

**Episode 2,384: Bad Arguments for More Wars, with Scott Horton**

**Guest: Scott Horton**

**WOODS:**  You used to introduce me, Scott, as somebody who has written every book that's ever been written. And I feel like you've done probably 58% of all podcast interviews that have ever been done. Because you have – I mean, you're over how many thousands?

**HORTON:** I'm at 5,930-something right now.

**WOODS:** Are you going to do something when you get to 6,000? Or just keep recording them?

**HORTON:** Yeah, I don't know. And because I'm writing a book, so now I'm only doing, like, 2 or 3 a week. I used to do 5 or 10.

**WOODS:** I hear you. All right. Well, Scott, of course, is the author, most recently, of *Enough Already* – what's the subtitle?

**HORTON:** *Time to End the War On Terrorism*.

**WOODS:** Yeah. Okay. So, You want to check that out. Scott runs the – well, I don't want to say "runs" because maybe I'm stepping on Sheldon Richman's toes. But you're with the *Libertarian Institute*?

**HORTON:** Yeah, I'm the director. Sheldon just writes. I mean, he's the executive editor.

**WOODS:** And are you still editorial director at Antiwar.com?

**HORTON:** Yeah, I'm the editorial director there, which don't have that much responsibility for Antiwar.com, frankly. That's Eric and Dave DeCamp and Kyle Anzalone are pulling my weight there.

**WOODS:** Because then you do the Scott Horton Show and you're writing this book and don't know how you're managing it all. But anyway, I'm glad you're able to carve out a little time to talk to Ole Woods here.

I have a couple of things I want to ask you about to try to get updates on that are going on in the world. And I haven't done an episode dealing with China and Taiwan at all. And so I thought, let's take – I mean, obviously, I know you could do a Rogan-style interview with that.

But I don't want to, and I don't think most of my listeners want to. I just want to ask you some basic questions about the situation, because obviously it looks like tensions are rising. But the tensions are always rising with the US and anybody, so I don't know how different that is, but it does seem like something's going on here.

So, I listened in to a debate on this subject of whether the US should be aiding Taiwan, let's say, by sending them various types of military equipment, at the Soho Forum hosted by our friend Gene Epstein.

And what was interesting was that the side arguing that the US should be involved ended up winning the debate. And that's a real accomplishment because that's not an audience that wanted to vote that way. So, let me lay out at least some of the gist of his argument and you tell me what your thoughts are.

The debater who won, his argument ran something like this. That if you listen to the Chinese leadership, you will hear language that indicates that they intend to reunify China. And in the context of Taiwan, we all know what that means.

And we also know that they would like to bring about naval dominance for China. They want China to be a power that displaces the US. And so, given that, he says there are three reasons we should want to assist Taiwan.

Number one, they are a relatively free society, and that's worth defending if we can possibly do it without too much trouble to ourselves. Secondly, there's a strategic concern because Taiwan has nearly 25% of the semiconductor capacity in the world, as well as 92% of the advanced chip manufacturing.

And if you think that doesn't matter, then you don't know how important semiconductors are. Semiconductor chips are in cars and a great many other things. He calls it "the oil of the 21st century economy".

So, that's another reason. Then still another reason is our friendship with Japan, and that if you listen to what Japanese officials are saying, they are concerned about a China that's on the move.

The Chinese Air Command says that they could reduce Japan's raw imports by using blockades by 15% to 20%, that Japan's economy could be severely harmed by an activist China.

So, all these things put together spell out the need for the United States to take some kind of position, short of war, that he hopes might ultimately prevent war in the future. Now, when you hear that, how do you respond?

**HORTON:** Well, there's a lot of different points there. But, I mean, let's start with the end. So, we ought to do something to prevent it short of war. Meaning what?

**WOODS:** We'll ship them weapons. I'm pretty sure that was his plan.

**HORTON:** And that was the question of the debate, should we sell weapons to Taiwan?

**WOODS:** It was something like that. Because nobody was saying, should we go to war with China? But should the US play an active role, up to and including the supply of military resources in order to prevent this outcome?

