



## Episode 652: That Donald Trump Foreign Policy Speech

Guest: Scott Horton

**WOODS:** I've had a number of requests to talk about the Trump speech, and in fact, I specifically had somebody saying to bring Scott on to talk about the Trump speech. So then when I was looking intervention into this, I saw that I think you did an episode of your show on the Trump speech. But, well, I want to do an episode of my show on the Trump speech, so that's why I'm bringing you on.

**HORTON:** Great.

**WOODS:** So I looked at, I read the whole thing, and I read a few people's commentaries on it. And it seems like it's one of those inkblot tests; you know, it depends on your personality how you're going to interpret this speech. It's one of those kinds of speeches. I've got a bunch of passages that I pulled out that I thought we might want to talk about, but before we do that, what's your overall impression of this speech? And by the way, for people listening like way in the future, we're talking about a speech that was delivered in the end of April 2016, and it was billed as an extremely important, defining foreign policy speech for Donald Trump. All right, go ahead.

**HORTON:** Well, just overall kind of in a word, absolutely horrible.

**WOODS:** Really? Okay.

**HORTON:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** All right, all right. And yet, see what I mean? I read Pat Buchanan's column on it, and Pat is running victory laps, saying isn't this great, the return of the national interest. Has Justin Raimondo written anything on it, as far as you know?

**HORTON:** Yeah, he's very much in Pat's corner on that, yeah.

**WOODS:** Ah, okay, all right. See, if only I could get his — if only he would learn how to do Skype, then I could get the two of you guys on, and that would be a fun episode. That right there, that would be a good episode.

**HORTON:** I don't know.

**WOODS:** I don't know; we've got to send somebody over there and force him to learn with it. To heck with it. All right, anyway, given that that's what I now know is your reaction, let's start by trying to pull out anything in the speech that might be considered good. Now, the things that I consider good are not — let's say some of them, anyway, deal with his interpretations of the outcomes of past wars, the Iraq War, the interventions in Libya, Egypt, Syria, etc. I think on that he's saying things that are true, although these days they're so true that they're almost commonplaces.

**HORTON:** Yeah, well, is it okay if before I slam this guy I talk about Hillary Clinton for just a second? By way of disclaimer, really.

**WOODS:** Okay, okay, yeah, go ahead.

**HORTON:** I absolutely hate Hillary Clinton, and I mean in a terrible, childish way. I'm not a mature person, Tom. I really absolutely loathe her, and I'm fairly certain, when I really try to be as honest as I can about it, that she is absolutely the most horrible single individual human being on the planet Earth, and if I were Saint Peter, I would have no problem pulling the trap door on her sorry ass. And that is in the most broad strokes and in the finest of details. She is absolutely horrible on virtually any policy you could name, foreign or domestic, future, past, present, and you know, and that's not because I'm some commie saying she's too far to the Right. It's because I'm a pure libertarian saying she's too far to the Left and to the Right. She's the perfect centrist, moderate, extremist totalitarian, who is just the perfect walking distilled everything that is wrong with politics and policy and the state in this society. Is that clear?

**WOODS:** That's clear.

**HORTON:** Okay. So Donald Trump — if she's George W. Bush, Donald Trump is Barack Obama. He's less worse than her, but that's not really to say anything good about him.

**WOODS:** All right.

**HORTON:** Now, as you said, he said a couple of good things about the regime change, and that's probably the most redeeming parts of the speech, is he basically denounces the Bush and Obama doctrines of knocking off Israel's enemies, the secular dictators of the Middle East. But at the same time, let's get real. He supported now all three Iraq Wars. He supported — he *demand*ed the war in Libya in 2011 and denounced feckless, weak wimp Obama for not hurrying up and getting it on and overthrowing Qaddafi. So he can get away with flip-flopping around and saying, well, I wasn't in government at the time and I changed my mind, and maybe you heard me on the radio in '02 saying I was for the war, but I changed my mind before that; I just can't prove it — or something. But he was bad on all these wars when he had the chance to actually be good on them.

