

## Episode 396 – Iran Update, Plus: Rand Paul’s Best Strategy Guest Scott Horton

**WOODS:** It’s kind of a potpourri episode, although I have primarily two topics in mind. The second one will be Yemen. I find that Yemen is one of these topics that I told you before we went on, it’s like Bosnia in the mid 1990’s. Like everybody felt like they should know about it, but every time they started to learn about it their eyes glazed over and they gave up. So this show will be a chance for people to get the basic gist, all they need to know about what’s going on over there.

But before that, this deal with Iran, it seems like I’ve been talking about this forever. The issue just doesn’t die down because it continues to attract controversy, you continue to have neoconservatives trying to undermine it. So I thought maybe we could talk about where things stand right now and what are the neocons up to with regard to it, what are the goods and bads about the deal.

I saw, by the way, a video of Marco Rubio questioning John Kerry. Now talk about not much to choose here, but I have to say John Kerry, to my mind anyway, made Rubio look like an uninformed idiot, which I supposed isn’t that difficult, but it was really embarrassing. If you’re going to go up against John Kerry at least know what you’re saying.

So tell me, what’s the deal basically promising, and what is the neocon objection?

**HORTON:** Well, first of all, yes, anyone who it’s even possible for John Kerry to make an ass out of them – John Kerry! – has got a real problem.

All right. So here’s the thing, I’m trying and trying as hard as I can to get better at saying all this as quickly as possible and still make sense, Tom. But the bottom line of all this, and we could get to footnotes someday if you want to get into all the details, but the bottom line is Iran never had a nuclear weapons program. They had a civilian nuclear program that is allowed. It’s their, quote-unquote, unalienable right under the Non-Proliferation Treaty that they’re a part of ever since the ’70s, back when they were our allies and we gave them nuclear reactors in the Ford years, and they’ve never been found in violation of their safeguards agreement to the IAEA, which is mandated under that Non-Proliferation Treaty. In

other words, everything that you've ever heard about the threat of the Iranian nuclear program is just a bunch of hype, and it's basically all spin with no real problem there.

The difference between enriching to industrial grade for your electricity program and making uranium for nuclear weapons is vast, it's 3.6% or 3.7% versus above 90% pure uranium 235 to even be able to make a nuclear bomb. And they haven't done that, and we know they haven't done that because the IAEA has had them, quote-unquote, safeguarded all along, verifying and accounting for all of their nuclear material. And they have said a million times over that they have verified the non-divergence of this nuclear material.

So all the nuclear deal that Obama and John Kerry are negotiating with the Iranians right now, they're basically negotiating for the Americans to finally recognize that and lift the sanctions and leave the Iranians alone about it. And in exchange the Iranians get to let them save face by scaling back their nuclear program somewhat, but not really changing the nature of it at all because it never was for weapons in the first place.

So I know that's not the spin you usually hear on it, but this is basically just the Americans finally conceding that okay, they have the right to a civilian nuclear program, and there's actually nothing that we can do to get them to not have one. So okay, we'll just go from a safeguarded to an extra-super safeguarded nuclear program. That's all the deal is.

The only reason that the Israelis and their partisans in America, meaning the entire Republican party and the whole Israel lobby and the neocons and all that, the only reason they're against it is because they need an enemy, simple as that. War is the health of the state, and yada yada, like you're used to hearing, and it's the same for the Israelis as it is for the Americans. This is how we sell planes. This is how we change the subject from domestic problems like the occupation in Israel, like the disastrous consequences of America's wars for us back home like we have here, is the Iranians are great, we'll substitute, we'll miniature substitute for the USSR, and for the Israelis I guess, you know, for Syria and Hezbollah or whatever.

And so they have an interest in keeping the thing going, but it's not interest based in reality, it's not the national interest of the United States of America, it's just corrupt interest.

And Netanyahu himself, in fact I have it here so I can tell you all about it, Netanyahu himself, the Prime Minister of Israel, it is in *Haaretz*, he held a cabinet meeting with his national security cabinet and at multiple sources, it wasn't a matter of controversy whether these quotes were legitimate or not at the time, just a couple of weeks ago. And Netanyahu said his biggest fear is that Iran will honor the nuclear deal 100%, and that they'll stick with it for 15 years and they will never break it, and we won't be able to catch them cheating because they won't cheat. And then the real danger is, then after 15 years of acting like a normal country, in a normal time, within the international system to whatever degree, greater degree obviously than current, then they'll sneak up on us after 15 years of acting fine and being treated as such, and gaining influence in power in the Middle East overall.

