



Episode 499: What to Tell Your Friend Who Says Saddam Really Did Have WMDs

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: I try to remember to remind people that I send The Scott Horton Show a \$100 monthly donation over at ScottHorton.org. I don't do that for a whole lot of people, so I hold you in very high esteem – not quite high enough esteem to be on Episode 500, but just high enough to be on Episode 499.

HORTON: (laughing) Ahh, I almost made it.

WOODS: (laughing) I'm just kidding you.

HORTON: I hope the next show is Ron Paul or somebody great.

WOODS: I planned out Episode 500 like 800 years ago or something, but as we were about to go on, I thought to myself, and I actually said to you, I'm talking to Scott Horton, pretty much the only guy in the world who wouldn't be impressed by 500 episodes, because – how many episodes have you done of your show?

HORTON: I am right now – well, total episodes of my show in general, I don't know, but interviews –

WOODS: Yeah, interviews.

HORTON: – I have 3,940 something, so I'm working on 4,000 interviews.

WOODS: Yeah, I mean, that's crazy. So The Tom Woods Show is very nice and everything, but it's a Johnny-come-lately compared to Scott Horton.

HORTON: Well, I have to admit, half of them are Gareth Porter debunking lies about Iran's nuclear program.

WOODS: Yeah, well, fair enough. I mean, I sometimes joke that 8% of all YouTube videos are me talking about nullification.

HORTON: (laughing) Right.

WOODS: So you've got to play to your strengths. All right, the reason I had you on today, I just got done explaining to the audience what the purpose of this is, is not because there's any burning issue in current events that I feel like we have to cover at this particular moment, but just because I know I'm not alone in having somebody in my Facebook feed or whatever, who from time to time will say something that I know is wrong, and I just don't want to go to the effort of refuting it, so I bring Scott Horton on to do it.

But particularly, I know people who have run into critics who say look, you libertarians, whether or not you think the war in Iraq was a good idea, the fact is you are wrong to say Saddam did not have WMDs, because we did find them later on, and the media is just lying to you about it. We did find WMDs in Iraq. Now, I have in particular a post by somebody whose name I won't mention, who makes a number of claims, and I thought this would be a good springboard for us to talk about.

But let's start off with this most basic, most fundamental of all claims, which is that in fact Saddam did have weapons of mass destruction, but it just barely made the news. Is there anything to that at all?

HORTON: Yes, but hang on a second. Let's start with this war had nothing to do with weapons of mass destruction at all, other than that was the lie that they told you to try to make you and your mom afraid enough to let them do it. We can't let evidence – we can't wait around for the proof, because it might come in the form of a mushroom cloud over an American city. This is too dangerous for us to have to show you evidence. Just trust us, and let's do this in a hurry.

And they did it. That was the excuse. As Paul Wolfowitz said, we settled on weapons of mass destruction for bureaucratic reasons, meaning that they needed an excuse to say that Saddam was in violation of UN resolutions, and they were just enforcing UN resolutions. Otherwise, they're all war criminals, because America after World War II – well, really in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, but especially after World War II – outlawed aggressive war, unless you have a UN Security Council resolution making okay. And so in order to not be war criminals, they had to come up with a case, and so the case they made was weapons of mass destruction.

That's not why they did it. They did it because that's what Ariel Sharon wanted to break up the largest Arab state that could threaten Israel. They did it because Cheney had run Halliburton into the ground and needed to pay off his guys with a bunch of Army base-building contracts, and because of his cronies in the oil business in Houston wanted to red line and keep Iraqi oil off the market in order to keep prices artificially high, and because the military – and this mostly goes back to the neocons – the military had their policy of expanding what they called lily pad bases all across all of Eurasia. Full spectrum dominance. Benevolent global hegemony. No near peer competitors will ever mess with us again. We are the world empire. Russia and China combined won't even think about trying to challenge us, because we dominate everything forever, way out ahead of them where they won't even bother. Now,

nowhere in there is, oh, I'm afraid that Saddam is going to spray mustard gas on me. That was just the excuse. That was a lie from the very get-go.