And right now he's saying reinvade Iraq for Iraq War — if we're fighting Iraq War 2.5 now, mostly from the air, although, no, not really; we have troops on the ground. It is Iraq War 3 already. He wants to go ahead and double it. It's a big secret. He's not going

to tell you. Apparently it's none of your business, anymore than it's ISIS's business, how or when he's going to go about it, but he's reinvading Iraq, because, after all, Fallujah, Mosul are in the hands of the Islamic State, as well as Raqqa in former eastern Syria, now western Islamic State. Somebody's going to have to get them. He's going to send in the Marines. He made it clear in no uncertain terms.

Same thing with Libya. He was against – well, he was for, but now he wishes he had been against Libya War 1, I guess, but he avowed in yesterday's speech, Libya War 2, were going to bomb their oil, we're going to blockade their oil and we're going to attack them from the air, at least. We're going to crush the Islamic State, believe me. We're going to get rid of them. And so, yeah, he's against regime change, except in the places where regime change already didn't work. Then he's going to double down.

And then instead of completely denouncing and destroying, completely obliterating Hillary with a wave of his hand on the issue, he agreed with her almost entirely that we need a safe zone in Syria so that we can save all of the Christians there, which, yes, admittedly it's all George W. Bush and Barack Obama's fault that the Christians of the Middle East are in such dire straits, but he's saying we need to invade Syria, carve out a piece of Syria and call it Refugee Land, in defiance of the so-called legitimate central government of that country. We're just going to invade, just the same as we have special forces on the ground, backing the Kurds in Syria right now without the permission of the government in Damascus either – much less our Congress – but fighting against Damascus' enemies.

But anyway, and that was the good part, okay? And when he said, yeah, we don't want to keep doing regime change and we don't want to keep doing what the neocons do, he then said basically everything horrible on all of those same issues. And you mentioned Egypt there. That's one that he threw in that's exactly wrong. That's one where America has always backed Hosni Mubarak and Sadat before him – backed Hosni Mubarak for 30 years. He's Hillary Clinton's "family friend." Obama and Hillary did everything they could to keep him in power as long as they could in 2011.

But what happened was virtually the entire population of Egypt, from the coast all the way down the Nile, the whole civilization said get rid of this guy. And that was the so-called socialists and labor types and Millennials and the city dwellers and the farmers and the people in the countryside, the Muslim Brotherhood, yes, and everybody else. And they overthrew Hosni Mubarak, America's sock puppet military dictator over Obama's dead body, and they did it anyway.

And then America, they put on the front page of *The New York Times*, they were that ham-handed about it. They said, well, what we want to do if we can't keep Mubarak is we want Omar Suleiman, who was the head of the Egyptian secret torture police who did all of the extraordinary renditions torturing people to death for Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. This is who Obama wanted to be the next pharaoh in line.

But instead what happened was they held democratic elections, and the Muslim Brotherhood won. So then a year and a half later, America and Saudi's sock puppets

inside the military overthrew them, cancelled the elections and democracy there for all time, and murdered at least 1,000 people in the streets, have rounded up and executed hundreds of Muslim Brotherhood leaders since then, as though these guys were al-Qaeda.

Hell, you go back to the Republican debate the other day – I think the last debate? Or no, it was a few debates ago, when Rubio was still in there – where they're saying, yay, Hosni Mubarak is our hero because he kills the Muslim Brotherhood, and then in the same breath, boo, Bashar al-Assad in Syria because he kills al-Qaeda and America's on the side of al-Qaeda, when the Muslim Brotherhood is basically al-Qaeda if they were a bunch of rich, old men who own property and wanted to participate in electoral politics. So in other words, they're conservatives, not radicals.