So that's the best threat they can come up with. Not a nuclear strike, but that there never will be even an Iranian nuclear weapons program, and that's how they get you. That's what the war party is left with now, which ought to be the end of the argument, although it doesn't seem to be.

**WOODS:** Well, supposing that some people, some of the Likud people in Israel, for example, do believe that what they're saying about Iran being an existential threat and that they do believe that there is a strong possibility they will acquire nuclear weapons capability and so on, then you would think that an Israeli attack on Iran would have to be coming in the coming months given that my understanding is that Russia is going to be providing Iran with anti-aircraft capability, which would neutralize potential air attacks. So you would have to get those air attacks in pretty soon if this really is an existential threat.

If they don't launch an attack in the next few months, wouldn't that prove to us that they never really believed it was an existential threat to start with?

**HORTON:** Possibly, but then again I don't think the Israelis necessarily have the capability to do that. I mean, when you say you'd better attack them now before it's too late kind of rhetorically there, it's really the United States that has the

capability to really attack Iran. And it would be a major operation, not the kind of thing that the Israelis could sustain on their own.

The only way for them to do it would be to do it in a way to necessitate an American response. Somehow provoke the Iranians into striking back at American targets or Saudi targets in the Gulf, that kind of thing, and draw the Americans in.

Which, by the way, was Dick Cheney's plan, according to Seymour Hersh, the best of them. Dick Cheney and them did discuss using special forces in the Gulf to attack the U.S. Navy and use that as an excuse to attack Iran. So this kind of thing can happen.

**WOODS:** I could follow up on that, but I think that speaks for itself.

What did you make of the whole Tom Cotton fiasco? It's kind of old news now, but this guy came out of nowhere more or less. He came out of obscurity to neoconservative stardom with his whole stunt trying to put a monkey wrench in the works of the agreement with this kind of arrogant and annoying letter to the Iranian regime condescendingly explaining the way our Constitution works, about the role of Congress. That's funny for the neoconservatives all of a sudden to be deeply concerned about the role of Congress in the making of foreign policy.

**HORTON:** Yeah. Well, I think the major lesson from that is that this guy Tom Cotton is going to be a real problem for peace and liberty basically from now on. I mean, he's the new John McCain. I don't know what could ever get rid of him, maybe if something could make him unelected somehow. Tom, I don't know, but it seems to me like the worst thing America has going right now is this senator, because he's basically Bill Kristol's little sock puppet. And apparently was actually trained by second generation Straussians in all Straussian theory and this and that. And as a liberal writer I don't like put it, he is Ted Cruz but with a combat record, basically. He fought in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and basically he's the mirror image, the six-and-a-half-foot walking, talking point of the worst of the American neoconservative movement, you know, Bill Kristol and them at the *Weekly Standard*.

And so that's the major lesson for me, is watch out for this Tom Cotton guy from now on, man. He is going to be such a thorn in the side of everybody who cares about peace and freedom.

And then the second thing about it is, well, thankfully it didn't really work, and the Iranian negotiators just played it off, and he really didn't have it right. Maybe it's just a technicality, but the Senate has advice and consent powers, but it's really the President that actually ratifies the treaty. Even if he had already signed us up for it, he only ratifies it after the Senate gives its advice and consent, which is kind of different.

But then also, he and Rand and the rest of them who signed that letter, neglected the fact that the rest of the permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany were going to be signing onto this thing, the P5 Plus One, and then with a U.N. Security Council resolution, and the entire European Union, and the United Nations have their own sets of sanctions that they have put on Iran, at American behest of course all along, but they're lifting them. The deal is basically done. And at that point the deal is with the so-called international community and not just the Western powers, but the entire U.N. Security Council. And at that point it's really a question of whether even Jeb or Hillary when they come next time could undo this deal.

So I don't know if Cotton thinks that Marco Rubio is going to be our next President, but I'm here to tell you he's not.

**WOODS:** Well, speaking of which, I wasn't planning to ask you about this, but what the heck, I like to just go where the conversation leads me. What do you make of the lineup for the GOP nomination? I don't understand why half of them are even in the race. I can't tell most of them apart. What's the point of entering, well, what's the point ever of entering, except for personal aggrandizement and narcissism, I suppose.

