that we'll take the jihadists, the veterans of Iraq War II, the Libyan veterans of Iraq War II, Zarqawi's guys, al-Qaeda in Iraq from Iraq War II, who had fought with American support in Libya, and we'll send them on to Syria, along with their weapons. And this is, of course, how the ambassador got killed in 2012. That whole thing about Benghazi being fake security in the stand-down order, that's the limited hangout. That's the fake controversy to distract you from the real controversy, which is: why was the CIA working with Qatar to transfer a bunch of arms and jihadist terrorists from Libya, America's enemies from just a year before? I mean, we actually still had American troops in Iraq throughout 2011.

Anyway, that was the real scandal, was they were taking all these terrorists and the guns and sending them on to Syria to fight against Assad. And why were they doing that? As Barack Obama explained to Jeffrey Goldberg in *The Atlantic*: to bring Iran down a peg. Bush had empowered them in Iraq War II. We can't undo that, but maybe we can take away Iran's friend in Bashar al-Assad's Shiite-backed Baathist regime in Syria. And that was the reason that in 2011, with the dawn of the Arab Spring, America, Saudi, Qatar, Turkey, and Israel all started backing a bunch of terrorists.

And they knew they were terrorists. They were coming from Saudi Arabia from the very beginning. From the summer of 2011, we know that. From the summer 2011, we know that the French special forces and spies were on the ground helping to organize the resistance, and the Americans were soon to follow. They had a new finding from Obama authorizing intervention and arming the terrorists by – well, it was reported in December, so it was certainly done by November of 2011, probably a couple of months before that. And they knew that they were the terrorists, and they admitted it. The State Department said Jabhat al-Nusra is nothing but an alias for al-Qaeda in Iraq, in Syria. The bad guys from Iraq War II now come, and now they're the moderate rebels, and we support them.

And that is what led to the rise of the Islamic State, which then was, oh, my God, a huge catastrophe of a blowback of too great of a – Oh, as George W. Bush would say, a

catastrophic success. It was so good, they did such a good job backing these terrorists, the terrorists, some of them, they didn't take out Assad. They went east, back into Iraq, and they seized all of western Iraq. And so that was the absolute embarrassment, public relations disaster for Obama. So that was when he then launched Iraq War III, guess what, back on the side of the Iraqi Shia, the Iraqi Shiite army that Bush and Petraeus had built —

WOODS: Hurry up. We've got to be a three-minute summary.

HORTON: — and the Shiite militias. And so that's who gained, is the very same guys that we wished we hadn't fought Iraq War II for and backed all these terrorists in resentment against that previous policy. Had to reinstitute that exact same policy again. And that's where we are right now with the end of the actual Islamic State, but a continuing fight on the Shiite side in Iraq against those Sunnis, still like it's 2005.

WOODS: All right, now —

HORTON: That makes sense.

WOODS: Yes. Now we're going to start going through — so first of all, before we get into the Syria thing, when you say Iraq War III, describe again exactly how this is distinct from previous — when does it take place, and what does it involve that makes it distinct?

HORTON: Okay, so ISIS broke away from al-Qaeda in Syria and al-Qaeda overall, Ayman al-Zawahiri in the spring of 2013. And they essentially at that time consolidated power over eastern Syria. And this was actually a doctrinal fight inside al-Qaeda, because the whole point of al-Qaeda attacking America was that, as long as America's there to back their enemies in the region, they'll never get anywhere, and how are they supposed to create their caliphate as long as America's backing all their local kings and dictators? So that's why: to bog us down, bleed us to bankruptcy, force us out in the long game, the hard way, replicating the war against the Soviets in Afghanistan. So only then can you try to create your caliphate.

Well, Baghdadi, the leader of al-Qaeda in Iraq, aka ISIS, he decided he didn't want to wait, and Ayman al-Zawahiri's hiding in his mommy's basement over in Pakistan somewhere or something, and so who's he to tell me what to do? And so he decided he was going to create his caliphate now. And so through 2013, he consolidated eastern Syria.