Okay, now we're skipping ahead a bit, but have they found any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? Yes. But only stuff that was left over from the Ronald Reagan era, when Saddam Hussein was the Republicans' pet and used those chemical weapons to fight against the Iranians, used American satellites to target them, and of course attack the Kurds with them during the Anfal Campaign and the Halabja massacre. All of this before Jeb Bush's father was even the president. All of this was just in the Reagan years. And everything that they've found since then is all from that era, from pre-1991.

And they say, oh look, a stash of warheads in the desert. Yeah, but you know, notice they don't even claim that the UN never knew about this. Right, because of course the UN did know about this. In some cases, the munitions were declared but weren't moved, because they were more dangerous to move than to just leave there. As long as you have stable, secular Saddam sitting on them, they're basically fine where they are.

And this story came back up right around a year ago. *The New York Times* had a big story about American GIs who were exposed to these chemical weapons, who were made sick by these chemical weapons, and how yes, the Bush administration covered it up and let them be sick. The DOD let them be sick and did not treat them. It's not because Bush didn't want to say look, everyone, I was right after all. There were weapons of mass destruction. That's not why. In fact, I don't really know why, other than socialist bureaucratic economics at the VA and whatever.

But there was nothing to cover up, because the accusations of 2002 and '3 were that Saddam was making chemical weapons, that he had storehouses, warehouses full of sarin, VX, mustard gas, that he was trying to make anthrax – which of course was not quite a subtle implication that Saddam had been behind the anthrax attack in the United States, which they had originally tried to claim, Brian Ross at ABC News and John McCain and others had claimed that in the first place. But everything that they found, everything that GIs were exposed to in the occupation during Iraq War II and all that, all of that is from before 1991. They never made anything after 1991.

Now, here's what they did. In '91, for the young, that was when America fought Operation Desert Storm, the first Iraq War, and at the surrender Saddam agreed to give up all his WMD. Well, he did cheat, Tom. He lied, and he tried to keep some of his mustard gas, but he got caught by the UN and destroyed it all before the end of 1991. Every last bit of it.

In 1995 – and Dick Cheney outright lied at the VFW speech, and George W. Bush outright lied at the Cincinnati speech in 2002 and claimed that when Saddam Hussein's son in law, Hussein Kamel, defected in 1995, that he revealed that Saddam lied; he did keep his weapons after all. No. What he said was, yeah, you're right; we did lie, but you caught us in 1991, and it's all gone. I know, because I oversaw the destruction

of every last bit of the stockpile myself, and here are all the papers about it. And then you might remember, Hussein Kamel went back to Iraq, and Saddam executed him.

But at the same time, he turned over every last scrap of paper he had to the United Nations, because he didn't know what his son in law had given up, and he didn't want to be caught, because, you know, he's the very top. He could have been ignorant about something. So he said, here's all the papers; here's everything. We're declaring everything; we're admitting to everything. And the CIA Duelfer Report, the George W. Bush administration report confirms all of this. They had – in fact, that's the Fox News headline of the Duelfer Report: "No Weapons of Mass Destruction Program in Iraq after 1991."

And they knew, the UN inspectors knew for a fact that it was all gone, that it had all been destroyed by 1995. In 1997, Rolf Ekéus of the United Nations weapons inspectors, was ready to certify Iraq Weapons of Mass Destruction Free, but Madeleine "We Think the Price is Worth It" Albright preempted him and announced that the sanctions against Iraq will never be lifted as long as Saddam Hussein remains in power. The same sanctions are staying, but now they have a new mission. Instead of forcing Saddam to give up all of his weapons of mass destruction, now the excuse for them is they're going to starve the people of Iraq to such desperation that they will all rise up and overthrow him – or will wait till the Republicans come and have their regime change then. So that was the policy starting in 1997.

