



Episode 1,469: Scott Horton on Iran, Syria, and His Critics

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: Yeah, let's say a little something about Scott Horton Week. You don't have to give us any hard numbers, but during Scott Horton Week, which occurred some episodes ago, I had you on five days in a row, covered a lot of foreign policy topics. And I was urging people to support you, as you basically put aside a lot of the things you might normally do so that you can devote yourself to what could be your most lasting project, which is your book-length treatment of the war on terror, and I was saying we've got to support Scott while he's doing this. And I am very happy to say that folks who listen to this show absolutely rose to the occasion and joined me in supporting Scott Horton. So I just want to get your thoughts about that.

HORTON: Yeah, absolutely. Well, first of all, thank you to you and to all of your great audience members who contributed. It was a great success. And I'll take from that what I have to get through the book as an advance on the book, is essentially how we sold it, and that's how I mean to treat it. And so that means, obviously, some of it for my expenses for staying alive and such like that, lights on. But also, as we talked about, I finally got my 501(c)(3) action Jackson straight for the Libertarian Institute, and so I'm going to try to keep as much of that capital invested in the institute itself as I possibly can. I told you that Pete Quinones is now managing editor there. We've got a bunch of great podcasters and quite a few great writers, and so I'm looking forward to moving forward with the Libertarian Institute and using some of those donations for that purpose, too. So that makes me double-extra super grateful to you and to all your great people, seriously. And you're right, they really did come through in a surprising way. And it's really great.

WOODS: I'm really thrilled for you, and I'm thrilled in a sense of being proud of the folks who listen. They hear Scott Horton, they know this is a serious guy who's really passionate and knowledgeable, and we need to take that passion and knowledge and put it on paper for us. It's going to help. It's going to do a lot of good.

All right, what I thought we would do today — just because I was also looking for an excuse to get you back, let me be honest with you. But we had some critical replies to some of the arguments that you made in a couple of the episodes, and I forwarded a couple of them to you and got responses from you. But then you came up with the idea: why don't you an episode of replies to critics? So for instance, a couple of them would be taken from the comments sections of the different episodes. One of them was an email that was submitted through my site. So why don't we start off, I'm going to read one of them out loud, and then we're going to get the Scott Horton reply.

So here's the first one. The gentleman writes: "Hi, Tom, I know you are in an admirer of Scott's, and I believe he makes a lot of very good points about the situations in the Middle East, but his characterization of every American decision maker involved as being incompetent, evil, and even racist, in my opinion, is a lot of overreach and paints an inaccurate picture of the full situation. I think there needs to be some counterpoint to this, as I think he's leaving out a lot of inconvenient facts. For example, the Iran deal included a lot of cash paid to the Iranian government, cash that has since been shown to have been used to bolster fighting throughout the Middle East and especially Syria. Iran is definitely seeking hegemony in the region and is definitely a very unfriendly regime toward the US."

And then after that, he goes on to recommend bringing on Victor Davis Hanson on the show, but that's a separate issue. Let's focus instead on what he says about the Iran deal, the so-called cash paid to the Iranian government, what the Iranian government has done with the money, seeking hegemony, they're an unfriendly regime. How do you respond to that in general?

HORTON: Okay, sure. Well, first of all, the whole thing about the government being incompetent, evil, and even racist, and whatever, well, that's true on every issue all the time. That's what all libertarians think about the state. It's our enemy. And at best, they're incompetent. God forbid that they get the job done that they're trying to do. So that is the point of view that I come from. Sorry. And it leads to me being right all the time, since my bias is against the state, which is itself illegitimate, which is based on aggression, and which necessarily is based on generating fear of what might happen if we were without them. So they have a huge incentive to lie to us all the time, and in my lifetime, I've seen enough lies to know that the burden of proof is on them, by far.