But we go ahead and pretend they're terrorists and pretend it's all the one big terrorist conspiracy, when – and I love this slogan, as you know, as Trump said in his speech, "Israel's the only democracy in the Middle East." That's right; that's because if there's an election in the Middle East and America and Israel don't like the result, we cancel it, like in Algeria, like in Egypt, like in the Gaza Strip, like in Lebanon.

**WOODS:** All right, so you're saying he got the story of what happened in Egypt wrong when he was listing the –

**HORTON:** Yeah, and that's an important one too, because it's true that America does these color-coded revolutions, where the guy we want doesn't have the strength to win, but so they just kind of do a coup anyway. We've seen this time and again, a dozen times just in this century so far. But this wasn't one of those. You could say that absolutely that what happened in Libya and Syria were America and Saudi's counterrevolution, trying to co-opt people protesting in order to get regime changes that were already on their agenda.

But the counterrevolution in Egypt was the form of the military coup canceling the legitimate – and you know, it really was like almost an inspiring fall-of-the-Soviet-Union type of moment, where they overthrew a dictatorship and then agreed to hold elections and abide by them, which is not anarchocapitalist paradise, but it's better than living under a foreign-backed military dictatorship. And yes, the Muslim Brotherhood were a bunch of horrible Republicans, but they weren't a bunch of bin Ladenite terrorists. Only in Frank Gaffney's folklore are they that, the Egyptians ones, anyway. In Syria it's kind of a different story, of course, with the Muslim Brotherhood there.

**WOODS:** Let's shift over to Russia for a minute, because here Trump says, I think we ought to try to get along with the Russians. He said, there are going to be people who tell me that Russia is going to be unreasonable. Well, maybe that'll happen, but we're going to have to see first. And that actually got a favorable response from the Russians. So what about that? Is that not an improvement over Gaffney and Cruz and Fiorina and the rest of them?

**HORTON:** Absolutely, by miles, and on the most important issue on the face of the Earth, the American relationship with Russia. There's nothing more important than that. But then he turned right around, as Daniel Larison pointed out in his piece in *The American Conservative* –

**WOODS:** Yeah, I read that too.

**HORTON:** – and denounced Obama for basically changing America's mind, so to speak, on the so-called missile defense system that they were going to put into Poland and into the Czech Republic, which the people of those countries absolutely didn't want, which George Bush laughingly – and Obama too – no one in the whole world bought it – as they laughingly claimed that this was to protect Eastern Europe, our allies like Poland, from Iran, which doesn't have missiles that could ever get to Poland, has no history of any negative relations with Poland whatsoever, and was never making nukes in the first place, as we talked about a million times.

And it was obvious that the missile defense system was for Russia, and it's also obvious, Tom, that it's not a missile "defense" system when you are a world empire and you are bringing the entire – not you – the United States of America is bringing the entire Warsaw Pact and even the former Soviet republics into our NATO military alliance, up to their doorstep, and call it missile defense, when really it's like bringing armor to a fist fight. It's enabling us to achieve first strike capability against the Russians, which means a cancellation of mutual assured destruction and the idea in the minds of the goons at the Pentagon that they could get away with one good first strike and take out enough of Russia's retaliatory capability and be able to shoot down the rest as they try to launch it that we could get away with it and win.

And then of course that means that on the Russian side, that their trigger finger has to get that much itchier as they move from launch on warning one to launch on warning two, or whatever they call it, where they have to take every false alarm that much more seriously when they know that that is the American doctrine. So in other words, if you want to end the cold war with Russia, cancel the GD so-called missile defense system going into Poland. That's step one. So why is that cowardice and weakness when it's Barack Obama? That's the one thing he should have praised about Obama.

And it just goes to show this guy's all over the place, basically. You can't put stock in anything. I don't know. Dan Sanchez calls it Horton's Law, that I say that if a politician makes a good promise, forget it. If he makes a bad promise, you can take it to the bank. Like Obama said I'm going to get us out of Iraq. Yeah, right. He said I'm going to double down in Afghanistan. Yes, of course he is, right? No doubt about it. And that's basically what we have here, is Trump goes, I'm for and against everything. Yeah, well, wherever he's bad on something, you can pretty much bet on that. And wherever he's good on something, how come he can't be consistent on even that one issue for more than a minute?

