

**Episode 2405: Contra Shapiro: The Rights and Wrongs of Israel and Gaza**

**Guest: Scott Horton**

**WOODS:**  All right. So, obviously, last week was out of town. And so, before going out of town I recorded some episodes. And then, like, the world blew up and none of my episodes had anything to do with it.

So, better late than never. We've got Scott Horton on to talk about what's just happened in Israel with this attack by Hamas, and then the Israeli counterattack. I talked to you about this in the car, because we were talking about my book.

I was driving to go see Morrissey, and I said: *You know, as long as I’ve got you on the phone...* We talked a little bit about what had happened.

And I said to you, why would Hamas do this? What's the end game for them, when they obviously know the overwhelming firepower that Israel has, and its friendship with the US?

Why would it do this? It has to know that the counterattack is going to be overwhelming. Well, what are you thinking here? And I noticed on Antiwar.com that you recently wrote up something very similar to what you said to me in the car.

So, can we start there? Why would you do this knowing what is sure to happen?

**HORTON:** Okay. Yeah. So, that's a great place to start, Tom. That is my current article on Antiwar.com this weekend, and it'll be under my name in the right-hand margin there on Antiwar.com after that. People can find it. And it's about how the whole purpose here was a reaction.

You got it right. Of course, quite literally, they had to have known. Hamas had to have known that they were bringing on a massive campaign by the Israeli government in retaliation for this horrendous slaughter which they perpetrated.

For people not up on the news, they killed hundreds of people. I'm not exactly sure the number of civilians versus Israeli military who were killed. I know it's somewhere right around a thousand who were killed overall.

And after all, the Israeli military are mostly conscripts, Tom. They're drafted. So, I have to presume that none of them want to be there. Maybe some of them do, but, you know, it's a gray area. But if you're a conscript, that's not exactly the same as being a volunteer, I don't think.

You know what I mean? I mean, obviously they're combatants versus non-combatants. Non-combatants are even more innocent than them. But a slave trooper is still like – anyway, whatever. They murdered hundreds of non-combatants too, men, women, and children, slaughtered them.

Okay, that's what they did. And they did that in order to "make" Netanyahu launch the giant attack that he has launched, and has slaughtered already hundreds and hundreds of civilians in the Gaza Strip as well, in response.

And as of – well, I'm not up on the latest news this afternoon. But the last I checked, they had not launched a ground invasion yet, but were preparing a massive ground invasion with the stated intention of completely obliterating the group Hamas off the face of the Earth.

Which, seems an impossible task to do with the civilian population of Gaza stuck in the middle there. So, then the purpose of that is, quite literally, yes, to get their people ("their people") killed – the people, the Palestinian civilians of the Gaza Strip.

That's why Hamas murdered the Israeli civilians, to force the Israeli government to launch this giant campaign that they know will kill civilians in the Gaza Strip (Palestinian civilians, men, women and children, too) in order to then provoke the counter-reaction to that.

This is what Saul Alinsky says in *Rules for Radicals*, that the action is in the reaction of the opposition. I learned that from William Norman Grigg, the Bircher. I'm not a communist, thank you very much. But anyway. And he wasn't a communist either. He just knows his enemy.

But look, the point is, Hamas has no power. Israel has all the power. It's zero versus 1,000% power relationship, there. These guys have AK-47s and shoes. The other side has essentially first world military technology to the nth degree.

So, Hamas can't defeat Israel in any kind of pitched battle. Well, certainly they can't invade Israel. They can fend them off, as we saw in 2014. Well, depending on just how far Israel is willing to go against them, of course.

But so, the point is to provoke that reaction and then to provoke the counter-reactions. So, now Nasrallah, who is the leader of Hezbollah in southern Lebanon, he has to take a position on what he's going to do.

But he apparently has been firing off some rockets, although I don't know if all those have been directly attributed to Hezbollah or not. There's been some rocket fire and exchanges of fire back and forth at the border.

So, that very clearly could blow up into a real war with Hezbollah at the northern border of Israel. At that point, you have the government of Syria that is an Alawite government, but very close to the Shiites.

It's sort of a break-off group of the Shiites and very close to the Shiites, allied to Hezbollah and allied to Iran. Now, these are the Shiites and Hamas are Sunnis, and the Palestinians are Sunnis. And yet they have supported the Palestinian cause for a very long time, the Iranians have.

For their own political purposes, of course, not out of the goodness of their heart, but for their own political reasons they intervene in this way.

And remember, Tom, now, that George W Bush, when he launched Iraq War Two, all he did, by stupidly listening to the stupid neoconservatives, was the exact opposite of what they had hoped to accomplish, i.e., they put Iran's best friends in power in Baghdad.

Which is why we have hardly any influence there whatsoever right now. And then also, I don't know if you saw the headline that the crown prince of Saudi Arabia, Crown Prince bin Salman – or Crown Prince Bonesaw, as I call him, the murderer.

He got on the phone to the president of Iran. It was the first time they'd ever spoken. And they said: Yeah, you know, we've got to do something about this Palestinian thing. So, all the governments around the region, every armed group around the region, all the different little Sunni and Shiite militias in Iraq and Syria and God knows where, everybody has to take a position.

And politics get radicalized. Everybody's attention had diverted from the Middle East to the germ and then to Ukraine. Well, your attention is diverted right back to their cause again.

And I think the correct way to put this is, as Madeleine Albright would say: *They think the price is worth it.* To cause that to happen in order to get the end result that they want. And quite frankly, as I detail in both of my books, that Osama bin laden was exactly the same way.

This is how he felt about the situation in Afghanistan. Afghanistan was Osama's Gaza Strip. He wasn't from there. He was a Saudi – squatting, by the way, him and his Egyptian friends.

But their idea was: *We want to replicate the Soviet Union's war in the 1980s, with America in the role of the USSR, bog them down in a war of attrition in Afghanistan, bleed them to bankruptcy and force them out the hard way.*

Well, Osama bin laden knew good and well that the Soviets had killed a million Afghans, Tom. They make Bush and Obama look like angels. Well, not really, they killed hundreds of thousands. But what the Soviets did in Afghanistan was just absolute bloody murder.

But Osama bin laden didn't care about that. His idea was: *Well, whatever, they'll all go to Paradise, right? Let God sort them out. If they're good Muslims, it'll be fine. And if they're not, then damn them anyway*. *And so, if that means America has to do all this, because in the end, we'll get what we want.*

 That's how a terrorist thinks. That's how terrorist acts. And so, it's the same thing that Hamas did here. And the price worth it, why?

Because quite frankly, they are, as Max Blumenthal said on my show the other day – and he is a firsthand witness to this, a real journalist over there, not a radio host like me staying home, writing books.

He's been over there a lot, wrote a whole book about it over there, two books about it over there and everything. He said these are the most oppressed people in the world, or at least among them, right up there with the North Koreans or something.

They live in essentially what is, as Pat Buchanan, our friend, said on *MSNBC* back ten years ago: *It's quite literally a concentration camp*. And I forgot who was the host of the show, but the host of the show said: *Come on, Pat. I mean, that sounds like you're talking about the Holocaust. You can't do that.*

And Pat goes: *No, no, no. Now that's a death camp. That's different. I'm not saying that, but it's a concentration camp*. And then he brought up examples from history. He said – I forgot what it was. Like, the British in Myanmar or Burma or something like that, the British somewhere.