And so that doesn't mean that I'm condemning everyone who was ever in the infantry or ever worked for the State Department or whatever. But overall and in effect and incorporating the special interests involved in pushing these things, yes, the whole thing is illegitimate. The entire doctrine of American hegemony is illegitimate. So, yeah, it's immoral to take part in that, and a lot of people involved in that realize that and quit and write about it and join us and agree with us and donate to Ron Paul and vote for him for president, as we all know.

WOODS: So what's this stuff about cash paid to the Iranian government? Is that the most accurate way to describe that?

HORTON: Yeah, and I think in this last week of the foreign policy show, I don't think we really, truly directly addressed the Iranian nuclear program, although obviously we have in past episodes. I could be wrong about that. We covered a lot.

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: But the main point about it is that that money was Iran's money, plus interest, that Jimmy Carter had seized back during the Iranian Revolution in 1979. And America had already been determined by — I forgot which world court it is; it's one of these courts of international settlement there — had already ruled that America had to give the money back. It was money for arms that they were trying to buy, that the Shah's government was trying to buy from the US at the time, or was in the middle of buying, essentially. So John Kerry — and I hate him too. Everybody hates John Kerry. He made this deal with the Iranians where, *You know that money that we stole from you that we have to give back to you anyway? Well, that's the*

money that you're going to get as our concession to you for this nuclear deal. The only other concession America made was lifting sanctions — in other words, ceasing aggression. So not doing anything *for* them, but just stopping doing something against them. And that was it.

And then, as he says here, this cash "has since been shown to have been used to bolster fighting throughout the Middle East and especially Syria." So I don't know where it's been shown. I mean, obviously, all dollars are fungible, so maybe there's a good article somewhere that says that the Quds Force took control of the money directly and then turned right around, I don't know. But assuming it went into the Iranian general fund, then sure, it still went to "bolster fighting in Syria," but what does that mean? It means helping the secular Syrian state fight the al-Qaeda and ISIS terrorists that America and our allies were backing against them. The guys who were the bad guys in Iraq War II became the moderate rebels under Obama. And of course, the whole point was to weaken Iran. Again, Obama said to Jeffrey Goldberg: that's right, we should get rid of Assad in order to help bring Iran down a peg.

I'm happy to keep repeating myself about this, because it's the key to everything that's going on here, okay? In Iraq War II, Bush had empowered Iran and their Shiite friends, plus five. There was no way to take that back, really, without starting that whole war all over again for the Sunni side, and that just was not on the table. So Assad was seen as a consolation prize. If Bush boosted Iranian power in the region by five points, let's see if we can take them down two by getting rid of their last friend, Assad, the secular Baathist Alawite, who's allied with the Shiites and the Christians and the Druze, and a lot of Sunnis too, in Syria. And so that was the whole point of it.

Then the hawks who supported that policy because they hate Iran so much want to complain that Iran and Hezbollah and Russia have improved their position inside Syria, made Syria dependent on their power, in fact, to protect them. But whose fault is that? It's the hawks' fault for starting this thing in the first place. All other things being equal — and I'm no imperialist. I say we shouldn't be backing dictators. We certainly shouldn't be back in jihadists against them. But all other things being equal, just from, I don't know, a Republican point of view, what would have made sense would have been to ally with Assad against the jihadists. The jihadists are the ones — the bin Ladenites, the radical Sunnis are the ones who crashed into our towers, not Hezbollah and not Iran. But instead, it's this massive bait and switch, where nope, they're all just really bad, and so instead of differentiating, we should even take the side of our actual enemies against those who stand in the way of American hegemony.