**WOODS:** And according to the Larison piece, he's even misleading about that, in that it's not like they've completely dropped the idea of the missile defense system. Now

they want to maybe try to arrange it through NATO. So even there, he's only technically correct in what he's saying about the gutting of the missile defense systems in the Czech Republic and Poland.

All right, so I agree. I agree. Look, I read this shortly before this conversation we were having right now. I didn't read it the day he gave it, and all I did was I looked at some headlines and I looked at people's reactions, and there were hysterical reactions on the part of the foreign policy establishment, and there were some guardedly optimistic reactions on the part of some people I trust. So I thought, well, maybe it was a decent speech after all. And then I read this thing and I thought, maybe this will be a really significant thing.

And I was so utterly disappointed by this thing, because, yeah, it is true that he will say some things, as we acknowledged before, that Ted Cruz won't say. Well, all right – and that John Bolton won't say. But it is so overwhelmed and swamped by, the Iran deal is bad and Obama bows to our enemies and Joe Biden hates Israel. I mean, what is this? I could read that in *Commentary*, I could read that in *National Review*, but in a way this tells me as much about the neocons as it does about Trump. If they get that hysterical over what looks to me – and I wanted to like this speech. I'll be honest with you. Of course we all want him – we want anybody to give a good foreign policy speech. I wanted to like this speech. If this feckless speech with three mildly pacific statements in it is enough to make them hysterical, then they are certifiably insane.

**HORTON:** Well, there's no doubt about that. I mean, if the neocons' enemies, if that's how we judge people as just whether the neocons hate them or not, then we've got to love everyone, because everyone's against them, and they're against everyone. They never take responsibility. Everything they destroy is everyone else's fault. So you know, he's certainly on the outside of them. But then again, he says, I'm going to hire a whole new team of guys. Well, okay, like in my fantasy he hires Doug Bandow to be his National Security Advisor or something. But is that going to happen? No. Who's he going to hire? He's going to go right to all the very same think-tanks that all Republicans go to to get their foreign policy guys. And you go back, he always talks about how much he loves John Bolton – "Now there's a no-nonsense guy who knows just what to do." Uh, just what Richard Perle wants him to do? Yeah, great. You know?

**WOODS:** Yeah, I know it; I know it. Now, I'm looking at the passages that I picked out, and this is one that I think Larison also picked out. He says – this is Trump: "We're getting out of the nation-building business" – good – "and instead focusing on creating stability in the world." Ugh, all right. Well, what would that look like? What would that mean?

**HORTON:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** What would that amount to?

**HORTON:** Well, and that wasn't the worst part. I think really all he meant by that was basically we're not in the deliberately creating chaos and overthrowing governments

and making big changes to other people's societies business anymore, kind of renouncing the Wolfowitz doctrine, which, you know, again, if I really believed him, then you know, I guess that would be great. But then again, you know, like he mentioned the Iran deal. First of all, he lied about the Iran deal and said that the Iranians had been breaking their end of the deal, which is just completely ridiculous.

**WOODS:** Yeah, I don't think they have. Yeah.

**HORTON:** But then, I mean, that really possibly foreshadows him ruining the Iran deal. And then what happens when Iran says, that's it, we're not abiding by this anymore? Or God forbid they even withdraw from the nonproliferation treaty and their previous safeguards agreement that already made sure that their nuclear program was civilian-only? Or God forbid they do something that makes it look, that they can even be framed credibly for trying to make nukes? Does anybody think he would hesitate for a second? I take him at his word that if he could come up with a case that the Iranians were making nukes that he would absolutely attack, and that he very well might drive them out of the deal and create just such a crisis, you know?