**HORTON:** Yeah. And you know, if you ask me the whole thing is locked up for Jeb anyway. And you know what? It's puzzling to me why people can't understand this. I guess people actually think that there's a democracy and this and that, and people power, and pluralism and all that. I had a junior high school civics teacher, or sorry, I meant junior college civics teacher, who really...it's funny how you can

put those two together so easily. She just really believed in all this democratic pluralism stuff. And the thing is, the factions that choose the American president are not represented in primaries and caucuses in the 50 states. It's the bankers, and the insurance companies, and the arms dealers, and the pharmaceutical companies, big agribusiness, and of course Israel, and then maybe at the fringes the gun lobby and the AARP, retired people, Social Security lobby. Other than that, that's as close as you get to public participation at all is through the gun and the Social Security lobbies. Other than that the whole thing is locked up by the oligarchical special corporate interests. And of course the state itself, which is millions and millions of voters, you know, that line up and donate with our tax money and all of that. So that's how these things are chosen.

So I don't see anyone on the top tier with Jeb other than Jeb. I guess they say Scott Walker, but I don't know enough about him. Maybe he is a top-tier candidate. But the rest of them are nothing but second tier, and I don't see why any of them would ever be able to rise above that. Not that Jeb has any good qualities, but just that he has all the major factions locked up just because he's inherited this entire network, this entire system of donors, and money, and trust of the Bush family brand on the right in America. So I don't see how he could possibly lose unless he gets... I mean, there are individual stunts that could get him in trouble, like if he gets caught saying the N word in front of an open microphone or something like that, then go down in smoke. But other than that, I don't know how he could lose.

And then when it comes to him versus Hillary Clinton, I just think that after a year and a half of being told how inevitable she is, she's gonna not be very inevitable at all. Even her last book tour had like one-tenth of actual turnout from the one before, something like that. She's already old news before this thing ever starts, so I think she's going to have a real hard time. I think she's probably got the Democratic nomination locked up, but I don't think that she'll be able to beat Jeb in the general, and so there you go. I mean, I'm just speculating, but it seems pretty easy to see why everybody, you know, that so-called second tier candidates as you said, they're basically a bunch of blobs, and so what about them makes them special enough to beat out Jeb? Nothing.

And you know what it is, look at John McCain in '08, the liberal centrist Republican that nobody likes, that's guaranteed to be the nominee in the end,

who had the lowest poll numbers all year long until it came time to actually choose the nominee, and then there he was.

**WOODS:** Yeah, and I remember seeing people on the news in 2008, the election was still going on, the primaries were still going on, McCain had emerged as the clear front-runner, and a guy is being interviewed on TV saying well, I'm not happy about it, but I guess I have to go down and vote for John McCain now. What is wrong with you? Why? Why do you have to vote for John McCain now? That's ridiculous.

I guess we have to say a little something about Rand Paul for just a minute, because you can't avoid it. I just want to say on this general subject you have now got a whole slew of people in the race, and another slew set to enter. You've got Mike Huckabee, you've got Ben Carson, Ted Cruz, and a bunch of others. And to my mind they're basically indistinguishable. Mike Huckabee is more of an economic populist than the others, but really they're pretty much indistinguishable.

If you're Rand Paul, you could be thinking to yourself, let's say six months ago, that for strategic reasons I've got to moderate my rhetoric so as to broaden my appeal. Now I understand that. I don't agree with that strategy, I think it's self-defeating, but I understand why you would do it. But at this stage of the game I no longer even understand it. I'm not saying that I don't agree with it anymore – I never agreed with it – but at least I understood it. I don't understand it at all anymore because at this point everybody in the race, as anyone could have predicted, is an ultra-hawk. Everybody's an ultra-hawk. So the idea that I will appeal to some of the hawks by being a little cagey about my views can't possibly work. Somebody who is super-conservative about hawkishness has a million options other than Rand. So the only way he can distinguish himself is by saying this whole thing has been a hugely expensive and enormously unsuccessful policy by any conceivable standard, and anybody who on this stage is going to continue to peddle it to you is just another typical BS, big-government, government propaganda liar.

You can spin this in a way, in a populist way that would appeal to some undecided Republican voters. There is a group of people that no one is even trying to reach

out there. No one's even trying to get them. And I feel like now Rand has put himself in a position where he can't even plausibly try.