**HORTON:** Yeah. No, we shouldn't do that. And I think its playing out right in front of our eyes right now in Eastern Europe. We're much more likely to provoke the conflict that our government claims they're trying to prevent.

In the case of Ukraine, they literally said: *We are carefully calibrating the amount of weapons that we're pouring in, so that it's the proper amount to deter Russia from invading without provoking them into invading.*

And then I even have quotes from the CIA officers who were involved in the arms transfers, who complained to the press that: *We told the bosses we've calibrated wrong, we're provoking an attack here. But they wouldn't listen.*

So, this is a government program, first and foremost. Once you have someone with lobbyists and a vested interest in selling F-16s to Taiwan, now the calibration has nothing to do with seeing the future in some, like, State Department weenie's crystal ball about what's the exact amount of weapons to calibrate.

As though they could tell, like some Soviet commissar with his central plan. But then they have all these external incentives coming in, like massive corporations like Lockheed who want to sell ships to the Navy and want to hype up and fund all the think tanks that publish all the studies that say all this has to be done, and that mostly ignore the fact of nuclear weapons, and seem to think that we could have a real fun Pacific War like during World War Two with Japan, and it'd be great.

And the thing about it is that people have just got to get acquainted with the geography here. First of all, just for the sake of argument, let's say everything that he said there for his argument was right. We cannot defend Taiwan. It's 7,000 miles from San Diego. It's 90 miles from China.

Imagine the Chinese navy trying to come over here to the Caribbean to keep Cuba out of the hands of the Americans if they were intent on invading and conquering Cuba. It would make no sense whatsoever. They could not prevail in that circumstance.

They could try, and they could die in a nuclear war with us. But at the end of the day, Cuba would not be in the hands of the Chinese.

It's the same thing here. We could have a war (and then still lose Taiwan anyway) but in the process, lose half our navy and hundreds of planes and possibly devolve into nuclear warfare.

To go back to – well, there's a bunch of different ones there. First of all, it doesn't matter if they're relatively democratic country or not – or land, it's not really a country. It was a right-wing military dictatorship under American support for, what, 50 years?

After independence or after the end of the Civil war there. It only became a democracy in the late 1980s and into the 1990s. And even then – our Constitution delegates our national government the authority to provide (or to guarantee) a Republican form of government to every state in the Union, not every renegade province on earth.

It makes no sense whatsoever for them to give any kind of war guarantee. Now, I admit – I mean, as you started it out, nobody's talking about a war. But, I mean, yeah they are.

Maybe at the Soho Forum they weren't, but think already argued, as far as the calibration goes, they've given the Taiwanese, if you want to call it enough to deter, let's see how it goes.

But they're just as likely to over-correct there and provoke a war. And if it does come to war – which, all the think tanks have done their studies and their war games (as well as the Navy has) about what it would look like.

And almost invariably – they leave out even the existence of nuclear weapons, because that would reduce the entire argument to already over. We can't have a war with China under any circumstances. It could go directly to H-bombs, and then we start losing cities.

We can't have that. I mean, imagine, China invades Taiwan, so we all agree to kill ourselves if they dare to do that. It makes no sense whatsoever to try to give that war guarantee. And it sounds crazy, but we could have had a nuclear war over West Berlin.

Think about it. If the Soviets had rolled into West Berlin, like: Okay, we've all got to take a cyanide capsule! We have to give up our society because: *Hey, the "relatively democratic" West Germans lost part of their city to the commies*.

That was the law at the time. That was the policy at the time. It certainly was conceivable that if that had happened, if we'd lost West Berlin, that those dominoes would have started falling down and we'd have gone to nuclear war over it. This is completely crazy.

Same thing with the Carter Doctrine in the Middle East. So, the Persian Gulf belongs to us. And even though we hate the new Ayatollah, if the Soviet Union invades Iran, we're giving a war guarantee to the Ayatollah we hate to keep the Soviets out. Which could have led right to nuclear war right there, too.

These kinds of policies, you can see how at the National Security Council they have this big agreement where they all think they're smart and decide on something, but where they're really just painting us all into some crazy corner. And one more thing about this – and we can get to Japan and whatever follow-ups in a second.