**WOODS:** Yeah, I mean, that –

**HORTON:** Which, by the way, again, Hillary's absolutely horrible on this. Obama could have had a deal with Iran in 2010, but Hillary sabotaged it. She should have been banished on an ice thingamajig and sent out like an Eskimo grandma after that, and that should have been the end of her.

**WOODS:** Yeah. Well, at least – I don't know, at least – I'd like to start calling her Eskimo Grandma. That's a pretty good – I'm going to steal that.

**HORTON:** It's just the ice float thing. If they have a name for that, where they put the grandma on the piece of ice and send her out to sea –

**WOODS:** Yeah, I don't know if there's a name for it, but Ice Flow Grandma is good enough.

**HORTON:** Okay.

**WOODS:** Let me read you this passage: "However, unlike candidates for the presidency, war and aggression will not be my first instinct. You cannot have a foreign policy without diplomacy. A superpower understands that caution and restraint are really truly signs of strength." Now, maybe before this speech I might have been inclined to say, well, I think on balance he would be – and by the way, I actually do think that on balance it's likely that he would be more restrained than a Ted Cruz. I still believe that. But unfortunately, because of the rest of the speech, this comes off sounding like the kind of flourishes that we got from George W. Bush, and you know how much that wound up amounting to.

**HORTON:** Right. Well, yeah, I mean, that's obviously the first point. But what was most important about that to me was not that he meant it or that it was really a slight at Cruz. I think that was an attack on Hillary. Or maybe that's just my confirmation bias, because I want so badly for him to understand what Sanders could not, that attacking Hillary Clinton on foreign policy is how to win, characterizing her as the Dick Cheney, loose cannon, God knows what wars she's going to get us into, folks, but she's going to get your son killed, believe me. That kind of attack on Hillary Clinton, she's wide open for and has no defense against, because she, again, literally is the worst human on the face of the Earth.

And so if that's what he meant by that, that unlike some people in this race, my first instinct isn't aggression, never mind Cruz, but as an attack on Hillary as foreshadowing the general election run against her, that's what I really want, because I think if he does that at all, it's going to score real points. And if he learns that and repeats it and he spends the whole campaign doing that, I think first of all he'll prevent her from being the president of the United States. And secondly, he might actually come to believe it, that you know what, if I were a crazy, ridiculous, pinhead like her, I'd be for the next war, but I'm not.

And I don't think he really knows or believes anything, so he's kind of learning right now, and I'm thinking the fact of good of politics could be should be the best reinforcement for how true it is, too, that, guess what, the rank and file American Right is sick and tired of war too. The Left puts up with it because it's the Democrats doing it, but they don't really love it like right-wingers love it. But the right-wingers are exhausted too, man. They're over it.

And sorry, can't help it: another Rand Paul failure to understand — ding, ding, ding — that he could have absolutely been as anti-war as possible, and it would have only helped him. There was a thing in *Politico*, where he says, now that he's not running for president, now he can be more libertarian, now he doesn't have to moderate his views so much. Yeah, how did moderating your views help, dude? None. That's why he lost. But has learned absolutely nothing from it, just as I predicted, because what a terrible person he is. Sorry, go ahead.

**WOODS:** All right, well — (laughing). Look, you and I have had numerous discussions about that situation. That's most unfortunate. But yeah, it's funny that you said that, because yeah, in the back of my mind when you were talking about Trump, I was thinking the same thing about Rand, that it was the same failure to appreciate that there is a — I mean, the fact that Trump, even if it's only superficially, is running on a so-called America first platform, the very fact that he's doing that and getting away with it, the fact that he is sometimes, at least, saying things like, hey, I want to try to bring about peace in the Middle East; so shoot me — the fact he's even saying that sometimes and they still vote for him anyway shows that that as an obstacle, the foreign policy as an obstacle to a libertarian success was always overstated.