It was Bill Clinton, not Saddam Hussein, who kicked the inspectors out, when he decided on the day, Tom – the day that the full House of Representatives was due to begin to debate articles of impeachment against the president of the United States, he launched Operation Desert Fox, which he named after Rommel, the Nazi. And he went over there and he bombed Iraq for about four or five days in December 1998, just long enough to put off the impeachment hearings and actually bought him a little bit of political breathing room there by doing that and posing as the commander in chief standing up against Saddam and this and that. That was when the inspectors were pulled out, by Bill Clinton. They were not kicked out by Saddam Hussein.

So there's that. We could get back to just how well George W. Bush and his principals knew for a fact that there were no weapons of mass destruction if you want next.

WOODS: Well, let me add one other thing before we get to that. What about the claim that we have all these other intelligence services around the world who agreed with the U.S. that Saddam had these weapons, so it just goes to show this couldn't have been some neocon plot to confuse everybody if other intelligence service also thought that?

HORTON: No, it was just the exact same narrative as you remember it in 2002. They were selling it as the CIA are supermen. Hey, you, trust us, okay? The president has secret information that we don't know about, but that they do. Boy, there's never been men with X-ray vision like our CIA – which just made it all the more remarkable when they couldn't find anything. Where's the accountability? A minute ago, you guys

were saying, for a year straight, that these guys were such supermen that we must trust you when you tell us that they are telling you these weapons exist. And then, where are they? But that was the same thing, and that's on the record, by the way, from Germans and French and whoever else, saying we were trusting you guys. You guys were handing us the information that said they had these chemical weapons, and so we were saying we "know it," because we trusted you.

But you look at the British information, they just plagiarized a USC master student thesis. They were just making up a bunch of crap. They needed a pile of paper to say, this is our evidence, but they knew it was fake. Just like the story of Saddam Hussein trying to buy yellowcake uranium from Niger. The CIA had debunked that 14 times, but then they just went ahead and stove-piped it straight through the vice president's office into the speech. And then I don't know what they had on Tenet that Tenet decided to let it slide before it went into the State of the Union, but the CIA had taken that out of Bush's speeches numerous times before that and had investigated and investigated and investigated and debunked those forgeries repeatedly before they ever really even made it into the intelligence stream.

So there absolutely was a plan, and here's where I'll start telling you some articles. "Agents of Influence," by Robert Dreyfuss; "The Spies Who Push for War," by Julian Borger; "The Stovepipe," and "Selective Intelligence," by Seymour Hersh; "Pentagon Home Office to Neocon Foreign Policy Shop," by Jim Lowe; Karen Kwiatkowski has a three-part series in *The American Conservative* magazine, beginning with "In Rumsfeld's Shop," and I'm trying to remember the other two, but anyway, it's a three-part series in *The American Conservative* by Karen Kwiatkowski, who worked in the Pentagon and sat here and watched the neocons lie us into war.

They expanded the Iraq desk. They called it the Office of Special Plans under Douglas Feith, the Assistant Deputy Secretary of Defense for Policy. And then under him was Abram Shulsky and Michael Ledeen and Michael Rubin and all the neocons from the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs and the American Enterprise Institute, and they just sat up there and went through the CIA's trash, cherry-picking out things that looked like useful talking points. That's it. You couldn't even really call it intelligence, just looking for things that could indicate it might be so. Good enough for them.

And by the way, Jonathan Landay and Warren Strobel at Knight Ridder newspapers, they were reporting about this from '01 on, from immediately after September 11, they were reporting that, wow, the mid-level analysts at the CIA are upset, because there's a group of neoconservatives surrounding Donald Rumsfeld over at the Pentagon, and they're determined to have a war with Iraq and to tie Iraq with al Qaeda and to push this whole other agenda, and they're very concerned. Apparently this new group is called the Office of Special Projects and stuff. This is, you know, it's really plans. But this is at the end of '01, beginning of '02, this agenda was immediately announced, and it absolutely, as I was saying before, was an agenda that had nothing to do with weapons and everything to do with the Likud party in Israel and the — well, the war party here in America, Republican and Democrat.