But I wanted to point out the hypocrisy that the Americans who support the right of Kiev to go to any lengths to reabsorb the renegade provinces of Donetsk and Luhansk in the Donbas in Eastern Ukraine, and who absolutely refuse the right of the Russians to guarantee the independence of those renegade provinces are the same ones who say that America should intervene to guarantee the independence of the renegade province of Taiwan from China.

And that we ought to play the role of Russia in backing the Taiwanese against the Chinese if they ever tried to reabsorb them with force. Which just goes to show that the whole liberal rules-based world order and all that is made up.

The Americans break the law, break the rules, whenever they want, like in Kosovo, and Iraq War Two, in Syria, and Yemen, Somalia. All these things are illegal. They don't have the pretension of any kind of American legal authorization or UN resolution for any of these things.

Which, I'm not a big UN guy, but that is the treaty, that we'd have to have a UN Security Council resolution to authorize starting an aggressive war. They just do whatever they want, whenever they want.

**WOODS:** So, your point is that there are limits to what can be accomplished in the world. And these are not limits imposed by Scott Horton. These are limits imposed by the reality of things.

So, it's not that you're just stingy about helping people and the neocons are full of love and cooperation. It's that you're living in reality and they're not.

**HORTON:** Yeah. Look, Pat Buchanan said, what, 20 years ago or something? He goes: *What if they roll into outer Mongolia? What are we going to do?*

Are we going to tell Beijing that they'd better get the hell out of outer Mongolia or else we're going to do like Iraq War One and force them out? Like, forcing Saddam out of Kuwait?

Or we're just going to have to admit to ourselves that: *You know what? Outer Mongolia is just not our jurisdiction, and them and the ChiComs are going to have to work that out.* And, like, I can see there is a whole left/right dynamic here.

You see it within the parties where the Democrats hate and fear the Russians and the Republicans hate and fear the Chinese instead. It's like a trade off. And that's because Putin is sort of a conservative Republican with a Christian identity and a red, white, and blue flag, and stuff like that.

So, why wage war against a guy like that? They're not the communists or anything. But meanwhile in China – I mean, from the right-wing point of view. That's also why the liberals hate him and fear him, right?

Then for China, they got this big red flag which to the big dumb bull of the American right means: *Always enemy, must fight.* But that wasn't the policy Richard Nixon or Gerald Ford or Ronald Reagan or either of the two Bushes.

Which, this is probably the thing that they were the best on, was Nixon went over there and shook hands with Mao Tse tung, who in raw numbers was quantifiably the worst human being who ever lived, who killed more people than any other person ever killed, including Hitler and Stalin and Tamerlane and whoever you got.

And Nixon went over there and was like: You know what? Let's end the Cold War with you early now. And did that. That was 50 years ago. Now we're going to go back on that over Taiwan, which Nixon and Kissinger decided rightly?

As Lew Rockwell would say, it's a heck of a note to have to root for the Rockefellers. But they decided rightly, that: *Look, we don't care about Taiwan. Why should we? It's everything to them. And really, in the scheme of things, it's nothing to us.*

And people who say that: *Oh yeah, but we've built up this massive microchip industry there*. Well, why did you do that?

Whose interest was it for America to put their crucial microchips in the global instant-order of chains of production over there on Taiwan, 90 miles off of China's coast, where they're afraid that China could come and take them at any time?

It's like they want just to obligate us to having a war. Meanwhile, you could more or less pack those factories up and move them to Texas tomorrow. We already have – Advanced Micro Devices is right here in Austin.

I used to know a guy that fabricated chips right here in town, a good friend of mine. So, I don't know if they quit doing that or they just need to up their game. But there's no reason in the world why there's something magic about that island, why all the chips have to be produced there.

It's almost all American patents and intellectual capital behind how to manufacture those microchips in the first place, American engineers who figured out how to do it. And then there's actually a really great article in the *New York Times* magazine from, I'm gonna say, like, a month ago, Tom.

Like, their weekend magazine did this in-depth thing about the Taiwanese microchips and how important they are. And the thing of it is, like, you can tell just from right there what a fool's errand it is that they're trying to keep these chips out of the hands of the Chinese.