And so that's his next sentence here, right? He says, "Iran is definitely seeking hegemony in the region." Well, he's right that they're standing in the way of American hegemony in the region, but actually, if you look at what they've done to achieve hegemony of their own, the so-called Shiite Crescent, the worst thing they did was send Ahmed Chalabi and his Iraqi National Congress — who, they were doing their own thing, but with Iranian help — to blow a bunch of smoke up the rear ends of a bunch of American Zionists, Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz and their friends, on the lie that a new Shiite-controlled Iraq would be an ally of Israel. And so this was a major reason that they pushed for this clean break policy to overthrow Saddam Hussein. It was supposed to weaken Iran, these fools. So if that's Iranian aggression, fooling American likudniks, neoconservatives, into launching this war in the Bush administration to suit their purposes, again, whose fault is that? All the same hawks complaining about Iran now are the very same ones who said we had to get rid of Saddam Hussein (for them).

Then as I just said, Obama's policy in Syria is what necessitated Iran and Hezbollah and Russia to come to Syria to help protect the Syrian state from what was essentially a treasonous project to support al-Qaeda against that Syrian state. And then, again, those same hawks are the ones who want to complain that Iran has increased their power and influence inside Syria now.

And you look at Yemen, where the Houthis, what? Had exchanged phone numbers with the Iranians before, or something like that? They were not really tied to Iran at all. They're simply friends, not even allies. And their war inside Yemen was their own war, to a great degree, as I did explain on the show, exacerbated by American intervention there — against al-Qaeda at first, and then for the last four and a half years, for al-Qaeda, against the Houthis, which has not — again, a treasonous policy, because the Houthis *supposedly* are tied to Iran.

Our government says that Iran has sent them all these missiles that they fire at Saudi. Well, how are they going to get them there? America and Saudi have Yemen under a total blockade. The airport is shut down. Their seaports are shut down or under the control of America and its allies. The Iranians aren't sending missiles in there. If anything, these are missiles that were bought with American money back when they worked for Barack Obama. At one point, Nikki Haley at the United Nations had displayed this missile that it had Saudi and said, *See? This is an Iranian missile*. And the weapons expert Scott Ritter said, *No, it's not. It's a North Korean missile, and the Iranians in the Yemenis both bought it from the North Koreans back ten years ago, lady. You don't know what you're talking about*. It's all a bunch of propaganda. So the Iranians get credit, from their point of view, for every one of the Houthis' victories in Yemen, and they don't have to lift a finger.

In fact, just yesterday, the foreign minister, the Houthis' foreign minister traveled to Iran and was met by the Iranian foreign minister for the very first time. Before they had only made him meet some deputy. And only now is Iran recognizing the Houthis as the legitimate state government of Yemen. You might have thought they would have done that four and a half years ago.

And again, these are all victories for Iran that America is handing over to them, in the words of King Abdullah, on a golden platter. And why are they doing that? Because they're stupid. Because everybody thought Paul Wolfowitz, Tom, was the smartest guy in the room. *Well, you know, he was right about a thing before, and so I guess we just have to trust his judgment, if he says this is going to work*. But it hasn't. It's been a complete disaster. And by the way, working on in the neighborhood of 2 million people killed in this thing so far. Well, that includes Afghanistan and Pakistan. But still, okay, a million and a half, or something. More than a million in Mesopotamia and the Levant and now down into Yemen. No one who attacked us, all people who were completely innocent of attacking us. Oh, I guess other than a few AQAP people there in Yemen, at the beginning of that.

WOODS: Let me read, again, something that I sent you, and this actually appeared, as I say, in the comments section of one of the episodes. And the gentleman writes as follows:

"Sorry, Scott, you're wrong on this one. Both Iran and al-Qaeda are you anti-US jihadists, anti-Western civilization, actually. Supporting one side against the other is not treason, but rather a wise move that directs their energies against each other instead of uniting against the West." He later says, "You're also wrong on the start of the Syrian revolution. It was peaceful for six months while Assad was shooting on the demonstrators. Only afterward did it turn

violent." And then he says, "Also, of course, Assad doesn't want to kill Syrians who surrender to him, just like Hitler didn't bomb Paris. You're making a straw man. What is meant by 'Assad is killing his own people' is that he commits mass murder until they surrender. More children have died in the latest Idlib offensive than during the entire war, yet you accept that because there are jihadists in Idlib. This is obscene, man."