**HORTON:** Yeah. Well, listen, I think you hit the nail right on the head there. And then a kind of unstated premise underlying all of that, of course, is that the war party is completely full of it. And peace is what is actually right. And any time that they want to actually try to pin Ron Paul on Rand, and say, well, your father says this, what do you say about that, he ought to just be more than happy to say hell, yeah, of course, what are you, crazy? My father's been right about this since 1996, let me tell you, and go ahead give them some quotes. So obviously telling the truth is a lot easier than telling a lie. He got all upset at the reporter lady for saying how come you keep flip-flopping on Iran, and he got mad at her and said I did not. Well come on, man, you flip-flop all over the place on Iran. Nobody knows what you mean, but they know that you'll say anything. So let's get back to flip before flop, I say.

And you know what, I'll say one more thing about this and then I'll let him off the hook and let you off the hook for letting me talk about him here. And that is that Rand Paul was on the Megyn Kelly show defending himself from accusations of sexism for yelling at the reporter lady for calling him out on his Iran flip-flop. So Megyn Kelly had him on to kind of let him off the hook I guess.

But part of the interview was she hit him with Krauthammer, and said, well, Krauthammer says that you have a Democrat-like foreign policy, and you're the weak sister up here, and that you're just like Obama and Hillary, how can you possibly live that down? So Rand was stuck. I mean, I guess he could have said, no, I swear, I'm just as bad on Iran as Krauthammer is, please forgive me. But he was kind of in sort of a mood that week I guess.

**WOODS:** But why didn't he just say well, look, Hillary supported Krauthammer's ridiculous war, so...

**HORTON:** Wait, but that's the punch line. So instead of pandering, because his pandering talking points weren't available, I guess, he just told the truth and said well, Krauthammer agrees completely with Hillary and Obama on the wars in Libya and Syria, which I warned against, and look how badly they've turned out, they spread jihad all over the place and this and that. And the moral of the story is

that if Krauthammer himself had been there, Rand would have still whooped him. I mean, even with Megyn Kelly as the stand-in it was not even a fight. And in fact he even repeated the same kind of message on the Sunday morning news show, this is now two weeks ago, I guess, where he goes nu-uh, it's the neocons who were like Hillary and Obama, they want to do like Hillary and Obama only times ten. So now he's attacking them from the right and making them big-government, liberal, Wilsonian, make the world safe for democracy nation-building democrat types...

**WOODS:** Good, I'm glad to hear that.

**HORTON:** ...marginalizing the neocons and claiming conservatism, which is perfect. So why pander on Palestine, why pander on Iran, why pander on any of this stuff, when all he has to do is just tell the truth and kick everybody's ass? And he proved it just the other day.

**WOODS:** It can be done. And I've thought to myself – this will never happen, Scott, so don't pack your bags just yet – if Scott Horton were briefing Rand Paul on talking points, I want to see Rand mop the floor with these people. He's not going to win the warmonger vote, but he can have one heck of a great old time getting a lot of attention for himself, spreading a lot of great information, and getting a lot of excitement among young people. Yeah, he'll get some young people because they liked his father. But I'm talking about excitement, I'm talking about I'm going to take eight months off and just go out there and work for this guy kind of excitement. I'm going to get in a Winnebago and go across the country, I'm going to ride my bike back and forth across the whole country, that level of excitement. That level of excitement comes only with this kind of stuff. It doesn't come with a launch speech talking about how I wish all the congressmen would obey the bills that they pass, or I wish the congressmen would read the bills that they pass. Well, okay, yeah, that's really sweet and everything. But what is it that got people excited about Ron Paul? It was that he was a fearless truth-teller.

And I guess what frustrates me also is so many people who say, well, you know, we loved Ron, but he didn't pass any bills, and he wasn't successful, he was just running an educational campaign. Now we've got to run to win. And by running to win what they apparently mean is, they want a campaign – I'm not even

implicating Rand in this – his own supporters want a campaign in which he runs away from things, in which he is very diplomatic about certain things.

And by the way, again, I know how to talk to right-wingers, to get them to think twice about what they believe about foreign policy. I know it because I've done it. It can be done, and I'm not saying that it's a bad idea to try. I'm saying it's a bad idea to be unclear, to be here, to be there, to try to balance all this. That's exactly what we loved Ron for, was that he did none of that. That's why we loved him. So I don't understand how the same people who loved Ron can now be advocating the exact opposite strategy, because how do you pitch that strategy to somebody? I can pitch Ron's strategy to an average person by saying look, listen to every speech given by every other candidate. He's going to say you're awesome, America is awesome, mothers are awesome, barbeques are awesome, vote for me.