He said the Spanish in Cuba. I know nothing about the Spanish in Cuba, Tom. He goes: *The Spanish in Cuba had these concentration camps where they enslaved everybody and brought them together in this thing.*

He could have mentioned Kennedy in South Vietnam, maybe. Same thing, anyway, Strategic Hamlets, right? But look, that's what they are. They're in a concentration camp, Pat Buchanan said. He's not a hippie. He's Ronald Reagan's guy. And he's like: *Look, man, that's the reality of this thing.*

See, Tom, I find this out more and more as I talk to people about this. We talk about "the Israelis" and "the Palestinians". Just right there, it sounds like the Palestinians have a country. It sounds like they're from a country called "Palestine".

Or a country called something, but the people from there are called Palestinians. Because everybody has a country, of course. So, if they're the Palestinians, then it's the Palestinians versus the Israelis. And it sounds like there's some kind of equal – not exactly equal balance of power, but equal station in the world, right?

Like, if we're talking the United States versus Mexico. Well, obviously the United States has much more military power and strength and economic power and strength than Mexico. We could beat them in a war if we had to, I hope.

But at the same time, still, Mexico has a national government and a military and stuff like that, right? But we're not talking about that. We're talking about Indians on the rez. That's what we're talking about. The Palestinians are Indians.

They've already been conquered, and licked, and beaten, and their land taken. It's just they're still stuck on it. So, they don't have control over it. There is no Palestine. And so, this is confusing to people.

I know because people say to me, they go: *It's funny because it's like they're attacking across this border from Gaza, right?* But then they talk about how one day they're going to have a two-state solution.

So, what does that mean? Well, that means that the fence there at Gaza, that's not a border. That's a prison wall. That's what it is.

**WOODS:** Let me back up for a minute, because I want to make sure I'm getting the point of your piece that you have, that in provoking Israel in this way, that Hamas was hoping to accomplish a particular outcome.

And one of the things that it does, as you say, it forces the regimes in the area to – more or less, they've got to take a side. And so, they either side with the US position on this. Which, they feel compelled to because of the relationships they have with the US government.

Or they can side with the opinions of 100% of their people. So, it forces them into a corner they'd prefer not to be in. But once all this political maneuvering is complete, how does this advance the cause of Hamas?

Is it that it provokes an overreaction that leads to condemnation? Or that leads to other powers getting involved? What's the end game?

**HORTON:** So, here's one concrete thing that they can expect to gain (and possibly a chain of events), would be to sabotage these Abraham Accords. These are Trump's peace deals. And now Biden has continued them, trying to negotiate these peace deals.

And they're right in the middle of trying to negotiate one with Saudi Arabia right now. So, what are these? They call them "peace deals". But none of these countries were at war with Israel. They're not really enemies of Israel. So, what's the ticket? What's going on?

What's going on is these countries had all promised, even though they have friendly relations, that they would not normalize official relations with Israel until Israel gave justice to the Palestinians, and that is letting them have independence on the West Bank and Gaza Strip and their own independent state.

Or somehow guaranteeing their equal rights as citizens of Israel in some kind of bi-national state. Or some kind of thing where they're no longer just occupied and oppressed like this.

And the idea was they had all agreed that even though they do really mistreat the Palestinians and they don't really stick up for the Palestinians, that, at least in this way – this was like their final straw: *We'll never completely normalize relations with Israel until they cut the Palestinians a break.*

And then what happened was Jared Kushner figured out that: *Nah. They have a price. And since Tom Woods and the taxpayers are picking up the tab, we'll just keep upping the number until it's high enough.*

*And we'll just buy off these regimes with dollars and with weapons. And if we give them enough, they'll forsake the Palestinians and go ahead and normalize relations anyway.*

So, this is a very important policy. From the point of view of Benjamin Netanyahu. This was – it's hard to get too far into this. But they had previously this the strategy of the periphery, where they were friends with Turkey and Iran and Ethiopia in order to divide the nearer states, and their attentions to countries that are on their other flank, basically.

As a good way to – like, supporting Iran is a good way to keep Saddam Hussein's eyeballs pointed east. Not west at them. That kind of thing. Then they changed that policy in the 1990s and they inverted it.

And Yitzhak Rabin said: *No, instead we're going to make enemies out of Iran, and we're going to scapegoat Iran. And we're going to make friends with the Arabs, and we're going to negotiate with the Palestinians and give them a Palestinian state.*

Now, he wasn't really promising a Palestinian state, but better than anything they'd been offered since then. But what happened was a Netanyahu fan murdered the guy, assassinated him in 1995.

And so, the periphery strategy had been inverted, but instead of making peace with the Palestinians, now it was: *Well, we'll just try to have more friendly relations with the Arab states*. And then the contest, the trick, was, can they do that without giving up the Palestinian state and living up to the Oslo Accord and their promises to give them a state?

And so, that was the game. So, this was supposed to be Netanyahu's great achievement. That: See? I can normalize relations. I can get all these Abraham Accords through and all these peace deals through without giving in on Palestine. See what a great leader I am?

That was the Netanyahu corollary to the change from the periphery doctrine to whatever they call it now. I'm sorry, I forgot what they called it after the periphery doctrine, but this was his addition to the grand strategy of Israel.

Well, it didn't quite work out that way. Or at least you could argue. Never mind that. The argument here is that Hamas said: *Oh yeah, you guys* – you might even look at this as a strike against these Arab states: *You guys are going to normalize relations with Israel and ignore us and forget about us*.

And so, they – by killing all these innocent Israelis and provoking this giant reaction by Israel and all the counter reactions. They get to destabilize and ruin some of those peace deals. Like, the Saudi deal is probably off now, and we'll see if the others survive.

And in fact, I'm sorry, I need, Tom, to track down this footnote. I forgot about this earlier, but Max Blumenthal mentioned when I interviewed him on my radio show last week that he had a quote from one of the leaders of Hamas saying that this was one of the things that they were trying to do was to sabotage – pardon me.

I don't know his exact words. But in effect, sabotage the Abraham Accord peace deals. And in other words, put their issue back on the map. And then I guess the idea would be, if it means that much to Saudi Arabia, and it means that much to Qatar – or was it Bahrain? I forget.

Whatever. If it means enough to these GCC states that they want to have peace with Israel, well, they're going to have to stick up for the Palestinians, and they're going to have to insist that the Israelis negotiate in good faith and so forth.

So, that would be the purpose from Hamas's point of view. I hope that everyone understands when they listen to this, that this is the furthest thing from any kind of justification. And I know that when people are upset that they do kind of hear things that way, but it's just not the case.

In fact, look, I wrote these books that Tom mentioned about the wars. And I explain Osama bin Laden's motive and his strategy for attacking us. His motive was avenging injustice.

His motive was he was angry about horrible, horrible things that America's government, Bill Clinton specifically, and George Bush Sr, had done. And that Israel had done under Shimon Peres and Netanyahu, and Sharon, I guess, by that time. That he was avenging.

And that didn't justify what he was doing at all. It just explained what world we're living in, where we got ourselves in this mess.

After all, when we're talking about al Qaeda, these guys were the agents of Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George Bush, and Bill Clinton before they attacked us under George Bush Jr. In fact, they were attacking us all during Bill Clinton, and he was backing them anyway.

And you guys can read all about this in my next book. Plus, I mention, and have some footnotes in my previous books, but I prove it to the nth degree in my new book about how he backed the mujahideen. I mean, the bin Ladenite terrorists, Arab-Afghan mujahideen terrorists, in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Chechnya.