So all right, let's start with the first paragraph there. "Both Iranian al-Qaeda are anti-US jihadists, so it's a wise move to support one side against the other." Any objection to that?

HORTON: Yeah, of course. He has no specific accusation against Iran, because he doesn't have any specific accusations against Iran. They're anti-US. Well, so am I.

WOODS: Wow, okay [laughing].

HORTON: I mean, what's the point of that?

WOODS: Yeah.

HORTON: You know what? A lot of people don't like what America is doing. Is that what he means? That they have a bad attitude? Or he's saying, what? That they're trying to build up a navy that they're going to use against us? And meanwhile, yes, backing al-Qaeda is treason, because they did attack us, and not just on September 11th, but they attacked the USS *Cole*, and they bombed the Khobar Towers, and they killed some Americans at a National Guard training facility in Saudi; they bombed the embassies in Tanzania and in Kenya in 1998.

And they were the worst part of the Sunni-based insurgency in Iraq War II, which, yes, is true, that there was no al-Qaeda in Iraq before America invaded there. But they were the suicide bombers. They were the head choppers. They became the excuse for staying. They're the excuse for staying now. There's a new report out that says we can't leave Iraq because we have to stay there to fight ISIS forever. If we begin to withdraw, then their numbers increase, we say, the Pentagon says, so America has to fight in western Iraq forever because of this.

And there is no good solution. They had as best a solution as you could have imagined after the Awakening, where the tribal chiefs on the Sunni side in alliance with the Baathists marginalized the bin Ladenites. But now those days are over since Obama took their side in Syria, which is what led to the rise of the Islamic State in Syria, which then conquered western Iraq, as well. And so there's going to be fighting there, essentially, from now on. And I'm against that, but at least that's against the declared enemies of the United States and of the American people. ISIS is just al-Qaeda in Iraq. They don't take orders from Zawahiri anymore. But it's still the same group as al-Qaeda in Iraq from Iraq War II.

And so yeah, it's treason. You could say it's cynical and smart to back the Soviet — or you could disagree, I guess — to back the Soviet Union against the Nazis, but the Soviets weren't our enemies. They were commies, but they hadn't done anything to us. They hadn't knocked our towers down. They weren't our enemy. So it was a crazy thing to take the side of Stalin, but look who the enemy is, and business is business when it comes to love and war and whatever.

But in this case, what did Iran ever do? Crickets, right? The worst that they say is, well, in 1983, they ordered the Amal militia to bomb the Beirut barracks. Or possibly, they'll come up with this propaganda where any time a Shiite in Iraq War II fought an American — which about 500 Americans died fighting the Shia — that that was Iran that was responsible for all those bombs and all those bullets, and that's just a fact, and you have to accept it, even though they never demonstrate that because it's not true. And even though we were fighting the whole war *for* the Shiites. The only time the Shiites were fighting us was when David Petraeus was targeting them — other than for a couple of months in 2004. The rest of the time, it was only when David Petraeus decided to target them in 2008 and they fought back, that 500 Americans died fighting them. And the Iranians may have been giving those groups some support, but to say that that was all an Iranian mission against America is just not true. It wasn't true then. It still isn't true when they repeat the lie now.

So yeah, it's treason to take the side of al-Qaeda, the men who are sworn blood-oath loyal to Ayman al-Zawahiri against Iran, just because, what? Because you don't like the ayatollah? Because he's anti-US in a way that you can't define? That's crazy, and it's wrong.

All right, now, here's the thing about the Syrian revolution too. He says it was peaceful for six months, while Assad was shooting on the demonstrators.

WOODS: I was just going to ask you about that. All right, so what do you say to that?