At the worst, they can just delay it. But more likely they're just provoking them by waging this kind of economic war against them when they're going to be able to get the chips anyway.

Like, there's $1 billion or something worth of trade or I forgot how many billions of dollars worth of trade between Taiwan and mainland China every year as it is anyway.

And the Americans say that – and this is Trump's former deputy or maybe national security adviser. Robert O'Brien said that if China does attack Taiwan, the first thing America will do is try to destroy those microchip factories so that China can't have them.

We'd rather nobody have them if we can't, and this kind of thing. And this is the craziest kind of mercantilist sort of policy, that we need the American empire in order to secure the existence of microchip factories for our future or whatever.

It's just completely nuts. You can make all that stuff right here in Texas, or in any other allied state with a stable government where people get along and wages are low, if that's what's so important here.

**WOODS:**  I want to interrupt our conversation, actually. Because I don't want to leave this part for the end to note that, Scott, your work with the *Libertarian Institute* has been really, really outstanding. The stuff you guys have done, the writing, the books.

Do you want to mention my book situation here? As long as you're on my show?

**HORTON:** Yeah, absolutely, man. I'm excited as can be about it. But you go ahead and say it.

**WOODS:** All right. Well, so I've mentioned a few times – plenty in my newsletter, but I think a couple of times here on the show – that I have a book coming out called *Diary of a Psychosis*. And it's written kind of in a day-by-day style (a la my newsletter) about what was done to us.

And because I do it that way, I'm able to recall little details that everybody else has forgotten. But the sum total of those details is a story we have got to tell. And so, Scott wrote to me and said: *Hey, man. Why don't you publish your book with the Libertarian Institute?*

And I said: *Okay.* So, the *Libertarian Insitute* is going to be publishing that book. So, it's doing good work. I mean, if you think of Woods's book on Covid is a good thing, an addition to the sum total of human knowledge, then you are, ipso facto, a supporter of the *Libertarian Institute*, on whose board I sit.

And Scott is currently doing a fundraiser for the *Libertarian Institute*. They run this thing on a shoestring. And when you look at these corrupt think tanks where the president's riding around in a limousine, and who knows what happened to your money?

Scott Horton is extremely frugal and sensible with donations, so I would highly recommend people support them, Libertarian Institute.org. What do you want to say, Scott? Then we'll talk foreign policy, but I do want to make this pitch.

**HORTON:** Yeah, well, first of all, thank you so much – for saying so, but especially for the opportunity to publish your book. I think that really that's great. And we're also very excited that we're publishing Jim Bovard's new book.

You might remember in the '90s he had *Lost Rights*. Well, now is *Last Rights: The Death of American Liberty.*

**WOODS:** Oh! Clever!

**HORTON:** I only read the introduction so far, but he's sending in the chapters and it's just killer. So, we've just put out Laurie's book, which is *Questioning the Covid Company Line*.

And I know you had her on the show. Brilliant, genius, wonderful libertarian, Laurie Calhoun, who also like you, was writing about this right all along, for the *Institute*, all during that time.

So, we just put that out and it's doing really great. It's out on Kindle and paperback and everything. And then we've got so many in the hopper, man. If you read *Enough Already*, remember I said that Iraq War Two, it kind of was about oil a little bit, but not like you think – not Exxon.

It was about oil for Israel and the promises that the Iraqi exiles had made to the neoconservatives. Well, there's a guy who was basically the American oil czar there in Iraq Wat Two, read my book, and was like: *Oh, you're right about that.*

And now he's written a book for us, fleshing out that story and telling more about the neocon plot to build an oil pipeline from Kirkuk to Haifa as part of their motivation for Iraq War Two.

We've got William Van Wagenen writing about Syria, and we have Brad Hoff and his co-author, Zach Wingard, also writing another book about Syria. We've got the wonderful Keith Knight (who is our managing editor) is putting out a book called *Nine Reasons* – I'm going to mess the title up, I'm sorry.

But it's *Nine Reasons Why I Left the Left* – something very close to that. Or *How I Left Progressivism*, something like that.