WOODS: What about the claim that — and we hear this all the time — that it's not right to say that George W. Bush lied? He didn't lie. None of these people lied. They were misled; it was an innocent mistake — or maybe it wasn't so innocent; they should have done more due diligence or whatever, something like that. But certainly we can't accuse them of lying. What is the deal there? It seems to me pretty clear, we can accuse them of lying, but how do we prove that?

HORTON: Okay, well, we can prove that in a lot of ways. First of all, like I said, Paul Wolfowitz already admitted that we settled on weapons of mass destruction for bureaucratic reasons.

WOODS: Right.

HORTON: So in other words, what he's admitting there is that WMD wasn't even the reason for the war. So there's big lie number one, that the war was ever about protecting America from Saddam's weapons of mass destruction. So the fact that they were lying that WMD was the reason is a pretty good indication that they were lying that the WMDs even existed, and we know —

WOODS: Yeah, wouldn't you think that the American troops would have been outfitted with some kind of masks or protective gear?

HORTON: Yeah, exactly, don't you think they would have invaded with MOPP gear if they really thought they were going to be attacked with chemical weapons? They had to wear it in the first Gulf War. He had chemical weapons in the first Gulf War. George H.W. Bush knew it, because he, as part of the Reagan administration, had helped him obtain it. And by the way, Matthew Aid at ForeignPolicy.com has a really great piece based on newly released CIA files from just a year, year and a half ago, about American support for Saddam's use of chemical weapons against the Iranians in the Reagan years, by the way, if anybody wants to look into that.

But again, as I said, Bush and Cheney were outright lying when they claimed, oh yeah, Hussein Kamel says Saddam kept some of the weapons. Yeah, what he said was he kept some of the weapons until he got caught in 1991, and then he got rid of the rest. That's what he said.

And by the way, a couple of other red herrings here real quick. People say, look, they admit that in 2006 or '7 or something, they moved a bunch of uranium out of Iraq to Canada to be used in a Canadian medical reactor. How do you confront that, what do you do about that? Look, uranium. Well, it was declared. It was sitting there under IAEA lock and key and helps put to the lie the idea that Saddam would have gone to Africa to buy some yellowcake, when of course he couldn't. There's no way in the world he could have turned it into uranium hexafluoride gas, much less had a centrifuge facility that the world didn't know about or anything like that. But assuming he could have done anything with yellowcake uranium, he had plenty of it in the country. It was just under IAEA lock and seal, as it still was at the time of the invasion in 2003. So same with, as I was saying, some of the other storehouses or warehouses

with some chemical warheads in them that were found recently or were in that *New York Times* report. They still admit, none of this was current stuff, and all of it was previously declared. So none of it has anything to do with the argument that the Bush regime was making in '02 and '03.

But then, the other thing is – well, there's a lot of other things, but one of them is that they had a spy inside Saddam Hussein's regime at the highest level, a guy named Naji Sabri. And on *60 Minutes*, Tyler Drumheller – who recently died; he was one of the leading CIA officers in Europe – he did an interview on *60 Minutes*, where he explained – and he had another CIA officer with him, actually – where they explained that they had this guy Naji Sabri on the inside of Saddam's regime, and that they personally briefed Bush, Cheney, and Rice in the fall of 2002, and said, as the CIA says, we judge with high confidence that this guy is telling the truth; they really don't have anything.

But they didn't care about that. The same as they didn't care that the CIA had debunked – and the FBI – had debunked the lie that Mohamed Atta, the lead hijacker, had met in Prague in the Czech Republic with Saddam's head of intelligence, the head of the Mukhabarat. It was absolutely debunked. The FBI proved that he was in Florida at the time. The CIA had sources who said they saw the guy, and it was sure as hell not Mohamed Atta. And they had debunked it, and Cheney went on telling that lie for a couple more years.