And even was backing the KLA in Kosovo, at war in Macedonia right up until August of 2001 under George W Bush. Just a month before the September 11th attack, America still thought: *Oh yeah, we can use these guys. Everything's just fine.*

Which, if you want. So, that's just an analogy. It's the same damn thing here. Where – not exactly the same. Israel didn't hire Hamas to be their mercenaries, the way the Americans had used the bin Ladenites. But they hired them, in a sense, to divide the Palestinians, to weaken them.

And Connor and I are, I think, going to byline an article at the *Institute* and Antiwar.com next week. We're kind of working on it, and I've been collecting all these notes, Tom. Where – and look, I understand this sounds like conspiracy stuff. In a way, that's sort of my specialty, right?

I talk about things that sound like conspiracy stuff, but then my footnotes are all the *Wall Street Journal* and things like that. And you go: *Oh man, I didn't really realize it was like that.* But it's really not the kooky stuff. It's really the straight dope. But it sounds really bad. But it is really bad.

And that's what it is, is that the Israelis (and particularly the Israeli right) they helped promote the rise of Hamas from the very beginning. It wasn't founded by them. It was founded by members of the Muslim Brotherhood.

But the Israelis quite deliberately helped groom them and sustain them and facilitate their rise, and including direct payments to them. And all while arresting and oppressing all their competition in the PLO and in any other, especially in any other religious groups and anything else.

And they did this for years and years and years. And they did it explicitly, Tom, in order to create a right-wing religious alternative to the secular commies in the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the sort of commie sort of nationalist PLO with Yasser Arafat and his guys, who were all kind of secularist types.

And they wanted to promote these – promote them, first of all, these right-wing fundamentalist religious types, just to divide them. But then, even better, they're perfect to scapegoat because, as we've seen with September 11th and the whole aftermath of the terror war here.

If the guy who attacks you is wearing a funny hat and has, like, explicitly wrapped up his case for war in religious doctrine, then that's a perfect argument for the other side to say: *See, these people are crazy. These people are intractable, impossible, irrational enemies.*

*They might as well be schizophrenic, paranoid lunatics that cannot obviously be dealt with in any way if their entire motive for attacking us and warring against us is because their horrible religion makes them do it.*

**WOODS:** All right. Well, that's a good place for me to jump in, because I want to ask you this. We keep hearing – in fact, we even heard from our friend Walter Block in the *Wall Street Journal*. I'm sure you saw the article he co-authored last week, basically saying this.

*That there is a culture in Gaza that begins with young children, in which even young children, if you interview them, will talk about their feelings about the Jews (not favorable) and that they look forward to the opportunity to committing acts of violence against them.*

And it then said: *Look, this is a culture that absolutely pervades the society. And so, it's very easy for you in an ivory tower at an American university to talk about the injustices suffered by the Palestinians.*

*But if I live in Israel, and I'm next to a place whose people have succumbed to this kind of death-cult kind of culture, what honestly do you expect me to do?*

So, is there something wrong with the premise of that objection?

**HORTON:** I mean, sort of. Well, there's a couple of things. I mean, first of all, as Walter Block might say, if we were talking about any other subject: *Well, history didn't begin yesterday*.

If the Israelis had dealt with the Palestinians in good faith in the year leading up to 2023, when we're having this discussion, and it's almost over already. We're deep into the future now, after the Israelis broke every deal they ever promised to live up to.

And Hamas helped them do it. Again, that's the purpose of them, is, if the Palestinian Authority and the Israelis are making some progress and the Israelis are actually into it for a change, Hamas will set off a suicide bomb.

And the Israelis are the same way. Most of the time, they'll look for any excuse to say that they can't deal, to blame the Palestinians. They say: *We have no partner for peace*. But they jail all their partners for peace.

And they leave a bunch of lunatics running around out there and say: *Wee, we have no partner for peace.* And look, here's the thing about it, Tom. I've got the direct quotes of the guys admitting it in their own words, including Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu himself.

Okay, you couldn't make this up. As Brom Kheifits would say – remember Brom on Facebook back years ago? Brom Kheifits would say: *Man, you couldn't make this stuff up*.

This is Benjamin Netanyahu, Tom Woods, speaking to his cabinet in 2019, quote, *"Anyone who wants to thwart the establishment of a Palestinian state has to support bolstering Hamas and transferring money to Hamas. This is part of our strategy to isolate the Palestinians in Gaza from the Palestinians in the West Bank. It's impossible to reach an agreement with them. Everyone knows this."*

Which is, of course, the whole point. *"But we control the height of the flame."* Get it? Hamas is a perfect little enemy for the Israelis to have. See, here's the thing, man. Israel doesn't want peace, Tom. They want that land. They want the West Bank, Judea and Samaria.

But they've got all these kidnapped people sitting on it, millions and millions of them. And what are they going to do with them? And the idea is: *I don't know, we'll just figure it out later. But right now, we're going to create "facts on the ground", and we're going to colonize the whole thing in the name of the Bible*.

And they can't do that if the Palestinian Authority, which is led by Mahmoud Abbas in the three-piece suit, rules both the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, because then the Europeans and the Americans might insist that the Israelis negotiate: *Hey, man, you should negotiate with the Palestinians. Give up the West Bank and East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip to be a Palestinian state, like in the deal.*

But as long as they have Hamas there, they don't have to do that. And I just quoted to you directly from Benjamin Netanyahu himself, explaining that that is why, *"Anyone who wants to thwart the establishment of a Palestinian state has to support bolstering Hamas."*

You can't make that up, right? And then, of course, the arrogance, the imperial arrogance, *"But we control the height of the flame."* But of course, the flame just burned the whole kitchen down. They completely blew it.

They think they're so clever, but they're not. They're just like the Americans and their arrogance. And listen to this, too. If you think that Netanyahu was just having a bad day that day. This is Bezalel Smotrich, who is the current finance minister.

He ain't the minister of garbage. He's the finance minister. And he is the leader of the Religious Zionist Party in the Knesset. And here's what he says. He's being challenged. The guy's challenging him about: *Jeez, I don't know about all this Hamas running around and Netanyahu's government's tacit support for Hamas in the Gaza Strip*.

And so, Smotrich is essentially defending the status quo against his interviewer, who is being critical. And here's what he says, Tom. And again, you couldn't make this stuff up. And by the way, a friend of mine who is an Israeli American, translated from the original Hebrew for me.

So, this is not machine translation. This is by an Israeli who is a dual language guy who translated it for me. And here's the quote, *"The PA..."* That means the Palestinian Authority, aka Fatah, aka Mahmoud Abbas, the much more moderate-seeming figure who's in charge of the Palestinian Authority that controls the West Bank. That's the PA.

He says, *"The PA is the liability, and Hamas is an asset on the international playing field in this game of delegitimization."* Think about it for a second. The PA is a liability and Hamas is an asset. It's a terrorist organization. Nobody will recognize it.

Nobody will give it status at the International Criminal Court. And nobody will let them push resolutions at the UN that then we would need an American veto over, or not need one. I'm not sure at all that given the current situation, given the current facts, and that the central playing field we're playing in is international, there.

Abu Abbas is costing us serious casualties. He means in a public relations sense. Abu Abbas is costing us serious casualties. And Hamas, in such a situation, is an asset. And then he answers back to the imperial arrogance because the question was: *Yeah, but isn't Hamas really dangerous?*

And he says, *"I don't think we need to be afraid of that."* The idea that Hamas – well, the question was pretty broad. The question was hyperbolic. The question was: *Aren't you afraid Hamas could take over?*

And so, that's the way he answers. He says: *I don't think we need to be afraid of Hamas taking over.* Which, of course, that's right. But that's not really the question, even if that's the way the interviewer phrased it.