**HORTON:** Yeah, and you know, I want to get back to what you said about George W. Bush in 2000 talking about a humble foreign policy and all that. George Bush never

said, yeah, you know what we're going to do? We're going to dip bullets in pig's blood and shoot them Muslims and that'll teach them good to mess with us – which is this guy's line. We've got to ditch the Geneva Conventions, not from the libertarian, you know, anti-internationalist point of view that we would have such a perfect rule of law here that we would have no need for such a thing because we're way even better than a Geneva Convention could ever be.

Yeah, right. He wants rid of it, because he wants to torture people to death, and he's said so openly over and over again. Far beyond waterboarding. Well, waterboarding is drowning someone to the absolute edge of death, to the brink of death, the death spiral, as the CIA doctors call it, and then they save their life, basically, and then do it again. They drown them, and then, eh, bring them back right at the last second. So, far beyond waterboarding. And hey, they're barbarians, the Islamic State. They cut off people's heads, so we can do whatever we want with them. There is no limit. As long as they respect no law, I as president will respect no law when it comes to how I fight wars against them.

And you know what? Again, when a politician makes a bad promise, you can take that to the bank. You know what? It's not like he really is such a Ron Paul peacenik that he has to say something tough so as not to look like too much of a wimp. No. Donald Trump doesn't suffer from the wimp problem right now. That's not why he's doing that. That's what he believes. And in fact, they said, well, some of the CIA guys say that they won't follow your orders to torture people, he goes, oh yeah, they'll follow my orders, all right; I'll be their commander, and they'll torture.

This is a guy we're debating actually having to – you know, being the president of the United States of America. Not that – you know, again. He's just Obama. Obama tortures people. George Bush tortures people. I'm not saying that. But like an avowed torturer with blood dripping off his fangs, rubbing his hands together about how he's going to torture people, how he's going to target the family members of people that his government accuses of being terrorists? I mean, we're way the hell off the deep end here, Tom, by far.

**WOODS:** Well, listen, I want to – you know what? Actually, let me say a quick thing, because when you talked about waterboarding, I know your point is that this would go well beyond waterboarding, but one of the YouTube videos that has stayed with me over the years was that video when Mancow agreed to be waterboarded. Did you ever see this?

**HORTON:** I vaguely remember it, but I don't really remember it.

**WOODS:** Okay, Mancow was like a right-wing radio guy, and he was mocking people who said that waterboarding was torture. And by the way, I was on Mancow's show a couple of times, and I think he's – I mean, I have been on hundreds if not thousands of radio shows, and I would say he was by far the worst host I ever interacted with. I literally could not get a word in edgewise. And it wasn't because I'm some boring old pointy-headed professor type and I make for bad radio. I do not make for bad radio.

The guy just wouldn't let me talk. It was horrible. And so then I was booked on him a third time for another book, and I just told the publisher, I am not going on that show. And they said, but he has a huge audience, you've got to go. And I said, yeah, and the whole audience will know that maybe there might have been some guy on the line.

But anyway – sorry, I'm getting off – this is a tangent off of a tangent. This video shows him consenting to be waterboarded so that he could be the tough guy and show everybody, you see, this is just a little water up your nose or whatever; it's no big deal. And after a very short period of time – I don't know, it might have been a couple of seconds – he stood right up or he signaled to stop, and his first words were, "That is torture." And that blew me away.

**HORTON:** After one moment.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**HORTON:** Yeah, Christopher Hitchens did the same thing too.

**WOODS:** Oh, I didn't know that.

**HORTON:** He volunteered to be waterboarded and said, absolutely, it's torture too.

**WOODS:** I didn't know that about Hitchens.

**HORTON:** And I mean, you know, they always sell this – I mean, think about it. I remember when I was a little bitty kid, the first time I ever learned about torture, it was like the mythological Chinese water torture was the first time I ever encountered the concept, really. Maybe Darth Vader and Princess Leia with that hovering robot. But anyway, Chinese water torture, that's the epitome of barbarianism. But when it's us it's an enhanced interrogation technique and we wear white coats and have a sterile white room, and it's all very scientific, and no one's really responsible, because we have a piece of paper right here that says it's okay.