And now, Bush and Rice and Powell, they were very careful not to push the Saddam-did-9/11 line very hard. Cheney mentioned the Prague thing quite a few times. But all the neocons in the media, on TV and in the newspapers and in the magazines, they would refer to it over and over and over again. So people really forget about how it wasn't just supposed ties to al Qaeda, which were completely fake – oh, and also debunked; I'll get to that in a second – but even ties to the 9/11 attack, that the neocons kept pushing and pushing and pushing.

And by the way, speaking of ties between Saddam and Osama, Michael Scheuer, the former chief of the CIA's bin Laden unit, he had once written a book, called *Through Our Enemies' Eyes*, that had it that Saddam was friends with Osama and that they had worked together. And some of the war party likes to try to cite that. But the funny thing is Scheuer will be the first to tell you that that book is completely wrong and that he knew it was wrong and that he told his bosses it was wrong before Iraq War II ever started. And George Tenet assigned Scheuer to lead a team to review everything they had on Iraq and al Qaeda, and their conclusion was there's no relationship whatsoever. And according to Scheuer, well, I told Tenet; I don't know whether Tenet ever passed that on. He doesn't know personally whether passed that on to Bush, Cheney, and Rice, but he absolutely reported to the Director of Central Intelligence before the war ever started that all these claims of a relationship between Saddam and Osama are lies.

And what's hilarious, too, is if you go back to Bush's Cincinnati speech, which is called "Denial and Deception," by the way, he comes in here and he says Iraq and al Qaeda

have a common enemy, and then he says that we know they have high level contacts – which, you know, could mean anything basically. But then he says, "These include one very senior al Qaeda leader who received medical treatment in Baghdad this year and has been associated with planning for chemical and biological attacks. We've learned that Iraq has trained al Qaeda members in bombmaking and poisons and deadly gases."

Okay, now, a couple of things here. First of all, this "one very senior al Qaeda leader" was not an al Qaeda leader at all. He's talking about Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who Colin Powell also invoked in the UN presentation, trying to pretend that this was a link between Saddam and Osama. And Zarqawi had told Osama, no, I don't want to join al Qaeda; I don't want to attack the United States; I'm interested in killing the king of Jordan, and so I don't want anything to do with you, and had left. And he did not get medical treatment in Baghdad, and George Bush knew it. He was in Kurdistan, in American-protected, safe, autonomous Kurdistan, where Saddam Hussein had no reach whatsoever in 2002 and 2003.

And Jim Miklaszewski at NBC News and a lot of other people, a surprising number of other reporters have elaborated this story to incredible degrees, and that is that the military begged George Bush for permission to go and kill Zarqawi at his camp in Kurdistan before the invasion. America had free rein in Kurdistan. We're invited guests in Kurdistan. No fly, no drive zone from 1991 on. Spies and Special Forces and whoever running around everywhere, free rein. But Bush would not let the military kill Zarqawi, because they needed the talking point. They needed to try to pretend that he was the link between Saddam and Osama, when he had told Osama no, and his only link to Saddam was Saddam had a death mark on his head. Saddam had an all-points bulletin out for the Mukhabarat to find this guy and kill him if you find him.

And now, do I even need to remind you what happened after the invasion and the destruction of the army and the Ba'ath government there, and when Zarqawi came down from Kurdistan to Mosul and founded al Qaeda in Iraq? Which actually, he didn't even name it al Qaeda in Iraq until the end of 2004. So one year and three quarters into the war, he finally then declared his loyalty to Osama bin Laden, but he had already butchered probably thousands by then and helped to create the massive civil war that we're still dealing with here today.