And then famously in June of 2014, he rolled into eastern Iraq and seized all of it in like two weeks: Mosul, and in fact, Fallujah, they'd already raised the Black Flag, just sort of snuck in. But Fallujah, Ramadi, Mosul, Tikrit, Saddam Hussein's hometown, and some other minor towns as well. I'm not sure if they ever took Samarra. I think Samarra stayed in Shiite hands, if I remember right. But anyway, they just seized a huge area of essentially all of Western Iraqi Sunnistan that had been the losers, the big losers in Iraq War II, that America had fought on the Shiite side.

And so then you had literally the Islamic State. And this guy Baghdadi declared himself the divinely ordained caliph, the Caliph Ibrahim like in the mandate from the Quran for there to be a Muslim leader, and whatever this and that — I don't know the chapters. But anyway, that was his claim. And they were, of course, they were al — what do you think al-Qaeda would be like if they ever succeeded in really creating a government? Yeah, exactly. Butchers, war

criminals, Berserker murderers. And they went completely nuts in committing war crimes all over the place. But for a time, they had a land the size of Great Britain with a population equal to the population of Great Britain, a taxation authority, an army that at one point was as many as 100,000 men, if you counted them up from the different battlefields they were fighting on at one time. And taxation and conscription, they took over all the local government offices, and they really did create a state there for a while.

As I told you at the time, back five years ago now, we don't have to fight them. They're surrounded by enemies, who will all – and they're the worst. These guys are going to burn themselves out in no time at all. They marginalized themselves right out of society back in '06. They were almost dead when Obama resuscitated them in 2011 with all the CIA money, him and Brennan. If they hadn't done that, these guys were completely on the ropes. But America did. Obama went ahead, in his embarrassment, went ahead and launched Iraq War III in August of 2014. And that was essentially an air war and a special operations war in alliance, again, embedded with the Shia. Called it the El Salvador Option, again, embedding with the Shia Badr Brigade, aka the Iraqi army, and Muqtada al-Sadr militias and Asa'ib ahl al-Haq and these other groups, who are many of them backed and armed by Iran. This was all, again, supposed to spite Iran, and all it did was empower them even further, again, in their new victory.

So Obama started that war in 2014. Trump inherited it in 2017. And by then, at the beginning of 2017, all that was really left was Mosul in Iraq and Raqqa in eastern Syria. And Trump finish that war by October of – well, Mosul by October of 2017 was the final assault, and then Raqqa was – well, I won't say liberated, but freed of the Islamic State, I guess by the beginning of 2018. So that was really the war. You could say 2014 through the end of 2017, I think.

WOODS: So what would you say the pros and cons or the pluses and minuses of this are? Now, obviously, we tend to think it's all minuses, but did the US gain anything through this? Did anything good come out of it?

HORTON: No. I mean, not really at all. They had a regime change in Iraq from the Dawa Party to the Supreme Islamic Council, but as I explained in the last show, those were both Iran's pets, and the guy in charge, al-Mahdi, is actually from SCIRI. And essentially, it's like this, and this is the worst thing I'll ever say about Iran, and it's as true as can be: that they took full advantage of Bush's war in Iraq War II. And that means they helped their allied forces mercilessly slaughter Sunnis and kicked them out of the capital city.

And that was a part of their doctrine, and in agreement with the Dawa and SCIRI factions, that they didn't want to rule the Sunnis. Like in that Tom Clancy novel, it didn't make sense for the Shia to take power and then have Saddam Hussein's same problem of trying to rule the other massive sect, which is mostly geographically distinct and separate. So why not just cut them loose?

And in fact, the Shia have all the oil in the south and in the north near Kurdish territory, near Kirkuk. This is the reason the Sunnis had to dominate the central government in Baghdad, so they could steal all that oil money from the north and the south. But if the north and the south were free of them, they could just let the Sunnis burn in the sun. Who cares about them? You know, that's how Petraeus ended the war against them, was he gave a bunch of money and promises that they were going to get jobs in the government. But that never

happened. The Shias that America put in power there are extremely chauvinist and are just hell-bent on revenge, tit for tat, no mercy.

And so that was why they were able to seize western Iraq, is because it was no-man's land. They had been forsaken, essentially. It was ungoverned territory, wide open for the taking. And I don't think that's changed. In other words, the Sunnis have this goal of somehow taking back Baghdad they can never take, when in fact, they can't even rule their own territory.