**WOODS:** Keith is such an up and comer that I feel like it's an insult even to call him an up and comer.

**HORTON:** Oh, he's just great. And he yeah, he's only that in the sense that, yeah, he's going to be around for a long time. And you can place your bets right now. Like, he's really an evangelical libertarian in the very best sort of a way.

And then man I'm sorry I'm rambling and I lost track of all the great books, but there's more. We've put out five, six books.

And of course, I'm working on *Provoked: How America Started the New Cold War with Russia and the Catastrophe in Ukraine*. Which, I'm shooting for the end of the year, maybe early next year. But I promise I'm working on it every day really hard.

**WOODS:** I don't doubt that.

**HORTON:** And we've got all these great podcasters and great writers that were publishing every day, at LibertarianInstitute.org. And we've got Ted Galen Carpenter. He was famously fired from Cato for being too good on the conflict in Ukraine, so now he writes for us.

Their best guy is now our guy. And so, as you mentioned, we've got Sheldon Richman, we've got James Bovard, Laurie Calhoun, and Ted Galen Carpenter. These are our all-stars basically, headlining.

And we've got this whole new generation of up-and-coming guys, as we mentioned, Keith Knight, and there's Kyle Anzalone, Connor Freeman, and Hunter DeRensis, who I think are all 27 for some reason, and are just doing great.

And so, yeah, we're really excited. The momentum is with us, and this is the future of the libertarian movement.

And this is our big fundraiser, so especially calling all of you millionaires and billionaires out there who have to donate to nonprofits every year or else the tax man will get you, LbertarianInstitute.org/donate is your new home address my friends.

**WOODS:** Well very good. And I'll just say one quick thing and I mean this Scott in the most friendly, brotherly way. Not as a dig at you, but I've been thinking of at some point doing like a little workshop on writing itself, because I have a lot of would be authors and authors in my newsletter audience and I have some tips to give.

So, I was thinking of putting on something like that. And so, I asked my list: Tell me, what are the struggles you have as a writer? What are the obstacles you face? So that I can see what the most common ones are, and I'll try to answer them.

And one of the things they said was: *I don't know when to stop*. *I don't know when I have said enough.* And so, Scott, I am now affectionately referring to this as "the Scott Horton problem".

**HORTON:** Yes, that is fair, and I accept that. But I have good news for you, good, sir. Which is that the aforementioned brilliant genius Laurie Calhoun is also (by trade or another, of some kind) an editor.

And I had her – I said: *I don't even want you to read it. All I want you to do is like, zoom all the way out in Word and just scan through it. Just look at the mess I've made so far here. I'm at 925 pages, right around there, 2,600 footnotes.*

So, she says to me: *Oh, don't worry, we can get this down under 400 pages, no problem*. Because I have this huge problem of – well, two big things about block quotes. One, I love them. And I really would rather show you than tell you as much as possible.

And she's just saying: *No, no, no, no, no. All that's got to go*. And then the other thing about the block quotes is that some of them are there just as placeholders because just haven't even written that part yet.

And I already was planning on summing those up anyway, but in a technical sense, these are taking up a lot of space. And she also just insists that every place I go: *Yeah, but then the* New York Times *themselves admitted that X, Y, Z*.

She goes: *Nah, nah, nah, just say X, Y, Z and give me the footnote*. *We're going to save you so much space by cutting out that.* So, I'm going to keep some of that as much as I feel like is absolutely necessary. But I'm going to cut out as much as I can.

So, that'll be the contest, is, how long can I get the book? And then how tightly can I sort of zip file it down back to – without losing my claims, but to a readable size? So, this will be an Olympic challenge, but we'll do it. We'll see what we can do.

**WOODS:** I am so glad to hear that. All right. Now let's jump into – I mean, again, I know we can continue talking about China and Taiwan, but I'm just giving people a taste here.

**HORTON:** By the way, about one more thing there on your thing about books. It was Dennis Pratt's idea at PorcFest that I do a little talk about how to write a book, because I've written some books. But think you guys know I'm not really a writer.

I'm a radio host, but I do collect these assertions, and I like to claim them, and sometimes in writing form. But you know what I mean, I'm not like a natural born writer, like a Bovard or something, you know?