HORTON: Yeah, well, it's partially true. I mean, there were peaceful demonstrations, large ones. But there was also violence, because the jihadist types were taking advantage of the disruption from the very beginning. And there are people, Sharmine Narwani, the great journalist writing in *The American Conservative*, has written all about this. And there's a guy that's been writing for the Libertarian Institute who's got a good half-dozen really great articles on the history of the Syrian war, and his name is William Van Wagenen, and he's done — I forget which article it is where he goes through — "There Is No FSA, There Is Only Al-Qaeda" is probably the one, where he goes through and shows how from the very beginning of the conflict, in some places anyway, there were cops getting sniped and getting bombed at the otherwise peaceful protests and this kind of thing.

But it's also true, then, that the Syrian government was clamping down hard on those protests, harder than was justified in many cases, probably. But that's not the whole story. The whole story has to include that USA and Saudi Arabia from the very beginning — and then very quickly, including the Turks, the Qataris, the Kuwaitis and the Israelis as well — were pouring in billions of dollars in cash and weapons and supplies and USAID. There's pictures of jihadists in USAID tents, driving around in all these brand-new Toyota Hilux pickup trucks.

And it was clear from, I'm almost certain it was July of 2011, that Alastair Crooke wrote in *The Guardian* that Prince Bandar bin Sultan is sending jihadists off from Saudi Arabia to go fight in Syria, just as he had done against us in Iraq War II, according to the CIA, which is correct on this. That when America took the Shiite side in Iraq, the Saudis took the Sunni side and backed that insurgency against us the whole time. This time, America was back on their side, the redirection again back to the Saudi side after Bush's big blunder.

And so there's all kinds of great histories of this. There was one that was called "The Jihad Next Door" that was in *Politico* magazine, about how from the very beginning of the war, of course, what was left, the bear remnants of al-Qaeda in Iraq perked up and said, *Hey*,

opportunity, somewhere to go and fight. They had been marginalized by the local Sunnis in Iraq. They essentially couldn't move. But once they could cross the border into Syria, they had free rein. And Patrick Cockburn was warning on my show from the very beginning that the Iraqi government was saying, *Please don't do this. You are reenergizing the Sunni insurgency in Iraq by backing the Sunni insurgency in Syria. Don't do this.* And of course, a couple of years later, that Sunni insurgency in Syria ended up conquering all of western Iraq: Fallujah, Ramadi, Mosul, and Tikrit, and I always forget if they got Samarra or not. They conquered all of western Iraq, a land and a population the size of Great Britain, for three full years after that, starting in 2014.

And so that's the whole thing, is it wasn't really a civil war. It wasn't really a war between Syrians. It was very quickly a bunch of foreign mercenaries sent by America and its Middle East allies, all of whom are monarchies and dictatorships, of course — well, including Israel on the West Bank and Gaza Strip, anyway. I guess there's a little bit of democracy still in Turkey. I can point that out.

And then the whole thing, "Assad doesn't want to kill Syrians who surrender to him," he makes it sound like it really was a war against the population of the country, when no, it was not. It was a war against the jihadist fighters. And in many cases over and over again, it is shown that the civilian population were essentially held hostage by ISIS and were not allowed to flee. This happened in Mosul in Iraq, as well as different places in Syria too, in eastern Aleppo, where the civilian population are basically held as human shields by the al-Qaeda guys.

That doesn't mean, and I never said, that, therefore, anytime Assad bombs a child, therefore, it's justified. I'm just providing the overall context compared to the narrative that you hear, that Assad is essentially just a serial killer and all he does is wake up in the morning and try to kill his own population until they're all dead, and the only thing preventing him from doing that are these rebels, these moderate rebels that America and its allies are trying to support in order to hold him off somehow.

But it's just not right. My point was, when he defeats the fighters in any given area, the killing of the civilians stops. The way he frames it, he has to conflate the civilian population with the fighters. Of course he stops fighting them once they surrender. No, that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about, when they surrender, they get on a bus and go off to the Idlib province, and then no more bombs in Aleppo at all. The population moves back to east Aleppo. They're happy to be there. They celebrate Christmas. The war is over, because the jihadists are gone, not because Assad is gone. Because the jihadists are, the CIA-backed, suicide-bomber, moderate rebels.

