Episode 886: Trump Launches Strike on Syria

Guest: Scott Horton

WOODS: Well, I don't know what to say here. I just don't know what to say. I guess we have to accept that everybody does this, but you know, given that Trump said the exact opposite just four years ago in 2013 when he was saying Obama needs congressional approval; no good is going to come of this; yes, even though it's a gas attack, there's tragedy all over the world; we have to look after ourselves — whatever. Plus, the Syrian rebels, who knows who these people are, but this is not our fight — and all this stuff. We don't need regime change. So when somebody says those particular things, you would think they wouldn't say and do the exact opposite.

I guess that's why I'm a little bit annoyed. I don't care when Obama and Bush bomb people. I expect that. But when somebody says the exact opposite and then does it, then it really makes me wonder who's running the thing.

All right, what's your initial thought about this? Initial thought. 60 seconds.

HORTON: All right, well, all along he has said he's going to knock the hell out of ISIS and al-Qaeda, which means — and radical Islam — which means guaranteed CIA and special forces wars against bin Ladenite groups, ISIS and al-Qaeda, in Yemen, Somalia, Libya, Syria, supposedly Afghanistan, even though they're really just fighting the Taliban there, and all across Africa and the Middle East for the next eight years. That was always promised. He's been bombing east Syria all along. He's sending the Marines, not just special forces, but actual infantry to get ready to take Raqqa from the Islamic State here starting very soon.

What's changed here is that he's attacked another secular state. He's attacked a dictator who wakes up and shaves his chin every morning before he puts on his three-piece suit. And this is the thing where Donald Trump supported the war against Saddam Hussein, he supported the war against Muammar Qaddafi, but then he learned his lesson. He snapped out of it and he quit being Hillary Clinton sometime apparently in 2011 or '12. And then like you say, he tweeted at least a handful of times in the years after that that we should not be messing around in Syria like this, going after a secular dictator, doing a regime change against a secular dictator.

And then of course the opposite argument of that is never the reality of what's really going on in interests and power and everything. The opposite argument of that is, "Oh, he's killing his own people. Bashar al-Assad, he wakes up every morning; he's just a serial killer. He lives only to kill the people of Syria, and somebody's got to stop him."

And then, so look, a bad thing happened. And then this is a direct quote, Tom. Donald Trump said, "And then children, little children, babies, the little babies," he said, as though he is a tiny child himself, and said basically — I saw you retweeted Ann Coulter. He saw something on TV, and so therefore, because his mind is such this tissue-paper thin little thing anyway, it just blew away. And his people came to him and said, "Look, here's a thing and we have to do something," and he went, "Okay." And then that's it. And so now all of a sudden, he's just flip-flopped the policy.

So in other words, it's not that he ever understood even where Syria is or where Syria fits in the Shiite Crescent alliance with Iran or any of this context. Right? Not really. And so it was basically a simple decision, instead of a serious decision like, Oh my god, are we really going to do this for al-Qaeda? Are we really going to take this huge step back from the war against the jihadists that's been going well relatively recently, at least in Syria? He can't think of it like that, because he's too stupid to even read a whole article to the end. He only knows what he's told, what he sees on TV, which is all just nothing. It's all devoid of context. And so he fails.

WOODS: All right, listen. Let's talk — you mentioned that I retweeted Ann Coulter. I've been on a retweeting frenzy. I've retweeted everybody from Max Blumenthal to Paul Joseph Watson on this. And in fact, I even — I know you've interviewed Max Blumenthal; I don't want to drag you into my problems with him. But I thought —

HORTON: I actually have a daydream about having a barbecue with the two of you guys and forcing you to become good friends, because I like you both so much.

WOODS: Oh, that's funny. Well, when I retweeted it, I actually wrote, "Heaven, help me. Trump even has me retweeting Max Blumenthal." So you know, maybe Trump will make that happen.

HORTON: Yeah, I know that he was very bad to you, and I'm pretty sure he started it, but I know it was based on a misunderstanding.

WOODS: Got to be.

HORTON: I know that there's good common ground between you.