The question is, just how dangerous is this fire that they're playing with? But you see how – and this all comes from Israeli media, every bit of it. None of this comes from Arab media, Palestinian sources, or *Al Jazeera* or whatever.

All this comes from *Haaretz*. All this comes from the *Jerusalem Post* and all of these things, a *972* mag. And and I have a thread, if people go to my Twitter feed @ScottHortonShow, I have a thread that's going around.

It starts out, it says, "The Israeli regime likes it this way – Starter Pack." And I just have link after link to news stories going back 20 years, explaining this absolutely cynical policy of the Israeli government to promote division between the Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank, despite their promise in the Oslo deal to recognize and support only the PA as the legitimate authority of both.

But they found ways. And you can ask me (and I'll follow up if you want) of how they did it. They found ways to make sure to keep Hamas rolling along in Gaza up until now, just so they can say to you: *But Tom, we have no partner for peace.*

*These people, they say they want to kill our kids. These people say that as soon as their first chance, they're going to put their hand around our neck, so we have no choice.*

But they made it that way deliberately. And listen, I'm not saying that the people of the Gaza Strip, especially the people of Hamas, in this group, whoever is teaching a little kid to say a hateful thing or whoever is quite literally themselves a lethal threat, all of that can be dealt with.

I mean, like, just on the face of it, if it was a one state solution, Hamas would be disarmed. The Palestinians might have their own local police, but they wouldn't be allowed to have a real militia. That would be part of the deal, would be that they would be disarmed.

So, like, a lot of this stuff is-- or even if it was a two-state solution – and this is another thing. Well, then they might be armed up more heavily. But then if they truly allow them to have independence, that would seemingly take a lot of the pressure off, even considering the fact of Israel as it exists within '67 borders.

Because after all, even Yasser Arafat had said way back in 1988: Fine, we'll settle for 22%. Just let us have our 22% of what's left of Palestine. And Hamas in the past has said that they would recognize Israel within '67 borders and settle for that in a final negotiation.

And then Israel says: *No, you have to recognize us up front instead of as part of the deal*. So, of course, just to sabotage it, right? Even when Hamas says: *Fine, we'll settle.* They go: *Nah, not good enough. You have to say that we're a Jewish state.*

I mean, seriously, they just move these goalposts and add all this stuff all the time.

**WOODS:**  All right. I want to clarify some things here. Do you think that a majority of people living in Gaza support Hamas?

**HORTON:** Well, the majority of people? Last I checked, only a bare majority of people in Gaza are even over 18, Tom. And they've been a majority minor population – what do you call that?

They've been a majority minor population virtually this whole time, even since the vote was cast for Hamas back in 2006. So, if you take the half of the population that's of voting age in Gaza, I don't know what they'd say in an opinion poll or if anybody ever asked them in a fair poll.

I'm sure that every time they're attacked – just like the situation here. George Bush's approval rating went up to 90% after he was doing absolutely nothing to protect this country in the month of August and September 2001.

And so, there's always what they call at the university, the "rally around the flag" effect. And so, if Hamas is their security force – which they are stuck with, which they did not really freely choose. They won a majority of seats.

They didn't win the presidency or the leadership or whatever role. That went to Abbas. In the parliamentary elections, they did win a bare majority. But then because of a failed coup sponsored by America, Israel, and Egypt in 2007, they ended up taking total control of the Gaza Strip.

So, they were never put in there in any kind of fair process in the first place. And again, we're talking about trustees in a prison, right? We're not talking about a democracy at all. And look, we're all libertarians. We don't believe in this popular sovereignty crap anyway.

Lysander Spooner debunked all that 100 and however many years ago. I can't do math live on the air. But the idea that the people of Gaza somehow are collectively responsible – which you didn't directly ask me, but it sounds like might be where you're going with that.

Because that is the discussion out there right now. That, like: *Well, you love Hamas so much, then you take your lumps.* But that's what Osama bin Laden said about America electing Bill Clinton twice and paying our taxes every April, that we deserve to die.

That's in his Letter to America from 2002. Where he has that exact mentality, that if the people's leaders vote wrong, and especially he said: *Aren't you guys like the big democracy, who talk a big game about how freely-elected your leaders are and all of this stuff? Well, it sounds to me like you're responsible for what they do.*

But how could that be right, Tom? That you and I deserve to die for what Bill Clinton did? I've already had my own problems with Bill Clinton. Now I'm on his side? That ain't fair. That guy bin Laden's stupid and crazy and evil and horrible.

Who could possibly think that way about individual human beings? It's just an excuse, right? People pretend that there's some kind of a rationale there. But it's totally not fair at all. You're talking about – I don't know what percent of the population of Gaza are actually members of Hamas, but I bet it's a very small percent.

So, like, their overall popularity? I don't know, compared to Republicans or Democrats in America or something, I really couldn't tell you. But I think – look, armed fighters, especially volunteer armed fighters, they take responsibility for their actions.

And, like, even at the Pentagon on September 11th, those people, they weren't combatants, but they had signed up for the service. Too bad Al Qaeda hit them with a plane full of civilians that they murdered.

And we forget, because it was 20-something years ago now. We forget, September 11th, they killed 3,000 people, man. They didn't execute children in the way that Hamas did in this thing. So, it's a little bit apples and oranges, but it's whatever, man.

I mean, it was an absolute horrific atrocity that they committed against the United States in order to modify our behavior one way or the other. And really, to draw us in and push us out the hard way.

**WOODS:** Well, here's a problem I think a lot of people have. Now, I'm Armenian. And the Armenians have suffered tremendously, especially recently. But if a group of Armenians were responsible for butchering some Azerbaijani civilians, I wouldn't think to myself: *Now's the time to have a pro-Armenia rally*.

I would think: *Now's the time for me to make sure the world understands I have nothing to do with those people. That no matter how just my cause is, these people are ruining the good name of my cause, and I want to go out of my way to separate myself from them.*

Whereas I don't feel like that's exactly what's been going on with all these rallies, so it makes me feel like it's harder to sympathize with them. Even though I can understand how people actually living in Gaza who aren't militant like this can have legitimate grievances.

**HORTON:** Yeah, well, look, I mean, I'm just not really impressed by that. I mean, the fact is that communists are bad on virtually everything, right?

And then if people are legitimately pro-Islamist, Hamas ideologues, and like that stuff, well, then they're complete screwballs and everyone would share contempt for that. They're completely stupid. And they probably reflect a pretty good image of Hamas, but I don't think that they reflect the Palestinian people at all.

And the Palestinian people are just human beings like everybody else, man. And all the big rallies against Iraq War Two, they were all put on by the ANSWER Coalition, which is literally the Communist Party USA.

And I don't give a damn. I went to both of the big ones February and March, 15th of 2003. And a lot of libertarians and right wingers did too, to try to support the leftists and the liberals and whoever showed up to try to oppose and stop that war.

To let it be known that we oppose that war. Millions of people came out. And yeah, the commies put it on. But is that what we were all there protesting for? It's just like with the Black Lives Matter thing.

You had black communities all over the country coming out against police brutality, and then they go home.

And then in some cities you have rioters and looters at night, and then somehow – and communists throwing firebombs and God knows what, White Antifa rich kids out there cosplaying communist revolutionary out there burning things down.

Now, we're supposed to hate every black person who ever protested against police brutality? And their cause is supposedly delegitimized? When – especially among libertarians. When we know that the state is evil no matter what.