And then so he says, "More children have died in the latest Idlib offensive than during the entire war." I mean, based on what? There must have been tens of thousands of kids killed in this thing overall if you're counting, you know, the deprived-to-death. Maybe in direct violence, but overall, certainly low tens of thousands. And more than that have died in the recent battle of Aleppo? No. That couldn't possibly be right, as far as that goes. But let's say ten have been killed, or 100 or 600. I'm against that. I'm not saying I'm for that or that I'm cheering on Assad for that.

But if I said to you we shouldn't overthrow Saddam Hussein, because all it's going to do is empower Osama bin Laden and his successors on one hand and Iran on the other, does that

make me a Saddam Hussein sycophant, or just I know better and just I'm providing the broader context of what's really going on around here? At no point in any of these interviews did I ever say whatever Assad is doing is fine. Whenever I talk about Russian intervention here, I say thousands of innocent lives are on their hands. There's no question about that. But of course, my priority is debunking the lies of the US government, their false narrative about what they are doing and why they are doing it, on the ridiculously false presumption, of course, that if the American people knew the truth, that they would or could do anything about it, I guess. But that's my fool's errand.

WOODS: Let me ask you one thing before we wrap up for today, just about the current situation in Iran. We're talking in the second week of August 2019, and we've gotten — I mean, I cannot figure out what's going on in Trump's mind, other than he does seem to have made a disparaging remark or two about John Bolton always wanting to be at war with somebody. He does seem to have approved the idea of Rand Paul possibly being some kind of emissary to Iran, which I don't know of any president who would have approved that. So my feeling is his heart's not in it, but at the same time, he's obviously surrounded himself with terrible people. I think he's — I wouldn't say he's easily swayed, but he's swayable. But yet, the level of intensity, I don't know, it seems to have died down. What do you think the likelihood of war is right now?

HORTON: Well, I certainly am not betting on one happening. I think it's not going to, and I hope the high watermark of the danger here was when he backed down over the drone that they shot down. And then it came out that he had actually asked them for permission. People can read about this at the Moon of Alabama blog. They're like, *Hey, would it be okay if I hit a couple of small positions near the beach or something?* and they said, *No, go to hell. you bomb us, we're going to bomb you back.* And he just said okay, and then just didn't do it and backed down. And so that should be the end of that, let's hope.

I mean, the problem is the doctrines that he's got himself stuck in. So I sort of take him at his word, because there are other indications that back this up, that his policy is essentially that he wants to scare them into signing a better deal. No more sunset clauses on the centrifuge limits, and let's add some ballistic missiles, medium-range missiles, I guess, and then get a better deal out of it.

But then he has Mike Pompeo and John Bolton are on the case here. Now, supposedly, they don't get along, but they sure seem to be equally horrible and working pretty much in concert on this, where their policy really is regime change. Their policy is not war, but to have such an economic war against Iran, they believe, I think — again, I'm kind of taking them at their word, but I sort of think they blurt this stuff out because this is what they really think — that Iran is this brittle regime, and that if they just really clamp down on the economy hard enough, the people of Iran will get so sick of it, that rather than blaming us and rallying to the state, that they will essentially choose our side and overthrow their government for us. And I think it's just absolutely crazy. It never works. But I think that's the policy that they're going for.

And so Donald Trump, I guess that's the good-cop, bad-cop routine. I mean, you see Mike Pompeo came out and gave a speech at the Heritage Foundation, where he has, I think, 15 things that Iran has to do. So it's not just ballistic missiles and centrifuge limits, but it's also support for Hezbollah and a whole wish list of the way things ought to be, according to the

hawks here. So that essentially is a poison pill, right? Remember the Rambouillet Accord that Madeleine Albright served up to Milosevic in Serbia and said —

WOODS: Yeah, he's not going to accept it.