WOODS: 'Cause I'm a good guy, right? I mean, who would be against me?

HORTON: He is a good guy, dude. He really is a good guy.

WOODS: All right, well, that's okay.

HORTON: Absolutely.

WOODS: Anyway, the point is, what impresses me about Coulter and these other people is that there's a difference I see between — I mean, Coulter loved Trump to the point where she loved one of his policies so much that she didn't matter if he favored mandatory abortion after that. So she was so on his team. And for her to say he's throwing it all down the drain on the basis of some sad pictures, that means that for

all her faults, Ann Coulter is better than a lot of the progressives who looked the other way under Obama. I mean, there were a lot of people who made excuses or this and that, and I have to say that the right wing, not the neocons, but I think they're holding up a lot better. These people are denouncing him. Paul Joseph Watson has a gigantic Twitter following, and he just immediately washed his hands of Trump as a result of this. I didn't see that many super prominent people doing things like that when things were reversed.

Now let's go all the way back to the very beginning. I want you to tell me about your opinion, and tell me also about what Phil Giraldi told you — because he's been on my show not too long, from formerly the CIA — about the actual gas attack itself. *The Sun* in the U.K. wrote an article you may have seen, condemning people like Ron Paul for speculating that since it makes no sense for Assad to have done this and since the people telling us all about it are liars who have been unreliable on absolutely everything for the past 15 years in the Middle East, we have to at least keep an open mind. Well, they said, Oh, he's obviously a terrible person for saying that. There's no evidence that anybody other than Assad was behind it. What's your thought about that specific part of this?

HORTON: Well, the thing of it is — well, first of all, it makes no sense for Assad to do the attack. Now, that doesn't mean that he didn't do it. Doesn't mean some idiot colonel in his ranks did it. We're talking about a government program here, the Syria Arab Army, so who knows, you know? But I don't really think there's any reason to believe that he had any sarin. They really got rid of that stuff already.

And here's the other thing: al-Qaeda had been making some serious gains against Bashar al-Assad last month, but then the tables were turned and the Syrian Arab Army, Assad's army, was making [inaudible] al-Qaeda, killed thousands of them, and were driving them back. And so in a tactical sense, it makes no sense whatsoever to think that, Oh, they were so desperate they resorted to using chemical weapons. They had al-Qaeda right where they wanted them, at least for the time being. Of course they'd already driven them out of east Aleppo, etc.

And then strategically it makes absolutely no sense for them to do it, because right as they're winning, they're also — this was on the eve of a brand new peace conference, where all of these groups are supposed to be sitting down in Europe and having a new negotiation in an attempt to end the war. On the face of it, whose interest is this in? Al-Qaeda. And would they kill innocent people in order to stage an attack against them? Of course. Now, that doesn't mean that's exactly what happened here, although that is what happened in 2013 when Turkey and al-Qaeda worked together to do the fake sarin attack there. So that's the first reason that everybody ought to hold their horses.

Now, the Russian explanation that it was a Syrian jet bombed the position, all right, but what they did was they bombed a building that had some chemicals in it, and those chemicals burned and that's what poisoned everybody. Now, when I talked Philip Giraldi, the former CIA officer, yesterday — and everybody can hear that recording at the Libertarian Institute there — what he said was that he has intelligence and military sources, high-level sources on the ground in the Middle East who say it is very

clear that the story that this was a gas bomb attack is a sham, and that they believe that the Russian story is right.

Now, on the other hand, I should mention that there's an article in *The Guardian* where the guy — and I don't know who this reporter is. There's an article in *The Guardian* where they guy says, Hey, I'm here on the ground and here's the crater in the street where the gas bomb hit — we're talking about one gas bomb and it just happened to be there were 70 civilians standing right there? I'm not sure. It's in the middle of the road, in the middle of kind of a neighborhood somewhere. But he says, And then there's a warehouse here and there's a grain silo here, but there's no evidence that they were bombed recently or that there were any chemicals being stored in it. It's just an empty old warehouse. And so that seemed to throw a lot of cold water on the Russian version of the story that Phil was saying that his intelligence sources were saying that they were buying into.