And we know that the cops are quite literally the violent, coercive arm of that state. And we know that poor people and black people get it all the time out of proportion to what other people get.

Not because they're black and cops are racist, but because they're poor, and cops like beating up people, and it's easier to get away with beating up poor people.

And everybody knows that. The ACLU says they do 50,000 SWAT raids a year in this country. And you're telling me some communist shows up and throws a Molotov cocktail, and we're not allowed to care about that anymore? We're not allowed to say that that's unfair?

That of course it's poor Black people are getting their homes SWAT-raided by the tens of thousands a year in this country. I just don't buy into that stuff. And by the way, I'm a libertarian, which means that nobody agrees with me, right?

Like, the left half of America is 130 million people, and the right half of America is 130 million people. And how many libertarians we got? A few million? So, everything I say is going to sound sort of like something somebody else said, or something.

But I just can't be responsible for that, you know what I mean? Like, Ron Paul, he would go – somebody wants to be around him? Fine. And then he'd just say what he always says, and just do the right thing anyway.

And I mean, look. Think about it like this, folks. Forget a bunch of commies protesting outside and making fools of the issue and whatever. Just put that aside. Just put the shoe on the other foot for a second.

Pretend that the Palestinians and the neighboring Arab states had won the 1967 war, and they had herded all the Israeli Jews into the Gaza Strip concentration camp, canceled Israel, and there were 2 million Israeli Jews locked in the Gaza Strip ghetto.

And then what? America would allow that to go on for 50 years? With these people under occupation like this? Well, the reality is, Lyndon Johnson would have sent in the Marines. He'd have never let that happen. And the American people would have never let that happen.

Well, how could it be okay, then? It's a simple question of, like, Immanuel Kant and the universal law, right? That, like, well, if that ain't right, well, then it wouldn't be right either when you do it this way.

And look, I'll tell you, my friend Mike, he said to me, he goes: *You know what, Scott? Here's what I don't understand.*

*If Americans, like, universally regret the way that the American Indians were treated and what had happened to them, and essentially the obliteration of their civilizations off of this continent and the establishment of our civilization in its place. Well, how come nobody cares about this when it's happening right now?*

And I said: *Yeah, exactly, exactly.* But – and here's the answer why. Because they don't know that. Because Ben Shapiro tells them that this is like Mexico attacking across the international border between Mexico and the United States, when that's a lie and Ben Shapiro is a liar.

This is like the Navajo attacking over the wall of the reservation. And if that happened, you would understand the power differential. And you would say: *Look, even if some* – and I'm sorry. I keep naming Indian tribes. I'm not trying to make anyone hate me.

Let's say "Brand X Indian tribe" left the rez and committed an atrocity. You would want to know what is going on there? And you would know it's probably that, like, Hillary Clinton was mining uranium right under their town and got them all cancer.

Some horrible thing, right? You would know it was a real reason why, and that they were being treated unfairly. And that Uncle Sam Biden has all the power in the world, and they have none. And so, it's on him to negotiate in good faith and figure it out.

Not to say: *Oh, you did something wrong? We're bombing the reservation now. We're going to kill all your kids too. See how you like that.* Can you imagine that happening now in America? It did happen before, and universally we regret it, that that was the way the Indians were treated.

Colonel Chivington said: *Nits make lice, men. Kill them all, the babies too*. And that's our history that we hate and regret. And it's happening right now in front of our eyes. And we go: *Well, but the poor Israelis!*

But they're the 800 pound gorilla, and the Palestinians are their prisoners. Again, this is not to justify what Hamas did. What they did was evil. It's just to explain the deliberateness of the evil, why they would do it, and the position that they're in.

And because, frankly, like, I know that most people don't know this stuff. And I think back on my own ignorance on the subject, Tom. Where I used to think: *Well, you've got two sides both claiming that God gave the land to them*.

And I'm not even a religious guy at all. And I just don't have a dog in this fight. And so, the whole thing is stupid. Like, you could never solve that, basically. Just like I was saying about the terrorism before. If they're motivated by radical Islam, well, you can't negotiate with that.

And I thought: *Well, look, if everybody just claims they have a magical land grant from ancient times, then whatever, let them fight, I guess.* Or, I hope they negotiate, but it's whatever. But that's really not right.

The Palestinians, their property rights there are plain old natural John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, natural rights. Plain old libertarian property rights that human beings possess universally across time and across this planet.

And it's the Israeli Jews, many of whom, at least the leaders of their state, who came from Russia and Lithuania and Germany and America. And they had to steal all this land. They had to "cleanse" the land, as they call it now, of 750,000 to 800,000 people, and never let them come home again.

And they needed an excuse, at least to tell themselves, and, I guess, to tell American evangelical Christians. That it's, like, manifest destiny. We can do this because we have a supernatural property right that overrides and cancels your plain old property right.

And so, even Sheldon Richman shows in his book *Coming to Palestine* that even before the declaration of the Israeli state, when European Jews were coming and buying up property in Palestine, they were buying it from absentee landlords in Beirut who'd been given titles by the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire.

When in fact you had had families who'd been tilling that soil and living on that land for thousands of years. The whole time it was their land. So, just like the interviewer asked me last week: *Well, Britain owned it, so Britain gave it to the Jews. So, tough.*

I was like: *Britain didn't own it. This is grand theft... something. That's like me going to your house and giving your front yard to the guy across the street. I got no right. The whole thing is ridiculous on the face of it*.

And honestly, like, even if you believe in religion and even if you believe that even though Jews and Muslims worship the same God, that that same God wanted the European Jews to come and do this to the Palestinian Muslims and take all their land away from them.

Well, you could at least understand why the Palestinians don't see it that way. Why it sounds to them like this is completely illegitimate. This sounds like a thin excuse to rustle their land. And so, I mean, that's really what it all comes down to, I think.

**WOODS:** Well, there are a lot more questions I could ask you. But on the subject of the origins of Israel, I mean, I seriously have thought about – I've actually done an episode on that, a debate episode on whether the establishment of the modern state of Israel concords with the kind of ideas you and I share about private property and legitimate property acquisition and all that.

**HORTON:** Yeah. With the great Jeremy Hammond.

**WOODS:** So, I've actually held a debate on that. I'll put the link to that in the description or on the show notes page, TomWoods.com/2405. But here's how it looks to me.

So, unfortunately, there is a chunk of American Christianity that believes that an important part of Christian eschatology (the bringing in of the end of the world) involves as a major piece of that drama, the return of the Jewish people to this particular land.

And I will just point out that this idea and all the things that follow from it, the rapture, and all that, this idea was absolutely unknown to Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Wesley. You could go on and on – Philip Melanchthon, all the Protestant reformers, even.

This would have been news to them. They never saw that in their Bibles, because what they understood was that the New Testament spiritualizes the promises of the Old.

So, if there's manna that comes from heaven, that's physical bread. Well, that's a foreshadowing of the spiritual gift that you get from the bread of Holy Communion.

So, in other words, we take these physical things and transform them into spiritual realities. So, we're not talking about physical land. And so, that was the way they thought of it. They thought that the Church was the new Israel.

They had a lot of different ways of thinking about it, but none of them involved: *We're going to go to this place and have disputes with people who were there, and have a contested establishment of a new state there.*

This would have been unknown to everyone. And yet, whereas I think American Christians think it's just obvious that, of course – and this is a problem, I will say. Even though I have dear, close, wonderful Protestant friends I love and respect very much.