But some people got some things out of it and said that they were going to now embark on that book that they've been thinking about but weren't quite sure whether they could do it or not. And I convinced them that now they could.

So, if you need any help with that, I have at least a few things to say that at least somebody has proven already found value.

**WOODS:** Yeah, I'd absolutely love to hear them. I'm going to want to just do a free workshop, like, over one of the Zoom or whatever. And I'll give a presentation and people can ask questions.

So, I mean, at some point if you're on my mailing list, which you can get on at TomWoods.com, you will get invited to this thing. As long as you open my emails, you'll see it.

**HORTON:** And can keep that subject short, by the way. Because I don't have that much to say, just a little.

**WOODS:** Well, it's like – we'll get back to this in one second. But you remember in 2017, back when Bob Murphy and hosted the Contra Cruise – we hosted a cruise for four years, and it was awesome.

The best one we did was the one with you and Dave on board, and Michael Boldin. That was the best one. And we had this informal session where I said: *Dave, I want you to do a private, like, off the record, no recording* – I'm kicking myself for not recording this thing – *on basically, like, how to write a joke. How does a comedian come up with bits and a routine?*

And he said: *You know, I don't think I have anything to teach on that because I just do it on instinct. I don't think I really have anything to say.* He filled up an hour with the most fascinating stuff.

And he didn't even know – it was all implicit knowledge. He didn't even know he had it. And that was kind of like when I recently did do a writing thing for my school life people. The knowledge just kept coming out. I didn't even know I had it, because it was all implicit up there.

So, I think we both have more than we realize we have. But let's get back on to more explicit kinds of knowledge. I want to talk about what Bill Kristol's been up to.

**HORTON:** One more thing about Taiwan. I'm sorry, Tom, but let me just say about Taiwan real quick. About a week or two ago, I interviewed Lyle Goldstein. And he is formerly at the Naval War College. He's now at Defense Priorities, which is a Kochtopus thing, but they're really good guys.

They've got Daniel Davis over there. And Lyle Goldstein, he did all the wargames and studied what war with China over Taiwan would look like for years as a professional there. And I think he's teaching at whatever university now as well.

And I interviewed him for about an hour and a half about what war with China would look like. And it is really bad. I mean, he says we will lose half our Navy. We will lose thousands of sailors, hundreds of planes, and it could very well lead to nuclear war.

And not just the threat that China would resort to nukes, but the threat that the Americans would resort to nukes. They start losing sailors by the thousands and these kinds of things.

In fact, I talked with a guy at, I think, a YAL fest just last weekend (or weekend before last) who told me he was a submariner over there and he could verify that the Taiwan Straits is relatively shallow waters, and we cannot dominate them with our subs.

They have too many mines, too many boats. We cannot effectively wage a war there. It would be essentially committing half of our military force to their deaths and then still lose.

So, I encourage people, if they really are interested in this subject and want to hear about it from a guy who really knows what he's talking about. It's just me asking the questions and Lyle doing the answering there. And that's a ScottHorton.org.

**WOODS:** All right. If you remember to send me the specific link, I can put it on the show notes.

**HORTON:** Great. Will do.

**WOODS:** Yeah. TomWoods.com/2384. So, Bill Kristol is overseeing the spending of a couple of million dollars on ads to try to get recalcitrant Republicans to get on board on the Ukraine thing.

Because this is an unusual situation for Kristol, that he has to persuade Republicans to be more interventionist. In the old days, this was the last thing he had to worry about. So, that's an interesting development.

And the other side of that is, I guess you probably know a little something about the relatively new president of the Heritage Foundation, Kevin Roberts.

**HORTON:** No, I'm afraid not.

**WOODS:** Okay. Well, he's not right about everything, but he's much, much better than we had a right to expect. Here's what he recently said about this campaign by Bill Kristol, *"Since when is it conservative to spend the taxpayers' money with..."*

And he's not talking about Kristol spending the money, obviously. He means the money spent on Ukraine. *"...with no accountability, no strategy, no timeline and no end game."*

**HORTON:** The boss at Heritage said that?

**WOODS:** Heritage! Oh, no, no, hang on. Wait. He says, *"This ad buy is a waste of money because conservative voters know the truth. We've spent too much money on Ukraine at a time when we can ill afford it. But I'm also not surprised, considering how well financed the neocon war machine in DC has been."*

How about that?