WOODS: Let's talk about Syria, because I think everybody feels like he has to have an opinion on the situation in Syria, because it's been on the table for so long. And yet, I think most people feel like: I don't quite get it. I know that Assad, I'm told by everybody is a bad guy, but I'm also told that he's at least secular, which means he may be better than any goof-off they might install in this place. I know the Russians are involved. The US is involved. I know that the US is involved for big-picture reasons involving Iran. Where do I even begin? Where do people begin?

HORTON: Well, it's Barack Obama, 2011, in alliance, again, with Saudi, Qatar, Israel, Turkey intervening, started pouring tons of money and guns into backing a Sunni-based insurgency, just like Iraq War II, and led by the worst part, the vanguard of it, al-Qaeda in Iraq from Iraq War II. Al-Qaeda in Iraq in Syria, Jabhat al-Nusra, sworn blood oath, loyal to Ayman al-Zawahiri. And it took billions of dollars and billions of dollars' worth of weapons and all kinds of training and supplies and food and trucks and all kinds of support from the West for these al-Qaeda terrorists to essentially tear Syria apart.

For all their garbage propaganda about mythical moderate rebels who were fighting here, Barack Obama himself said this is nonsense. It was his policy. *We're backing the moderates against all comers.* Well, he went and listed in an interview with Thomas Friedman, he goes, *The idea, Tom Friedman, that we were going to create an army out of a bunch of school teachers and doctors and pharmacists and lawyers and decent middle class folk, and they were going to take on al-Qaeda on one side and the Syrian state and their Iranian and Hezbollah allies on the other, I mean, come on, man. This is crazy and stupid.* "It's pure fantasy." That's what he said, like the free-falling elevator in Oklahoma City. "Pure fantasy." But anyway, he did it anyway. He backed al-Qaeda in the name of that fantasy anyway. And so that was what led to the rise of the Islamic State.

Now, Bashar al-Assad is, of course, exactly what you say: a secular dictator, and a murderous one. And in fact, his Baathist government was sitting on top of a 70% Sunni majority. Now, nothing like 100% of that 70% supported this war. And in fact, I think more than half of them supported the state all along and never did support this. So it wasn't a purely sectarian war. But it is the truth that it's very small minority groups that rule the state there. The Alawites are a very small faction. They sort of predate and sort of are a break-off of the Shia, and they're in close alliance with the Shia. But they also have an alliance with the Druze and three or four different kinds of Christians: Maronites, Chaldeans, Assyrians, and whichever all — including one sect that still speaks Aramaic, the language of Jesus' era in ancient Palestine. And many Sunnis, too, supported this secular state.

And so it's true that the methods of the Syrian state have been absolutely crude and over the long-term, effective, but maybe counterproductive in many cases, too. And they're absolutely ruthless in putting down this insurgency. But, you know, it wasn't a rebellion. It really was a foreign invasion by mercenary terrorists. I mean, we have it in *The Observer* from Alistair

Crook from the summer of 2011: Prince Bandar is sending jihadists from Saudi. I mean, that's all you need to know that they are replaying Iraq War II, only instead of against the United States this time, and our Shiite allies in Iraq War II, it's against Assad this time. But for the same reasons: they're friends with Iran.

And to listen to the American propaganda about this war in the papers, but especially on TV, I mean, they would really have you believe that Assad is killing civilians, full stop. That's the entire narrative of the whole war, right? That apparently, this guy only wakes up in the morning to murder his own people, as they say, and only American support for the scrappy rebels attempting to resist him is holding him at bay from killing every last Syrian. I mean, how upside down and crazy and false is that narrative?

And just look at what happened. In every case where the Syrian state was able to reestablish a monopoly on force in one of these cities where al-Qaeda had a presence, once al-Qaeda was gone, peace broke out, and all the people came back, and the government stopped bombing those areas. They're not sitting there bombing civilians who are being protected by al-Qaeda. That's crazy. That's nonsense. Just look at how it's played out.

And then what happened was Donald Trump – well, and we talked about how this led to – well, let me talk about Russia. In 2015, so this is after the Islamic State had been created and Obama had launched the war against it, in the middle of that war, the Islamic State in Syria started moving further to the west. And it was actually cooperating for a time or working more or less in conjunction with al-Qaeda and other allied groups in order to really threaten Damascus. And at that point, only after four and a half years of this, at that point, the Russians intervene with their air force and started bombing all of the CIA's pet terrorists there.