But I think they will agree with me on this, that this is one drawback of the failure of some Protestants to respect tradition. Because it's: *All I need is my Bible!* Is the attitude of some of them. Well, "all I need is my Bible" gets you this.

It gets you: *Well, my reading of my Bible says so and so*. But the thing is, then how come for 1,800 years, nobody else thought that. I mean, were they all just dummies for 1,800 years? Like, the Holy Spirit just forgot to guide the church until 1833 or whenever it was?

So, anyway, the thing is that therefore, it's almost impossible to have a conversation about Israel at all with a huge slice of the American electorate. You can't talk to them about it because they think God demands it.

And so, therefore, whatever the government of Israel or the government of United States chooses to do is divinely authorized. So, I don't even bother. If you're going to be that ignorant of your own theological tradition, I'm not even going to bother. There's no point.

**HORTON:** No, no, no, no, you should, though. Because the polls say that evangelicals, especially younger generations of evangelical Christians, they don't believe in this stuff anymore. And I think it's obvious why.

It's because 20 years ago, every – well, I don't know every. Many, many Protestant preachers of all different denominations in this country promised that if we support Bush's war, we're going to get some magic.

We're going to get to go up to heaven all together, like in the books that we bought at Walmart. All the *Left Behind* series and all this. It was a huge part of support for invading Iraq, was that this is all somehow some end times thing.

Well, did any magic happen? No. Just a bunch of good people got killed. $10 trillion got wasted, and the world got turned upside down for nothing. And here we all are still. And I think that many people feel very jaded by that and learn the lesson from that.

And so, remember again, like in all of these things, not just in terms of responsibility. But everybody's an individual and might recognize exactly what you just said. Reed Coverdale was raised evangelical and Christian Zionist as well.

But he just figured out exactly what you said himself. He's like: *Dude, I read...* I think he cited Ecclesiastes. Where it says what you just said. The covenant's fulfilled. Everything's changed now, et cetera like this.

I'm not into this stuff, but like, even on the face of it. Like, this is the understanding, right? Is that that's why it's okay for Christians to have a cheeseburger, because all those old rules are canceled now.

**WOODS:** All right. Let me jump in. I would say that it doesn't mean that no Christian could ever possibly support the Zionist project. They could, but they can't point to it and say: *I am theologically obligated to support it*.

That's my point.

**HORTON:** Or worse. That this is how to trick Jesus Christ into coming back now, so that I don't have to wait around. Which is to me the most ridiculous thing. If I believed in it at all, I'd say it was blasphemy. But it's completely nuts.

And by the way, I don't know nothing about Judaism either, Tom, but I can tell you this. I know that there are gigantic sects of orthodox religious Jews who hate and denounce Zionism.

**WOODS:** Yeah, let me jump in on this. The biggest opponents of Zionism from the beginning were exactly those people, who said that this is hubris, thinking that human action is going to force the hand of God. God will bring about the restoration of the Jewish people in his own time and his own way.

Anyway, that's not even really where I was going. What I was saying is, so they established this state, the UN then divides the area so that the Jewish people get some of it. But they got more than it seemed like their population entitled them to as compared to the people we call Palestinians.

And then war breaks out, but war breaks out only in the areas that Jewish forces had moved into that they were not entitled to under the UN partition. And then we have the situation we have now. Then that was obviously modified a bit in 1967 and on down to the present.

So, I my guess my question is, what was the long-term plan here? We've decided – even though some early Zionists considered the possibility of South America, somewhere in South America, but they decided on here.

All right. The problem is, now you're surrounded by people who are seething at you. And you're only so big and they're very big and they are very, very populous. What was the end game? How was this supposed to work?

The "special relationship" with the United States didn't really begin until a little bit later, even though Harry Truman was very pro-Israel, but it only very gradually developed. Was the idea that: *Well, we'll just have the US to just more or less bail us out forever?*

Like, is this how it's just supposed to go forever? In other words, did you think this through as to how this was ever going to work out in the long run?

**HORTON:** I really don't know about that history nearly as well as a lot of commentators on this. I would definitely recommend people read Sheldon Richman's book. He does talk about how Ben-Gurion had sent his aide – I forgot the guy's name – to go and scope the place out.

And the guy came back and said: We can't do it. There's people everywhere. We're going to have to figure out something else. And what they figured out to do was this ethnic cleansing campaign instead, to go ahead.

And then they lied and said it was " a land without people for a people without land". And it was a big cover up, by the way. It was a big "conspiracy theory" that there were 800,000 750,000 Palestinians cleansed from their land and that they were all huddled in refugee camps and all this stuff that was "crazy conspiracy talk".

And in fact, Eric Margolis, the great journalist, his mother was this Lois Lane type, running around doing independent, strong, feminine journalism or whatever after World War Two, interviewing all these potentates in the region and everything.

And she came home and reported about what was happening in the refugee camps after the cleansing. And they threatened to murder our friend Eric Margolis. They said: *Lady, we're going to kill your baby if you don't shut up about this stuff.*

Because that was a big conspiracy and a big cover up that they had done that. So, that's one thing. But I think they were backed more by the Reds then. I know that a lot of American scientists had helped to buy and or smuggle and or transfer as much excess World War Two weapons to Israel as they could.

I think that in the early days, they were getting along with the Reds there, and the Reds helped arm them up as well. And after all, they're surrounded by relatively weak states. And by the way, you skipped this part.

I don't know if you know this, but I think it's really important. That in the original war of Independence, the Israelis – and this is in Sheldon Richmond's book. Again, it's called *Coming to Palestine*.

And he was raised Jewish and Zionist until he learned all this stuff, and can't stand it and all this. So, he wrote this instead. But he says they made a secret deal with the King of Jordan. He gets to keep the West Bank.

And then at the end of the war, Egypt got control of the Gaza Strip – just exactly like we're talking about now with Hamas in Gaza. So they don't have to deal in good faith. So that the Palestinians don't get their state. Let them go, suffer under the tyranny of the King of Jordan.

But here's the thing about it, though, Tom. Is, if you stop at '66, okay? Or before the Six Day War, what they had accomplished with that ethnic cleansing campaign was an 80/20 super-duper majority, Jews versus Arab Muslims and Christians – mostly Muslims, but some Christians too.

And so, there are inside Israel now – and I don't mean the occupied territories, I mean what they call Israel proper. Within the '67 borders, there's about 20% of the population who are Arabs. We call them "Arab citizens of Israel" or whatever titles they have for them.

And they're sort of second-class citizens, but they're not nearly as oppressed as the people in the occupied territories, not that they have full equal rights. But they're only 20%, so it's okay to have a Jewish democracy at the same time, if it's 80% Jewish, right?

Then you can get away with that. The problem, of course, being when they expanded in '67, they took all that land and then they kept all the people. And I'm not saying they should have expelled them, but I'm just saying that's the dilemma that they have.

Is, they kidnapped all these people, along with the West Bank, when they took it. Again, in a war that had wasn't the Palestinians fault at all. It was actually Israel that started that war against Egypt, and then Jordan and Syria jumped in, and the Palestinians had no say over that whatsoever.

And so, you know, they got completely burned in that whole deal. But guess I would argue, Tom, that – and don't know if the Palestinians would really agree with this, especially now.

But it seems quite clear, certainly when it comes to relationships with other countries in the region and so forth, that if they had just lived up to the Camp David deal in 1979 or the Oslo Accord of 1993, and they had given up the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem to be an independent Palestinian state.