**HORTON:** Okay! I like this guy!

**WOODS:** Yeah. So, you gotta talk to Kevin Roberts one of these days.

**HORTON:** Yeah, absolutely. Well, hope he's not the mirror opposite inverse horror show on China like so many of them are. But that is absolutely good stuff.

**WOODS:** I don't know. Because yeah, sometimes then they break your heart on the China thing. Get your hopes up. But on the other hand, if you had him on you could find all those areas of agreement and then maybe you're the guy who changes his mind on China.

**HORTON:** Hey, sounds like it's absolutely worth a try. I mean to have a guy – the boss! – at Heritage talking like that about the war party is just fantastic. And you know, Tom attitude follows behavior.

So, the more you talk like that, the more you really think that way. You know what I mean? And really, like, who could ask for a better leader of the war party than Bill Kristol? I mean, there was a time where: *Oh, no, Bill Kristol is coming!*

And he has a desk drawer full of think tanks with him, an echo chamber the size of North America to make every lie he claims seem verified and true and repeated. But just, those days are over, right?

It's like when Jonah Goldberg led the *National Review* in denouncing Donald Trump. You could already tell then.

That was in 2015 and you could already tell then, they're like: *Did Donald Trump pay you to do that, Jonah Goldberg? You know how much we hate you, dude. We know that when you say Trump is the worst, that's the best thing that he could receive. That's the best endorsement he could get.*

So, Bill Kristol says: *Give up all that money that you had planned on spending on improving your own family's lot in the world, and help get some poor kid's legs blown off in Ukraine over a longer period of time so they can end up losing even more land to Russia than they already have lost.*

**WOODS:** Yeah, see, when you put it like that, Scott, it's not as attractive sounding.

**HORTON:** No, not really. Hey, the guy who was wrong about Iraq and Afghanistan – and don't even know if he bothered lying about Somalia – but Libya, and Syria, and Yemen, and Iran, but especially Iraq War Two.

I mean, listen, other than Bush, Cheney, and Paul Wolfowitz, this is the man most responsible for getting America into Iraq Wat Two than any other person in the world. And so, follow him into battle, or not.

**WOODS:** I want to make sure everybody listening to this remembers that you had a debate with Bill Kristol. Or maybe they didn't know in the first place. Most people do. You had this Soho Forum debate with Bill Kristol where you just demolished him.

And he obviously was unprepared. He thought you were some punk or something like that, and you just murdered him. It was right before my 2,000th episode. And you arrived the triumphant hero with a huge, loud, extended standing ovation for your performance against Bill Kristol.

And every time he tweets something stupid – I think one time I actually responded this way in writing, but the other times it's in my head. I'll say: *Boy, he didn't learn anything from his interaction with Scott Horton. This did not stay with him at all.*

**HORTON:** Well, let me tell you, Tom, I mean, I went into that thinking: *Man, I really gotta not let Tom down*. You know what I mean? Like, if I walk out of here and I didn't just get killed, then I'm okay. And did a bit better than that. I'll take it.

But then what I never could have expected or hoped for or wish for is that virtually every day in the now, what, two and a half years, since, two years, since? Virtually every day somebody trolls him of in my name. They trash him in my name.

And some of the things I could never repeat on a family show like yours. But some of the nicer ones are things just like: *Oh yeah, how are you typing? Did your father Scott Horton, give you permission to write?*

Or whatever, those are some of the nice ones. Some of them are really bad. And it's every day. Like, for the rest of his life, people bully him with his defeat at my hands. So, it's nice to see.

**WOODS:** And the thing is, he had ample opportunity, like during the Q&A.

**HORTON:** Not that I'm Irving Kristol. But am his daddy now, in that sense.

**WOODS:** Yeah, well, we know the sense you mean. But you could both answer a question if you wanted to. You had the option. And so, sometimes the questions would come and you would just crush the answer.