And meanwhile, we're drowning people to death, almost. But even in the news, it's always simulated drowning that simulates the sensation of what it might be like to drown, and all this kind of stuff. It's drowning. And listen, you can read the Red Cross report about this, okay? It's drowning people into, what they call, the death spiral, where your brain stem is shutting down. You are going through the tunnel of light to Heaven, and then they punch you in the gut and put your right side up again and make you puke all the water out, and then do it again. It's absolute medieval horror. So whatever they did to Mancow, the radio show host version of that, the nice, gentle one.

**WOODS:** Oh yeah. I think will actually, I'll dig out the – let me write this down. I'll dig out the Mancow video, because people should watch that.

**HORTON:** And you know, I overstated the pig's blood thing – real quick before we go, Tom. He didn't say, yeah, this is what we're going to do. But yesterday, the same day as the big speech, he brought up again the myth of General Pershing in the Philippines dipping bullets in pig's blood and executing 49 Muslim Moro rebels – or however you pronounce it; I may have said that wrong – and then sending the 50th one off to warn. Now, it's true, some people in the Philippines war did commit war crimes and bury pigs and sprinkle pig's blood on Muslims that they had killed, and it's in dispute whether Pershing ever had anything to do with that, but it's not true, the firing squad story he told.

But anyway, the real point is that this is his idea of setting the stage of what the War on Terror is going to be like under him, is that we are going to hit them where it really hurts; we're going to shoot them with – not literally, maybe, but we're going to make it impossible for them to go to Heaven the way we treat their corpses. This is the attack that we're going to wage against them, and that'll learn 'em. And this is the frontrunner, man. This is the nominee, pretty much locked up. And again, I can't help but still prefer him to Hillary. God help me.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**HORTON:** Because she's already killed a million and a half people in the world, and he only is about to.

**WOODS:** And I know there are some Bernie people who, on principle, won't vote for her, but it's going to be a shockingly high number who will wind up voting for her. It depresses me even to think about it. We've got to stop. We've got to call it quits here.

**HORTON:** Just so you know, I had 100 – no, well, I had at least a solid dozen or 20 more things on my list to complain about from that speech. It's really pretty bad.

**WOODS:** Yeah, well, you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to link to the speech, because you really should look at it. It'll only take you a few minutes to skim it.

**HORTON:** Which, by the way, which transcript do you have? Because the transcript and what he actually said were quite a bit different, in some cases, anyway.

**WOODS:** Oh, were they really? I actually don't know which one; I didn't know that it mattered.

**HORTON:** I think the *New York Times* one purported to be not the passed out copies, but what he actually said, although, you know, who knows?

**WOODS:** All right, well, I'll try to dig out – because of course what matters is what he actually said, so I'll dig that out, link to it at [TomWoods.com/652](http://TomWoods.com/652). Can you tell people – because I actually don't know. I know you had a thing with LRN. How do people hear you now?

**HORTON:** Oh, just go to [ScottHorton.org](http://ScottHorton.org). Basically the full show feed is more or less a dead letter, although as you said, I did do a Trump thing on it yesterday, on the full show feed, what used to be the full show feed. But basically right now what I'm trying to do, and this week has been a real slow week for me, but I'm trying to still do two or three interviews a day and put those out on the podcast feed. And I've had some really good ones lately, including Ron Paul and Patrick Cockburn and Robert Pape and a lot of really great ones. So that's all just [ScottHorton.org/interviews](http://ScottHorton.org/interviews) to sign up for that.

**WOODS:** Okay, I'll make sure and link to that on [TomWoods.com/652](http://TomWoods.com/652), as well. All right, thanks a lot, Scott; talk to you soon.

**HORTON:** Thank you, sir.