And you could hear all the American media people who, essentially, they don't know anything except these are their talking points, this is what we're all supposed to believe, this is our simple narrative, just like Saddam's weapons of mass destruction, just like "only Hillary can win this election" or whatever narrative that they believe in, that they just don't allow any dissent inside the bubble. They don't allow anyone to object to this.

In fact, if you think about the show *Morning Joe*, there's one guy that they respected enough, and I guess knew them personally close enough, and that's Jeffrey Sachs, this economist, and he's one of the guys who helped destroy Russia in the '90s. But anyway, this guy Jeffrey Sachs would go on *Morning Joe* and say, *Listen, this is crazy*. And then he would say what I just told you, essentially about this narrative of the war. And he would just say: what you guys are saying is just totally wrong. I mean, America is backing a bunch of suicide-bomber, crazy terrorists. These aren't moderate rebels.

They're moderate rebels? John McCain's friend, the Northern Storm Brigade, they admitted they were part of al-Qaeda in Iraq and had fought in Iraq War II against Americans. And he went and posed with them on the porch. And guess what. They sold Steven Sotloff to ISIS, who cut his head off, John McCain's friends in the Northern Storm Brigade, the moderate.

Or the al-Farouq Brigade. *Hey, they say they want to hold elections*. Oh, here's a picture of their commander eating a dead soldiers' heart. But other than that, he's pretty moderate, though. And then here's Nour al-Zenki, the CIA's favorite terrorist for a time there. And here they, are cutting the head off of a young fighter. And he looked very young; people think he

was 12. It turns out he was actually 19 and was a fighter. But still, they butchered him like an animal, cut his head off in the back of his pickup truck, and made all these American warmongers on Twitter have to eat crow for one day, that, *Oh, well, they used to be moderate before we abandoned them*, or whatever narrative. And these guys are nuts.

And so that doesn't mean that every civilian death caused by the Syrian government or Hezbollah or Iran or Russia on their side of the war is somehow justified. But the idea that they are all in alliance, waging a war against the people of Syria, and that America, Saudi, Qatar, Turkey, and Israel are the ones that are trying to save the poor Syrian people by backing their plucky moderate rebel resistance is just a lie. It's just not true. It never was true.

And as, again, Barack Obama said to Jeffrey Goldberg in the spring of 2012, the article is, "As President, I Don't Bluff." And that means, he promises to go to war with Iran if it comes down to it. And he's saying to Jeffrey Goldberg, *Will you please tell the Israel lobby that I really, really, really mean it, that I never, never, ever will let Iran get a nuke? They don't believe me, but they'll believe you.* That's essentially the point of the interview. And that's Jeffrey Goldberg's role as Commissar of Israel's interests in American media.

And anyway, so Goldberg says to Obama, Hey, if we got rid of Assad, don't you think that would be a good way to weaken Iran? And Obama says, Yes, that's what we're doing. That's why we're doing it. Oh, yeah. Here's a little lip service for the poor civilians we care about. But anyway, back to Iran. That's right. And then Goldberg says, Well, geez, can you tell me more about what you're doing and your efforts there? And Obama says, Well, I could tell you, but you don't have a high enough level security clearance, Jeff. In other words, I could tell you, but I'd have to kill you. In other words, there's a CIA operation going on right now to back a bunch of suicide bombers, to take out Assad, to take Iran down a peg, because Bush brought them up two pegs in Iraq War II. Now we're going to go for our consolation prize.

But then, of course, what happened? Hezbollah came. Iran's Quds Force and Revolutionary Guard Corps showed up. And Russia came back to the Middle East for the first time since the Soviet Union disintegrated. And the entire policy, just like Iraq War II was supposed to spite Iran, only empowered Iran. Not only is Iran a friend of Assad; he is now their dependent. What would he ever do without them? And their position inside his country is incredibly enhanced because of Obama's war there.

And it's just treason, because, look, al-Qaeda – and I know a lot of people disagree about this, but I'm not really interested in that. The real truth is al-Qaeda did the 9/11 attack. They are butchers of American civilians. And our government has taken the mandate to fight terrorism, and they've done this bait and switch, where not only do they take out these secular dictators, they take out al-Qaeda's polar opposites, the revolutionary Shiite regime in Iran, which loves nothing more than killing ISIS.