HORTON: Yeah, you have to let us occupy your whole country; otherwise, we'll bomb you. That's our peace deal. This kind of thing, it's made to be rejected.

But so you're right, though, back to the beginning, that I don't think Trump wants a war. And the military doesn't want to war. The Army and the Marine Corps know what it would cost them to have a real war with Iran. They know that they don't have what's called escalation dominance; that is, their belief that they will be able to control every bit of the war and what happens at each stage of it. They know that's not true, that the Iranians have a say in how a war with Iran plays out and that it could be really ugly for American assets and allies in the region and very costly for infantry, if it went that far —which even right there, nobody's talking about sending in the infantry, ever, ever.

So what does that tell you about messing with them at all? Essentially, anybody who wants a war with that country wants a war that they know that they cannot finish conclusively. And so it would be the start of just a whole new season of problems for everyone. And over nothing, right? If Donald Trump really wanted a better deal, he could have just gone in there and shaken Zarif's hand until it broke off and just said, "Let's be friends, pal. You know what? We've got this great deal that that idiot John Kerry somehow got past you, but I want to improve upon it."

And you know what? I mean, you had Boeing was selling them a whole new batch of airplanes, a whole giant deal that got cancelled. So in other words, that's an example of how you could get the military industrial complex in on peace here, is let them sell planes, even civilian ones, to the other side. Open up trade. Dick Cheney, should be famously, gave a speech in 1998 in Australia, where he denounced Bill Clinton and his anti-Iran sanctions and said, as the CEO of Halliburton, "We just want to do business." You know, Halliburton is an oil services company. They build pipelines and stuff. Iranians are people too, Dick Cheney explained. Let's work with them and make some money.

And that should be the future here. There's no reason in the world that we should have to fight with them. And whoever says, "Nuh uh, because their imperfect republic is an enemy of ours," has a point about the "imperfect republic" part, but look who's talking. And "is an enemy of ours," and they're really not. And what do you want, to have another war with them? Or maybe we've got to figure out a way to kill them with kindness. Or what, we're going to move on into a future without a Persia? I mean, these people exist in our world. We're going to have to figure it out. What's the problem?

WOODS: Scott, I know we've got to run, but just super quickly, do you have in your own mind a target for the completion of your war on terror book, like a target date when you want to have it all done?

HORTON: I really want to have it done by Christmas time to get it out for the new year and for the beginning of next year's campaign season and all that, but I'm not going to make any promises. I have my Ron Paul book, of all my Ron Paul interview transcripts, called *The Great*

Ron Paul, that'll be out any week now. I'm trying to put it out as fast as I can. And then I've got Sheldon Richman's book, *Why Palestine Matters*, that I have to publish here too. But I've really only got to reread it one more time, pretty much, and send it off to the guys. And I really think I should be able to get both of those done this month, and then really get back to work, cracking down on my book, and try to get it out in a few months' time here. But I don't want to make any promises because I hate writing books. It's so hard, gosh.

WOODS: Oh, I know, and you don't want to say something and you can't deliver. But yeah, it is not fun. I mean, let's not romanticize this. It is not a fun process. It's not the sort of thing you get used to as you've done multiple ones. It's all just miserable.

HORTON: Yeah, I've done it the one time, and it was horrible. I promised I would never do it again, but apparently it was so traumatic that I blocked out the memories of how bad it really was. So now I'm willing to do it again.

WOODS: Thank goodness. For our sake, thank goodness. All right, folks, ScottHorton.org is where you should go, as well as LibertarianInstitute.org, to support Scott and the Libertarian Institute and keep an eye out for everything Scott is up to. So definitely check out those links. They'll both be up at TomWoods.com/1469. Remember, I support Scott every month, so I urge all you good folks to do the same. Thanks again, Scott.

HORTON: Thank you again, Tom, and thank all of you guys. I really appreciate everybody's support a lot.