But then listen to Ron Paul. He's going to try to educate you about what's happening to your money, about the phony-baloney foreign policy, he's going to tell you things no one else is going to tell you, and he doesn't care. He's going to stand his ground even when the whole audience boos at him. I can pitch that to somebody and they'll say, wow, that's a very unusual guy.

But if these people who want Rand running an unclear campaign, what do they want me to say? Well, he kind of doesn't want war, but if it's ISIS, because they're chopping some heads off, that you've got to kind of go to war against. And maybe Iran, well, we don't want this deal, or maybe we do. How do I pitch that?

**HORTON:** Yeah, good on Libya and Syria, but bad on Iraq and Iran.

**WOODS:** So in other words, with Ron it was a consistent, clear, satisfying message that made internal sense.

Now I say this, by the way, Scott, not intending to have brought this up at all, knowing that probably 80% of my listeners are Rand supporters. So all I'm doing is shooting myself in the foot by saying this. I'm doing nothing that helps me in any way. I am alienating four-fifths of my people.

**HORTON:** Now look, you mean well, obviously. He needs to have libertarian criticism. If the only people that are attacking him are attacking him for being too weak all the time, then he's going to pander, we've seen it. So we try to get him to flip back, to flip from flop, if that's the best we can do, I guess.

**WOODS:** And I'll tell you, I'm tired of it being portrayed, like when Julie Borowski wrote a very effective letter about this, when people like that write these criticisms the immediate response is oh, you libertarians, you're all perfectionists, people have to be absolutely perfect for you to support them.

**HORTON:** Oh yeah, you prefer Hillary, I guess.

**WOODS:** That has nothing to do at all with what I'm saying. I can't imagine anybody running for office being perfect. The point is not to be perfect, it's to be coherent, it's to stand your ground, even when the going gets tough. It doesn't mean you have to be perfect, but it means you have to have a philosophy.

**HORTON:** And you know what, he doesn't need me, all he needs to do is read Ron's articles. Simple as that, just read his father's archive. He writes every week, and he's good on everything. It's as simple as that.

You know what? Look, let's talk about this a little bit more. Who cares about Yemen? Not anybody. I do, but... The thing is, this is what was wrong with both of Ron Paul's campaigns, too, the ones led at the top, was they went under, and how could you possibly argue against it. To them the cookie-cutter strategy, which is you run to the right in the primaries and then moderate in the general election, or whatever, that kind of thing. And they refused to latch on to the reality that Ron is changing the whole game, and that the best electoral chance he had was to basically say to the entire American people: never mind Republican party rank and file, this primary season is for you. Are you ready to take your government back from the oligarchy? This guy is changing the entire game. He's the only one who's willing to tell the truth about every single one of the Bill of Rights, every single one of the wars, and what's happened to your boom and busts cycle, and your business, and the rest of this, and run him as the game changer that he was.

And of course in every interview, every single interview in '07, '08, '11 and '12, he would say to Wolf Blitzer, man, you want to save Social Security you've got to end

the empire, or whatever. He was perfectly happy to speak, quote-unquote, from the left. He didn't care about that. He just said what he wanted to say, what he thought was most important. But then the campaign ads all said Ron Paul was in the Air Force. And they didn't say Ron Paul was in the Air Force and he's antiwar, not like the rest of the chicken hawks. They just said he was in the Air Force, like he's the toughest nuclear bomber up there or something like that. And then he's the most anti-abortion, and the most anti-Mexican of all the Republican candidates.

So the problem is, at least with Ron it was just the campaign was run like that, it wasn't him. But with Rand, Rand is that campaign walking, basically. He is that mistaken idea that what he needs to do is kind of pander to all different sides rather than being so principled that he has something real for all different sides. You know what I mean?

**WOODS:** I do, I do. And I know that people will say he's probably the best U.S. senator we have. And you know, Scott, he probably is. And there are a lot of things that he's done that other people wouldn't have done, and it's not that I don't appreciate those things. It's that I'm sad that I am a witness to what I fear will be a tremendous missed opportunity to build on something incredible. You remember those incredible days when Ron was running. Every day was a thrill. You went immediately to YouTube, as I said to Charles Goyette the other day, to see whose head just exploded today because of something Ron said on that guy's show. Or the huge crowds that came out to see him when he was saying things that absolutely nobody would say. Not things that have been focus-grouped, or not things that were 10% different from Ted Cruz, but that were a million miles removed from that. And the people just kept coming and coming.