And if you watch the Tucker Carlson show, you'll see Colonel Douglas McGregor, and Tucker will say, Well, gee whiz, Colonel McGregor, doesn't Iran kill al-Qaeda and ISIS? And McGregor says, That's right, Tucker. Iran ran kills al-Qaeda and ISIS. Now, our government is essentially insisting that we prefer to fight Israel's enemies to our own, that we should side with al-Qaeda, butchers of American civilians and soldiers in order to spite Iran, which is actually not the enemy of the American people, but stands in the way of American dominance in the

Middle East. So our government has rivals, and they prefer to ally with *our* enemies against *their* rivals. It's treason.

And it's not because Obama is a secret Muslim, or John Brennan's a secret Muslim. It's because Barack Obama's a secret and George W. Bush. The redirection policy begins with George W. Bush. And George W. Bush, after all, was just doing what Bill Clinton did backing the terrorists in Bosnia and in Kosovo. He just took a short break after 9/11 for a minute and then went right back to it. And Bill Clinton, of course, was just picking up where Reagan and Bush and Jimmy Carter before them had left off, in backing the Mujahideen in Afghanistan. So this is long-standing American policy to do this. It's not that Obama's from Kenya; it's that Obama is George W. Bush. That was why he did it.

And to Trump's credit, he ended that program. But what does he say? *We have to stay in Syria. Belay my last command to get out of Syria. Okay, we're staying.* And as he said, *We have to say Iraq? Why? To watch Iran.* In other words, to check Iranian influence in Iraq, that we have empowered again and again, we have to stay there longer, forever now. Which is funny, because actually, we're still embedded with the Shiite forces in Iraq fighting against the remnants of ISIS, the last of the Sunni insurgency, still fighting an Iraqi Sunnistan. Even as he says that, we're still allied with the allies that George W. Bush picked in 2003. Isn't that fun, except horrible?

WOODS: Well, I'd like to actually ask you something, if I may, that I'd like to have a pithy answer to.

HORTON: Okay.

WOODS: And that is the Tulsi Gabbard and Assad situation, because she has to defend herself constantly.

HORTON: Right.

WOODS: Like in the debates, *Well, what about you meeting with Assad or things you've said about him*, or whatever. What's the truth of that, and what would be the Scott Horton take on it?

HORTON: Yeah, well, the truth of that is that she's good on this. As I said before in that Somalia episode, she is – well, look at the reality. Okay, she was stationed at Balad Air Base in the Sunni triangle in Iraq War II. Now, she wasn't in firefights and that kind of thing, but she was – there was I guess a field hospital there, so she saw the direct result of brutal American and presumably other casualties at that base. And so she is an interested party, man. She's seen her people – and she's an officer. She is a currently serving major in the Hawaii National Guard. Her unit is deployed right now while she's sitting in the House and running for president.

So for her, one, it's personal. But two, she knows who's on whose side. These lip gloss idiots on CNN, they don't know anything about who's on whose side. History began this morning, as far as they know. And they read their little teleprompter and fake their little outrage. But she knows. And so she's saying what I'm saying to you, which is: backing al-Qaeda just because you hate Iran more, when al-Qaeda knocked our towers down, not Iran or their Hezbollah friends?

Any American ought to know better than that. Any American who's not Barack Obama or Hillary Clinton or David Petraeus, spit, ought to know better than that.

And so she's good on that. And she went there and met with Assad and did her little fact-finding trip. And when Trump was running for president and was saying good things like, *Geez, why would we be fighting on al-Qaeda's side, or why would we be standing in the way of Iran and Russia and Syria when all they want to do is fight ISIS and al-Qaeda? We should just let them do that* – he was saying that in the campaign, which is, of course, part of what was driving the establishment into an absolute insane fit, right?

Well, she went and briefed him. She went and met with Trump and said, *Look, forget partisanship or personality politics* – and I've ever read credibly that she was auditioning for a job or anything, either. She went to tell him, *Listen, you are right about Syria. Sunni this, Shia that, and you are doing good, and don't give into them on this. They're going to talk you in circles, but you stand your ground.* That was why she went to reinforce what was obvious to him from the outside, as well, and what Michael Flynn was telling him at the time, as well. And Michael Flynn has a particular brain, but on this he made sense in some cases.