And the refugees and the various refugee camps around the region were allowed to come home, at least to the West Bank or the Gaza Strip and their own independent state, if not back to their previous family's land.

That that would be a hell of a pill to swallow, but it would be swallowable, compared to, especially if you look at it compared to the status quo since that time, and the occupation of these people.

I remember Noam Chomsky said that at the time of the First Intifada, the American people were like: *What? Why would the Palestinians be upset about the situation that they're in?*

Like, they had no clue because no one ever tells them the situation of the occupation there. And in fact, by the way, one more thing. Somebody said to me the other day – oh, it was Darryl Cooper, the great Darryl Cooper, MartyrMade, great podcast.

He did a 30-hour podcast on this thing. And he said that – I'm sorry, was it Begin? I think he says – yeah, it was Menachem Begin, after the Six Day War.

When they wanted to start transferring settlers into the West Bank, he goes: *No, don't do that. That'd be crazy. We've got to let the West Bank go as soon as possible, so then we're not keeping all of these people*.

Because that throws off their whole 80/20 balance. So, now what do they have? They have essentially a 50/50 balance, only a huge percentage of the other 50 have no rights whatsoever and live in giant open air prison camps.

It's like the Palestinians say, *"From the river to the sea. Palestine will be free."* Netanyahu says. *"From the river to the sea, there will be one security force, Israel."* But what about the Palestinians?

They're just going to have to suck it up and get more and more and more of their land confiscated, until one day they just lay down and die, I guess.

**WOODS:**  I'm trying to think right now, as we wrap up, if I lived in Israel, what would I – now, forget about being a libertarian and all that. If I were just a regular person with no unusual ideology, just living in Israel, what course of action would I favor people taking?

Now, we read Walter Block urging the world, not necessarily to send a million weapons to Israel – although I don't think he would oppose that. But the world should give – I mean, you can read it for yourself – more or less unconditional support to whatever Israel should think necessary.

Even if it involves an unprecedented level of military action, necessary to root out this deeply, deeply rooted evil. That's Walter's opinion.

**HORTON:** He's insane. Walter, you're kicked out of libertarianism, pal.

**WOODS:** Hold on a minute. Well, if I'm an Israeli – maybe, let's say I was Labor. You know, maybe I'm not Likud. But I sit there and I say: *Well, okay, I can see that the Israelis don't have completely clean hands here.*

*I understand that, but the brutality and senselessness of what was just done in our country is so bad, the idea that at this point, I'm going to negotiate a two state solution? You've got to be kidding me. At this point, the negotiating is over.*

*Forget it, because I can't take any chances that the inhabitants of this new state won't, in fact, be – and maybe it'll be partly our fault for being unjust to them for a long time. Who cares? They'll be so hostile to me that I can't live in peace side by side with them.*

So, I don't know what the correct course of action is. I bet there are some Israelis who are thinking exactly that way: I don't know what the right solution is, because even though I may have been guilty of some injustices, I still want to keep my family safe, and don't know that I can trust these people over here.

What do you say to them? What is the solution for Israel now?

**HORTON:** Well, look, step one is go back in a time machine and deal in good faith for the last 50 years.

**WOODS:** Well, that's not doable, so...

**HORTON:** Just like after September 11th, Ron Paul said: *Negotiate. They want us out of Saudi Arabia? We should negotiate.*

They slaughtered 3,000 of our people. Ron Paul said we should negotiate. What are we doing supporting Israel, oppressing the people of Palestine and Lebanon when it's motivating guys to do kamikaze attacks on our towers? We should stop.

We can deal with Khrushchev. We can deal with Mao Zedong, quantitatively the greatest villain in the history of all of humanity. But we can't deal with this stupid militia of these scumbag Islamists, these trustees in an Israeli concentration camp?

Only if you pretend and phrase it that way because you want to, to satisfy your bloodlust. But that's just stupid and wrong.

That's like saying: *Well, I guess England and the Irish can never work it out, so they should just keep killing each other forever. We'll just have an apartheid state and what they call "low level war" from now on.*

**WOODS:** Yeah, but Scott, the difference is, neither the English nor the Irish (they'll say) had an irrational willingness to endure death. And so, that therefore you couldn't deter them.

**HORTON:** Both sides committed absolute atrocities against each other in Ireland and in every war. I mean, look at what happened in Bosnia. Yeah, absolute horrific atrocities by the Serbs, the Croats, and the Muslims. Over and over and over again, back and forth and around and around.

And then the war ended, and somehow, they live near each other. And it ain't perfect, it probably sucks. But it's not war anymore. And look, boy, you want to talk about having hard feelings and keeping them.

If you wanted to just be a Croat, or a Bosnian Serb, or a Bosnian Muslim, or any one of those sides, you could nurse that grudge forever and ever. Start the war up again tomorrow if you want to. Or not. You can choose peace and figure it out.

Again, the people of Israel, they've got to recognize and be realistic here about how much power the Israeli state has versus the people of the Gaza Strip. Most of the time, like, this is all a bunch of question begging gets in there.

Like, "Lift the Siege. Normalize relations." means just let Hamas run rampant, let Iran export to them all of their best missiles and, whatever, F-14s that Richard Nixon sold them, or something like that. I mean, I don't really think that's in the cards, and all that.

Look, we have bi-national type states around the world. They're not perfect. You figure out a way to do it. All this is within the realm of possibility. Again, Tom, look, the Israelis – and we know this as libertarians just dealing with government.

Everybody just presumes that government's legitimate. And everybody presumes that what they do is right, and in our best interests, that they're trying hard, this kind of thing.

People just presume that Israel could have peace, they would get it. If the Palestinians weren't such madmen, then the Israelis would deal with them in good faith. But that's not true. That's a damn lie.

You think that? Why? Because they're whiter? Because you don't speak Arabic? And so, the Arabs here must be barbarians? And the Israeli Jews are just like us? It's not true.

I just read to you the quote from Netanyahu saying: [mimicking Montgomery Burns] *Excellent! Yes, we like having our good little pet terrorists rule Gaza so that we don't have to deal in good faith with the people in the West Bank*.

So, how about that? Let's start with overthrowing Likud and getting some people who aren't the most cynical, throat slitting murderers in charge of the Israeli state, and see if they can negotiate in good faith.

Look, no matter what, they should be calling for a halt to the bombing right now and calling to stop the invasion.

They should be asking for Arab states that are friendly to Israel, like Egypt, or Muslim states like Turkey, who are friendly to Israel, to intervene in here, negotiate, swap prisoners, get those hostages out of there and figure out a positive way forward.

And look, again, it's Hamas that's jerking your chain here, folks. You're mad and you want to lash out? That's because Hamas has hijacked your head. They're telling you what to do and what to think, just like they did after September 11th.

Americans just got all mad as hell and turned their brain off and acted really stupid. And they killed hundreds of thousands of innocent Afghans who never did anything to us.

They killed hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqis, Libyans, Syrians, Yemenis, Somalis, who never did anything to us, who never had anything to do with September 11th at all.

Why? Because we were upset, and we wanted to let George Bush go and let some blood and make us feel better. Not us – you people, a lot of you. And that's just not right, man. It ain't right. And we should just know better than that.

And if that sounds like something you heard a commie say this week – it couldn't possibly be – but don't care about that, as far as who agrees with me. There are people on the right who agree with me about some things that I think are some pretty unsavory characters too.

Hell, there's some libertarians who agree with me about some things that I might not want to associate with, but that's not really the point at all. I mean, the point is to try to get the whole country to have the consensus about what's right and wrong, what we're doing here and why.