And the other thing he says there is about, "we know Saddam trained al Qaeda members in bombmaking and poisons and deadly gases." That's not true either. They tortured some poor schlub named al-Libi, who was an al Qaeda guy – I guess not a "poor schlub." He was an al Qaeda guy. But they tortured him into pointing the finger at Saddam Hussein. And that much is even admitted now, that he had basically, you guys want me to say "Saddam"? Okay, "Saddam." Please stop pulling my fingernails out. Yeah, Saddam, he's my best friend in the world. He taught me how to make chemical weapons, whatever you want me to say. And then when Qaddafi worked for America for a short time, Bush sent him back to Qaddafi, who killed him and called it a suicide.

WOODS: All right, Scott, if what you're telling us is right, that the weapons of mass destruction thing was not the reason for the war, then – and probably spreading democracy to Iraq was not the reason for the war. Let's assume that too. That, of course, leaves us with the question, what was the real motivation, and is there a way to know the real motivation, given that we're not privy to any of their secret meetings and conversations?

HORTON: Yeah, sure, and it's not a very satisfactory answer, really, Tom, because the answer is there are a lot of reasons, and none of them are good enough by a long shot, right? It's like ten times zero is still zero. And so even if it was true that Saddam was friends with Osama, that's still not necessarily a reason to invade the country, right? Maybe we could have hired Saddam Hussein to help keep a cork on the jihadist lid, if he wanted to live. I mean, that's even assuming the false premise there. So it's the same thing with the weapons. Let us come in and take the weapons out. Obama just made a deal like that with the leader in Syria, Bashar al-Assad, brokered by the Russians. We'll get rid of all the chemical weapons, and that'll spare you the regime change, that kind of thing. So we could have just as easily done that. But again, those aren't the reasons why.

But the real reasons why are even less worthwhile than that. The real reasons why are because Carl Rove and George W. Bush noticed that Bush, Sr. lost reelection, because his war was over. And if he'd still been in the middle of a war, he would have beat Bill Clinton in 1992. George Bush made that clear to Mickey Kaus, his authorized biographer, while he was still the governor, that what you want to do is you want to have a war against some weak little country that can't fight back, but that way you can look like a tough guy, get reelected, and get your domestic agenda through. And those are his own words. Mickey Kaus is the name of the biographer who wrote it all down. You know, we're talking about W. here. He didn't know he's not supposed to say that out loud. So that was a big part of it. For Bush and for Rove, they wanted to privatize Social Security – "privatize" Social Security. Fascize it; change it from socialism to fascism, put all that money in the stock market bubble. And they figured if they had a successful war, then that would help.

Then you have the military empire and the right wing nationalists, like Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld, who, they have their alliance with the neoconservatives and their doctrine of permanent American world empire. And that's what they call benevolent, global hegemony, and if you read the Defense Planning Guidance from 1992, you'll see that the plan is for America's military and posture around the world to be so great that no one will ever even contemplate trying to resist us – meaning mostly Russia and China. We'll take our unipolar moment, the opportunity we have to clamp down on just about everyone to such a degree that we'll forever be the masters of the universe. It's of course a fool's errand for a limited constitutional republic based in the middle part of North America to try to rule the entire Old World, but we are talking about military men and neocons, and this is their plan.

And then you have the Likud party, that is the right wing nationalists in Israel, Ariel Sharon and Benjamin Netanyahu. And they had Saddam Hussein, because Saddam

Hussein paid money to anyone who died in conflict with Israel, whether they were a suicide bomber or whether they were a little old lady who got bulldozed to death in her own home. Either way, Saddam paid them. And also, he just had the largest single Arab state and was basically intransigent, wouldn't work with them. And the neocons in America, who are basically just the Likud party's fifth column inside the United States, they were told by a very crafty liar named Ahmed Chalabi, who was working for the Iranians all along, as is readily agreed now by the CIA and the DIA, they were sold a bill of goods by him. And you can read their version of the bill of goods online in *The Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm*, where they advise incoming Prime Minister Netanyahu in 1996 – this is David Wurmser, Dick Cheney's foreign policy advisor; Richard Perle, the head of the Defense Policy Board and ringleader of the plot to lie us into war with Iraq; Douglas Feith, again, who was head of the Office of Special Plans, the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Policy, who actually did the lying, and some more.