WOODS: I didn't even know she did that. That's an amazing thing.

HORTON: But so that's why they hate her guts, is because she's good on this. And I mean, you think, *Oh, you're an Assad stooge. You're in Assad toady. You're this, that.* You know, Meghan McCain, the disgusting Meghan McCain said on *The View*, like had her right there to her face said, "When I think of Tulsi Gabbert, I think of Assad stooge." What does that even mean? Is that even a complete sentence? When you think of this, you think of that? Is that supposed to be an accusation? You calling me as stooge; do you want to define it? Like, what was that?

And of course, instead of – she should have really stuck it to her and said, "Let's talk about your father's friends, the Northern Storm Brigade, who sold Steven Sotloff to ISIS, who cut his head off. \$20,000, how many pieces of silver is that, traitor's scum spawn? Now, tell me again about Bashar al-Assad." That's what she should have said.

But anyway, she went, *Come on, don't be ridiculous. Assad is fighting these al-Qaeda guys, and that's bad.* But that's how crazy the narrative is here. That's how powerful the media bubble narrative is, where there's just no dissent allowed in, hardly ever, at all. I mentioned that Jeffrey Sachs character, because he was the one guy out of a million shows about Syria. S.E. Cupp would have the great Dave Smith on there, and S.E. Cupp is full 100% into this stuff. And Dave Smith would be like, *I don't believe it. No way. See, that's not right.* And she goes, *Assad's the worst person in the world. And Dave's like, Yeah, but what about Jilani, the leader of al-Qaeda? You sure he's not worse? He just killed 20 Druze for refusing to convert, lady. What's going on here?* But you know what? Hey, I know what side I'm on. It's that Upton Sinclair quote, where it's hard to teach a man a truth that his salary is dependent on him not understanding.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: So it just goes on. It's really incredible to see. And especially if you know who's who from the beginning, to watch this unfold in slow motion is, hey, the time of my life, man. I'll tell you what.

WOODS: So as we wrap up for today, just as a quick reminder, as of late July 2019, what is the situation right now in Syria?

HORTON: Okay, so America has troops embedded with the Syrian Kurds in northeastern Syria. They are occupying a small base called Al-Tanf down near the Jordanian and Iraqi border in the southeast. And al-Qaeda still has one last big readout in the Idlib province in the northwest of the country. So the Islamic State is no more. There are still scattered ISIS fighters here and there in western Iraq. I don't know if I've heard that any of them are really left in Syria anywhere. But all of the different terrorists who have lost all the different battles across Syria and survived, though, have fled now to the Idlib province in the northwest bordering Lebanon there, where Hezbollah keeps them out. And they're hemmed in by Turkey in the north and the Syrian Arab Army in the south.

And the Syrian Arab Army, that's the state army, was going to try to invade them last fall, but at the last minute, the Turks and the Russians made a deal, essentially over Assad's head, and said, okay, we're going to have a ceasefire now. We're going to separate out the incorrigible jihadists from the more moderate fighters and figure out what to do later. But then that never happened.

And so essentially, there is an al-Qaeda now, led by Abu Muhammad al-Jilani, is his name, and he is blood-oath sworn loyal to Ayman al-Zawahiri, the butcher of New York City. And there he is protected, essentially, by our allies, the Turks. And I'm not exactly sure what the Russians are doing, because the Syrian army tried to attack them a couple of weeks ago, and a Turkish-backed faction beat them back. And Putin sat there and apparently didn't say anything or let it happen.

And I don't know what's to be done with these guys. I mean, we warned for years and years and years that you have – unlike in Iraq War II, in Iraq War III and in the Syrian war here, you had thousands of people from all over the world travel to Syria to join into this thing, far more than Iraq – In Iraq War II people from all over the Middle East, yeah. But in Syria, you had thousands of Europeans traveled down there to join the fight. And we've already had blowback coming back from that. The first Syria war terrorist to attack a target in the West was in 2013, against a Jewish Museum in Brussels. And we were screaming, "Told you so. See?" These are the moderate rebels. They're already blowing back into Europe.