How could it be we're even having this conversation in 2023? I thought George W Bush was going to solve all this. Remember?

The guys from the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs told George Bush: *Don't listen to Colin Powell and build a Palestinian state.* Did you know, Tom, that Colin Powell, after September 11th, tried to get Bush to force through an independent Palestinian state?

But then guess what? Ariel Sharon, the leader of this foreign nation, mobilized his lobby, his neocons and his evangelical Christians, and they extorted W Bush and they told him: *You'd better back down, and you'd better drop it, or you're toast.*

And people can read all about that in the biography of Colin Powell by the lady fromthe *Washington Post*. I quote it extensively in my book, *Enough Already*. And then what else was I going to say where they can read about that?

Anyway, I'm sorry, slipped my mind. But – oh, I know! In this extremely important paper, "The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy" by John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt from 2007. They detail how it was Tom Delay – remember him? "The Exterminator", the House minority whip – No, I guess he was the majority whip.

He came and told George Bush: *You want to be a one term president like your daddy? Because I'll turn every evangelical Christian in this country against you.* And Bush crawled under his desk and said: *Whatever you say, master.*

To the majority whip of the House! Because his father was a one term president. Why? Because he turned on Israel. Because he forced through the Madrid Conference. He tried to force them to adopt a Palestinian state.

I don't know if people know this story. It's a huge story to me. And people can read about this at mondoweiss.net, if you type in "Mondoweiss" – that's Philip Weiss, the great journalist. Mondoweiss, and then type in "George Bush Sr blamed Israel for his election loss".

You'll find it. Those aren't the exact words, but you'll find it. And he did. In his own words, HW Bush said that the Israelis and their lobby in America turned against him, supported Bill Clinton. I don't know if he was referencing Ross Perot here, if that had anything to do with it or not, Tom.

But he complained about that, and his surrogates complained about that. And what happened was, riding high on the approval ratings from Iraq War One, they said – James Baker, just like Colin Powell did a decade later.

James Baker said to Bush S: *Now's the time to do this. We're going to push this through, and we're going to do this Madrid conference and try to push the Palestinian state*. And then people had criticized him.

And I don't know the exact context, Tom. I forgot exactly the context, but I'm almost certain that he said this in jest. I mean, James Baker is kind of an affable guy for a Sith Lord. And what he said was, *"F\*\*\* the Jews."* He didn't say "F". He said it, *"F\*\*\* the Jews. They don't vote for us anyway."*

Well, the thing is, in print that ain't funny. And a lot of people were like: *Oh, yeah? Well, you know what? We've got checkbooks. How do you like this, “Democratic National Committee”. Fill in the number yourself.*

And so, it was a huge mistake for him to do that and to say it that way, be so dismissive of their concerns in that way. And so, then the Israel lobby fully turned against Bush Sr and sabotaged his diplomacy on that.

And I have to tell you, Tom. I know you're only like a couple of years older than me. I was in high school at the time and I was very interested in the election of '92. I paid a lot of attention to it. And I think I told you before, I knew Bill Clinton was a Rockefeller guy before he was even sworn in.

So, I was so lucky that I got it, that it was all a big game. But I was really interested in that election. And I've got to tell you, I don't remember Israel coming up, and the right-wing Israeli nationalists want to overthrow the American Republican and replace him with a compliant Democrat.

Nobody told me that. And I admit I wasn't reading the *Journal* and everything. I was just watching TV, but I was watching a lot of it. And do you remember that being a subject of discussion in 1992? Me neither. But it was big time going on behind the scenes there.

And so, W Bush learned that lesson. Don't cross the Israel lobby. They'll have your ass. And so, they want X, Y, and Z, including the War of the Rock – which he wanted to do anyway.

But if they oppose pushing through the Palestinian state, as Colin Powell wanted to do – and isn't that what people were voting for when they voted for W Bush? I know they were, because that's what they told me. I was a cab driver at that time, and they told me by the scores.

They told me: *Well, at least Colin Powell is going to be up there with him. He knows what to do.* That's what they thought they were voting for. And Colin Powell goes: *Here's what to do. I know what to do.* And Bush goes: *No, I'm afraid of Tom Delay. No, I'm afraid of John Hagee, the blasphemer.*

**WOODS:** Scott, give people a link so they can follow you more. Because some people might want to after this.

**HORTON:** [laughing] Maybe.

**WOODS:** Some people might want to send you a note.

**HORTON:** All right, man, I am at ScottHorton.org. I've got 5,000 – I was just counting today. The automatic thing said 5,950-something interviews going back to 2003, for you there. Catch up, Tom. Actually, you can at this rate, because I'm only doing one or two a week now, working on the book.

But I've got books. You can find them on Amazon or at ScottHorton.org there with the interviews. I'm the director of the *Libertarian Institute*. We're publishing Tom's book, I'm so proud to say.

We published just the other day – two days ago, we published Joseph Solis Mullen and his brand-new book. It's called *The Fake China Threat and It's Very Real Danger*. Which is absolutely fantastic, and is endorsed by Lew Rockwell and a bunch of your other friends. A great book.

And then our friend Keith Knight has written – I love this title, Tom: *Domestic Imperialism*. See? Attack the left from the left. *Domestic Imperialism: Nine Reasons I left Progressivism,* by Keith Knight. And it's fantastic. It's so good.

And then we've got you, our heavy hitters. We've got Tom Wood's *Diary of a Psychosis*, *Libertarian Institute* production there. And James Bovard, the great James Bovard, really one of our most accomplished guys of all.

He's published so many books, and has written for all the most important newspapers in America for decades. And he wrote this book in 1994 called *Lost Rights: The Destruction of American Liberty*. Well, now he's publishing through the Institute *Last Rights: The Death of American Liberty*.

And we're putting that out, too. And it's fantastic. So, all this will be, like, in time for your Thanksgiving dinner, everybody. And hopefully for Halloween, I don't know if we're going to make that. But absolutely every one of these will be available for your stocking on Christmas morning.

And we're going to get all that out for you. So, I'm just so proud to be – you know, one of my jobs is publisher of so many great books. We just put out Laurie Calhoun's great book. I know you interviewed her.

The great Laurie Calhoun wrote this book. Oh, it's on the tip of my tongue. *Questioning the Covid Company Line*. That's what it is. And it's just like your book. It's a collection of her essays all along, as she was getting it right all along, just like you, and did such a great job there.

So, that's a fantastic book by the magnificent writer Laurie Calhoun. So, that's all great. And I'm working on *Provoked,* which will be out sometime next year. I need to talk with you, Tom, about – I need a gimmick because I think I'm going to put out – in fact, I've decided.

I'm going to put out my Russiagate section of my Donald Trump chapter as a standalone book, because it's 120-something pages.

**WOODS:** Yeah, of course you should.

**HORTON:** Oh, I'm going to. And so, that's going to come out first. Tentatively, it'll be called *The Russiagate Hoax,* but I don't know. And it's just the total and absolute and complete debunking of all of the Russiagate lies. Which is everything that they said. None of it was true. 0% of it was true.

**WOODS:** All right. Let's you and I get on the phone and let's call this a day. But let's get on the phone and strategize about how best to do that.

**HORTON:** Let's do it.

**WOODS:** I appreciate you taking some time like this.

**HORTON:** And then, read my guys at the *Libertarian Institute* and at Antiwar.com. I got a great group of guys doing so much wonderful work over there at both of those sites.

**WOODS:** All right. We will refer people there. I'll have the links in the description. Thanks again, Scott.