And in this document, what they say is, of course they're enemy is Hezbollah. Well, how do you weaken Hezbollah? You weaken Syria. Well, how do you weaken Syria? You weaken Iran. Well, how do you weaken Iran? By getting rid of Saddam Hussein in Baghdad. I know, it's stupid. It doesn't make any sense at all. Saddam and Iran, Iraq and Iran had just fought an eight-year war that America had backed both sides of. Surely they knew Saddam, his role in the Reagan years was containing the Iranian revolution.

But the way the story went was if we overthrow Saddam, then we'll get a Hashemite king, which means a British loyal sock puppet, like they have King Hussein in Jordan. So we'll get a Hashemite king, and trust us, the Shiite majority, they just are going to love being ruled by a Hashemite king. They're not going to have a problem with that whatsoever. And then things are going to go so well that we're going to build an oil and water pipeline from Mosul to Haifa, and Iraq is going to become an ally of Israel, and then that's going to destabilize Syria, which is going to make it – we're going to expedite the chaotic collapse to Syria, and that'll make it harder for the Syrian regime to back Hezbollah, which is preventing Israel from stealing the Litani River from the people of Lebanon.

So that's your plot. It's right there in black and white, a "clean break, a new strategy for securing the realm." Let's get rid of Saddam, so that we can weaken Assad so that we can weaken Hezbollah and weaken Iran. And then, yeah, of course that didn't work. Ahmed Chalabi was lying to these idiot, Israel-first, Likud neoconservatives and telling them what they wanted to hear, and they're stupid and believed it. When in fact, just like anyone who was just being honest and didn't have an agenda could have predicted, if you get rid of Saddam, you're taking the cork out of the bottle and you're importing the Iranian revolution that Ronald Reagan backed Saddam all those years to contain, which is exactly what happened, which is why after America fought a five-year civil war for the Shiite parties, they said thanks, now get the hell out. Because they don't need us, because they're the majority. So they didn't get their Hashemite king; they didn't get what they wanted at all, but they did get a million dead and counting; now, if you include Syria, on the order of 7-8 million people displaced from

their homes, all of Middle Eastern Christian and Druze and Yazidi and other ethnic and religious minority groups, their small civilizations have been wiped out. Jews who've been living in Baghdad nonstop for 2,000 years, now all in exile.

The entire Middle East turned upside down, which I don't think was Plan A; that's Plan B. Plan A was this is going to be easy, and they're going to do everything we say. And then when that didn't work out, they said at least we can have total chaos and destruction, and then that way, Israel doesn't have to make peace with any of their neighbors. They can continue expanding their borders forever, because there'll be no one organized to stop them, no one more powerful than basically a tribe with rifles. And so they'll be unopposed. So pretty much simple as that. You can read it and weep. It's right there. In fact, it's on my website: *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm and Coping with Crumbling States*.

And here's one more thing, Tom: this story didn't even come out until I think 2004. Then it was revealed that Saddam Hussein had sent a representative to meet with Richard Perle in London — Richard Perle, who again, signed on to the *Clean Break*, was head of the Defense Policy Board and one of the ringleaders of the war against Iraq — met with him in London and said Saddam is willing to negotiate anything. You can send in the Army, the CIA, and the FBI to look for weapons of mass destruction. We will change our relationship with Hamas and no longer pay families of survivors of suicide attackers. We will discuss mineral rights, if you guys want to argue about oil. It even spoke to Saddam's confusion about what the motive for the war really was. Like, basically anything that you guys claim is your problem, I'm willing to negotiate it. And Richard Perle told him, tell Saddam we'll see him in Baghdad, and that complete capitulation and surrender is not good enough. Just like in George Bush's 48 hours speech, you go back and look carefully, he says whether Saddam goes into exile or not, we are invading in 48 hours. Surrender is not an option for you. We're coming no matter what.