Now the thing was, Ron was surrounded by people who were traditional campaign types, who believed that a campaign is not the time to educate people, a campaign is a time to get votes. Now I suppose if you're running a traditional campaign, that makes sense. Who cares: if you want to educate people, go start a school. But here I'm trying to get a candidate elected.

All right, fair enough. But Ron is running in a Republican primary against all the major interests that back that party, so he's probably not going to win. So he might as well do something that will both get votes, because he did do reasonably

well in 2012. For a guy who basically wanted to start the whole country over again I'd say he did pretty darn well. But will also get attention, will make a legacy of the man, will get important issues discussed. That was the type of campaign he needed to run, and that's the one that he ran himself every time he gave a speech, every time he was in public, every time he was in the media.

That was the campaign he ran, but they were all trying to run the well, we'll trick people into voting for him, because he's the Air Force guy who delivered babies. And by the way, that's wonderful and I'm in favor of saying that he delivered babies and he was a family man, because that is good, because that is an entry point for some people. But you're not going to trick people into voting for him. That's an insult to people's intelligence. If they can vote for Huckabee they're not going to vote for Ron.

So go for the people that nobody's going for, nobody's even reaching for, no one has reached for in years. That's how Ron raised all that money. That was not raised from people who had been voting in GOP primaries for the past 20 years, it was from people who hadn't even bothered looking at a GOP primary in their entire lives, and he got to them. That was a new strategy, and that should have made them change the game the way they were playing it. And unfortunately it didn't.

In fact, John McCain beat Ron in New Hampshire among antiwar people. Now there is no excuse for that. There is no excuse for pitching Ron in such a way that McCain beats him among antiwar people. I mean heads should have rolled. There should be bodies all over the floor for that.

**HORTON:** Yeah, I remember that, and it was, it was just a PR catastrophe. And, you know, I have no idea whether Rand had anything to do with that, but it's the kind of thing where if he was there, that would have been his advice, you know, what Jesse Benton thinks, yeah, let's do that, let's run him to the right on everything. It's just a failure of vision.

**WOODS:** I'm not really sure of that. I think you're right...

**HORTON:** It seems like it anyway from the way he acts now.

**WOODS:** ...but I don't know Rand super well, but I've met him, and I've talked to him, and he sure seemed like a Ron Paulian to me. So I mean it could just be there's been a shift in strategy since election to the Senate, whatever, but he was very enthusiastic about the Rally for the Republic that was held at the same time as the GOP convention. I mean, that's not a conventional GOP move by any means. Ron was sticking his finger in the eye of the whole GOP by holding that thing. So there is still a genuine maverick streak here, so that's what makes the whole thing all the more puzzling.

Listen, let's wrap things up here, Scott. I'll get you back to talk about Yemen at some point if things really gain further steam there. But I think it was good for me to just get this off my chest. And the thing is that the kind of people who would really, really rake me over the coals for this, and again, I want him to succeed if he's going to be saying the things that he knows he should say, then I want him to succeed. I'm not actively campaigning against him. I'm not doing anything one way or the other. But the kind of people who would be...I know these people: if you say one tiny thing wrong about the way they're running a campaign, they will blacklist you, you will never be heard from again. It happened to me. It happened to me in 2012. I was shut out of all kinds of things because of an exceptionally mild blog post I wrote. These people are childish people. But most of them, they already can't stand me anyway so I don't think I'm really hurting myself by just on my own show saying this is why I'm uncomfortable, because it's a massive, massive opportunity with a huge mailing list, with committed people, to say yes, I dare to stand up and say the whole foreign policy is wrong. That's right, I know you're all against me on this stage, but doggone it, look around you, read the headlines, who are you going to believe? These people or your own eyes? I mean doggone it, you know, to not have that opportunity.

But as I say, Scott, maybe I'm wrong. Maybe he'll run the whole campaign the way he ran the Megyn Kelly interview. And I will be the first one to come on this show and say I was wrong, and I've never in my life been so happy to be wrong.

Scott, thanks for being here. We'll get everybody over to [scotthorton.org](http://scotthorton.org). I want to remind people that your show, the Scott Horton Show, the one that you do every single day for two hours a day, to educate people primarily on foreign policy, is so important to me that I donate 100 bucks to that show every single month. And I hope people who listen to you on my show will start listening to you

on your own show, see the value in what you do, and join me in supporting you every month. Thanks so much for being here.

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