And Gene would say: *Bill, do you have a response?* And he would just say: *No.* And I took that as, he doesn't want to go up against Scott. Because normally he would.

If he were on MSNBC and they said: *Bill Kristol, do you have something to say to that?* The answer would have been: *You betcha, and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.* But when he's sitting there with Scott Horton, it's [meekly]: *No, go on to the next question.*

**HORTON:** And by the end of the thing, he kept putting his Covid mask on, kind of hiding behind it, taking it off and putting it back on and everything. It was great.

**WOODS:** Oh, that was awful. Oh, jeez. He even had a Covid mask [laughing].

**HORTON:** The worst. So, I've had this thing going on on Twitter where – because this was so meaningful to me at the time, I figured I'd be lying if deprived people of it. It's #Raimondo20yearsago.

And I'm tweeting out all of Justin's columns from Antiwar.com right as they were lying us into war, in the early part of the war here. And boy, does Bill Kristol and his neocons keep coming up in those articles.

And Justin was just the best on him. He called him "the little Lenin of the neoconservative movement". Forget Trotsky, this guy's Lenin, and just will stop at nothing. And there was just so much great analysis there.

So, if anybody wants to look at those, it's just #Raimondo20yearsago on Twitter. And I've got a ton of articles there for you to look at – so much good stuff.

**WOODS:** Justin Raimondo, I remember – what you call Iraq War Two. I remember how horrified I was at that. And his columns, just reading his columns over and over during that time was such a consolation.

And I have to say that obviously, although there have been interventions since then, it's been nice, not – I mean, there's a sick feeling in the pit of your stomach when the first thing you have to check every morning is Antiwar.com.

I like to read Antiwar.com, I like to read it at my leisure. I don't want to have to read it because it's a sheer necessity because of the stupid BS the regime is up to that's so, so destructive like that war was.

And every morning I would be over there seeing what was going on. Are there any silver linings? Is there anything?

**HORTON:** And they really learn from that. That like, it's so important that we use drones and al Qaeda terrorist militias on the ground to accomplish American ends instead of sending GIs in to get blown up.

So, that was the policy in Libya and Syria and Yemen, is just back foreign terrorist shock troops to go in there and do suicide attacks and whatever. And then that way we can pretend that the war on terrorism is over, because it's a war for terrorism now.

And then nobody really gets all choked up if a predator drone runs out of batteries and falls out of the sky. You know what I mean? So, then you can just keep it going forever. And then look at, like, the war in Ukraine right now.

They keep saying – and I'm collecting these quotes like matchbox cars for the book. That they just keep saying: *Man, this war is great! We are killing so many Russians, but it's not costing any American lives at all!*

In fact, David Ignatius in the Post was saying: We are all doing great from this war. And then he literally, Tom, put in parentheses, "(except for the Ukrainians)".

**WOODS:** Oh, like an afterthought?

**HORTON:** Yeah, dude. And that's CIA. I mean, of all the guys at the Post, he is officially known as the man closest to the CIA there – former CIA employee David Ignatius. And just, he's speaking for them. That's the way they look at it, is like: *Into the meat grinder, young man. Back to the front.*

**WOODS:** It's so funny when people like that comment, like, on Twitter. The responses are all contemptuous. And it just makes me wonder how come we're not doing better if everybody who's even remotely conscious sees through these people? But that's a topic for another episode.

I want to end by urging people to go – let's put our money where our mouths are: *Oh, in a free society we would freely donate to the...* Okay, well, let's freely donate now. Especially when it's a cause that you know generates results.

You know Scott Horton is not driving around in a limousine. I can attest to that. He just puts his nose to the grindstone and works really, really hard for all of us. So, let's do something in return for Scott. So, LibertarianInstitute.org/donate.

I don't get any money. I've never – I don't think I've gotten $1 from the Libertarian Institute, nor do I seek it. It's just, I know these people. I've known Scott forever, and I know they're doing good work.

And I know there are people out there who would like to help something and they're not sure exactly what. Here's an example of what. So, thank you, Scott.

**HORTON:** Thank you so much, Tom.