And just look at what a disaster it's been. You don't need any expertise whatsoever. All you need is to just barely be able to sit back and remember the last decade of almost 4,000 dead Americans, tens and tens and tens of thousands maimed and wounded. Literally a million Iraqis killed; their entire civilization turned upside down. And none of it had to be this way at all, whatsoever.

WOODS: Well, tell us how we can hear more, if we're not totally demoralized from hearing what we've heard today.

HORTON: Well, I'm on the Liberty Radio Network from noon to 2 EST, 11 to 1 Texas time, every weekday.

WOODS: That's LRN.fm.

HORTON: LRN.fm, LibertyRadioNetwork.com. And my website is ScottHorton.org. You can find all of my interview archives, almost 4,000 of them now, going back to 2003, there at ScottHorton.org.

WOODS: All right, very good. We're going to direct people over to ScottHorton.org. The show notes page for today is TomWoods.com/499, so we will have links talking about some of the issues we raised today, and I'll fetch those from you as soon as possible. Scott, thanks for being here. I'm about to hit a milestone, but when you hit the milestone of 4,000 interviews, I don't know, I've got to – we're too far away to have a drink together. Maybe I'll mail you some microbrewery beer or something.

HORTON: Well you know what? As long as we're talking about it, you haven't done my show in years, Tom.

WOODS: Is it that long?

HORTON: Yeah, I mean, I quit trying, because you always just said forget it, dude.

WOODS: Well, yeah, okay, that was because of the Ron Paul Curriculum. I didn't do any interviews for two years. And I actually had – I won't mention his name, because he later did apologize for it – but I had a guy who's an admin for a big, big libertarian Facebook page get really, really personally offended and angry at me, publicly denouncing me, because I turned down his request. All he needed was half an hour, he said, and I thought, you have no idea how much my life is ruined by this Ron Paul Curriculum if you think that half an hour's no big deal. Like, that's the difference between sanity and insanity. Like, I can't schedule things. I have to have the whole afternoon to make videos. So it wasn't that I don't hold you in the highest esteem. So we will work that out. Let's figure out a good time.

HORTON: Okay, good deal. Yeah, I'd love to have you back on.

WOODS: And the thing is that on foreign policy, though, I don't know anything near what you know, so we'd have to talk about something that I do know about.

HORTON: Well, I mean, that's fine too.

WOODS: We'll fish around.

HORTON: I do interviews that are not just foreign policy, you know.

WOODS: Yeah, that's true; that's true. But I kind of feel like I'm trying the patience of your listeners who want to hear foreign policy. But anyway, if you do give them a diversity of topics, then I'm happy to be part of that diversity.

HORTON: Yeah, absolutely. So next time you write something, make sure I see it.

WOODS: Yeah, well, that's the problem. I don't have time to write anything either. I mean, I'm done with the Ron Paul Curriculum, but now I'm doing other things, but that are at least not making me crazy and hate the world. So that's an advance.

HORTON: There you go. By the way, you want me to send you this half of the recording here?

WOODS: You could, but you know, we are still on the air.

HORTON: Oh okay, well you'll have to edit that part out.

WOODS: Now people know how this works. I get Scott's – that's why Scott sounds like he's in the same room with me. Not only does he have great equipment, but I'm getting his local recording, and then I match it up – well, I don't match it up. My poor sucker of an audio assistant matches it up with my audio, so that it works all together. Okay, now people know the ins and outs of how the show works, I think it's time for us to go.

HORTON: Thanks very much for having me again, Tom. I appreciate it.

WOODS: All right, thanks, Scott. Always a pleasure.