And there are thousands of these guys, and there are at least maybe a few hundred Americans who went there, as well. And the FBI admitted they were not keeping track of the Americans who were traveling to Turkey to cross into Syria to fight in the war. And so some of them could slip back into the country. But there are thousands of these guys there now. I actually read a recent report that just said some of them are sneaking out of the country and headed toward Libya, which is also a wide-open, hellhole war scape between three or four major factions and with ISIS and other jihadist groups around. And so people are headed there for safe haven now. So that'll be the next chapter of another one of these wars, as well.

But that's essentially the biggest question mark, is what is going to happen in the Idlib province. Is some combination of the Russians and the Syrians going to go in there and finish them off? And see, if that happens, the Turks are worried that the Kurds will be empowered. That's their problem. But that problem really solves itself already, because the Kurds can make up with the Syrian central state again and allow Syrian troops back in to stand between Syrian Kurdish forces and the Turks. And so there shouldn't have to be a war there. That

compromise is already set. But I guess we'll see what happens. But there are, you know – I don't know.

I mean, think about it like this. What if in 2003, what if Saddam Hussein had already been in the middle of a war against a bunch of bin Ladenite terrorists trying to overthrow him, and then Bush had invaded and overthrown him anyway, in the middle of that? We saw al-Qaeda in Iraq rise up in reaction to the war, in reaction to siding with the Shia and that kind of thing. But imagine if that was already going on, if Saddam was already trying to repress a bunch of bin Ladenites – suppress, I guess – a bunch of bin Ladenites at that time. Think of how much even much less since it would have made to mess with him then. And that's what the Americans are doing. Oh, we're not backing the terrorists; we're just backing the mythical moderates. And yet, all that meant was gains for the terrorists.

Of course, if anybody ever listens to my show, on the introduction of my show is a clip from Hillary Clinton from February 2012, basically one year into this regime change operation. And on CBS News, she's being asked, why aren't we doing more to back the terrorists against Assad, the real bad guy here? And she actually had the more hawkish position at the time, but she's being forced to defend Obama's policy at that point on TV. And so she says – and we know from the State Department emails that were released through FOIA that she had been emailed just a couple of weeks before by her aide, Jake Sullivan, who told her that, Hey, look, boss, AQ is on our side in this one. And it was an article about "Ayman al-Zawahiri endorses revolution in Syria."

So she's clearly referring to that email when she tells CBS News, Well, Ayman al-Zawahiri, the leader of al-Qaeda, is endorsing the revolution in Syria. Are we backing al-Qaeda in Syria? Hamas has now endorsed the revolution. Are we backing Hamas? And so we have to be very careful that we're not taking a side in the war that our real enemies are taking a side on too, and that we're in it – she didn't mean directly backing them, but she meant that what we were doing would be beneficial to their position, and we better be really careful.

And yet, as we know from the history, she spent the rest of 2012 telling Obama, we've got to back these terrorists. And of course, again, under the theory that if we back the mythical moderates, that will somehow marginalize the jihadists, when there really were no moderates. And it was the jihadists who were taking the lead in the fight all along. So she knew better and did it anyway.

WOODS: Scott, we're going to wrap up here, because we've got just one more episode left. I want to keep them at a length that I make sure everybody listens to every single one of them. So we're going to wrap up here and remind everybody that Scott is working on the ultimate libertarian book on the war on terror. But it's not just for libertarians. It's written by a libertarian, which is what really matters, so we'll get a clear understanding of it. But it's written by somebody with an enormous knowledge. And you can look at it and read it as many times as you want or need to, to master it yourself.

So part of Scott Horton Week, my idea behind it, was to help Scott finish this project. And to that end, people who can support him so that he can take the time out and do it will be very, very much appreciated. So TomWoods.com/Horton is the link to go to to support Scott. And as I've been telling you all week, I'm not telling you to do something I don't do myself. I support Scott every single month. I'm just asking folks to support him at least just this one time, at least for the sake of this very, very important project.

HORTON: And matching funds.

WOODS: Yes, this week, we are have matching funds from a very generous contributor, who will match dollar for dollar everything you contribute. So it definitely is something you've got to do right away, as soon as you hear this. TomWoods.com/Horton.