So I don't really know what the answer is, but that's the real point. Nobody really knows, and we already attacked Syria based on no one really knows. And we know that last time this was sham. We know the last time in 2013, at least a handful of CIA analysts almost resigned over this. They refused to put out a CIA intelligence assessment. Instead, we got a White House government assessment, [clears throat] which is just some made up nothing because the CIA wouldn't stand by the intelligence.

And we know now from a report from one year ago in *The Atlantic*, Barack Obama's exit interview with Jeffrey Goldberg, where, it's funny, the article starts out, Oh, sarin gas attack, blah, blah, blah, and then you get about three-quarters of the way through the article and there's this all-important paragraph that says that James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, interrupted Obama's morning briefing to tell him, "I will not stand by these 'Assad did the sarin gas attack in Ghouta' claims and this is no slam dunk, Mr. President," which is a direct reference to what George Tenet told George W. Bush, that the WMDs in Iraq supposedly was a slam dunk.

And so when Clapper told Obama, "I won't back you up, Mr. President, on the intelligence behind this attack if you do it," Obama didn't know what to do. He had to drop it. And by the way, his Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Dempsey, also publicly said to the media, "Geez, I don't know why we have to attack Syria right now. And so that was throwing Obama under the bus, basically. His Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, his Director of National Intelligence were both saying I'm not going to stand behind you if you attack Syria right now. So Obama was like, "Okay." And the House of Commons in Britain had already said no, and the American people were absolutely against it, left and right. The only force — go back to 2013 and check the record. The only interest in America that was pushing for war with Syria was the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and their allies. No one else.

WOODS: You know, when I saw that Bannon had been demoted, I kind of thought that was the canary in the coal mine, because I know people don't like Bannon, but they don't like anybody surrounding Trump. And Bannon's not my kind of guy either. We already talked about that on your show. But there's some parts of him that are better than the other people, and although he's not an Islam lover, nevertheless, I think his

desire to go after the radical Islamists is genuine in that he doesn't want to go after the Assads of the world, so I think it's likely that he probably dissented from this.

And what's so irritating to me is that the left should be cheering that and saying — I don't know why people are constitutionally incapable of saying, You know, I think this guy's a real bum, but on this one thing he was heroic and doggone it, it's a shame that he's out of that thing. Instead, like idiots, they're breaking out the champagne. Yeah, they break out the champagne, and then the bombing starts. You know, what's the — I'll take Bannon in there if he might say, "This is a dumb thing to do. And not only that, but it's a betrayal of your whole message." I mean, I have never seen anybody like Trump before, where he has to be reminded of what he said three days ago, or of what he said 500 times in a row. I've never seen anybody like this. I mean, yeah, I know politicians say one thing and they do another. George H.W. Bush said, "Read my lips. No new taxes." Then he got in and he raised taxes. All right, I get that. But this is unbelievable. "Yeah, we're not going to do nation building, we're not going to do regime change. We've got our own problems." We got this whole message. And then it's like we have to remind him: don't you know what you said ten minutes ago?

HORTON: Yeah. Well, on the Bannon thing, it's absolutely a matter of the broken clock, right? This is a guy who thinks that the West must be in this massive civilizational conflict with all of Islam, and so from that point of view, of course the last thing you want to do is back al-Qaeda. But then again, you don't have to hate and fear Islam and think we need a clash of civilizations in order to think that it's wrong to back al-Qaeda, right?

WOODS: [laughing] Right.

HORTON: It's jus that Bannon happens to be clear on this one. So a different example would be in Egypt in 2011, when that was really the entire population of the country overthrew the American-backed sock puppet dictator. And then they held free and fair elections, and the conservative, old Muslim Brotherhood, who stood for election, won the election. And at that point, the Bannons of the world went, Oh my God, the Muslim Brotherhood, ah! Well, that was a complete, ridiculous overreaction. As a matter of fact, al-Qaeda hates the Muslim Brotherhood — the Egyptian branch of them anyway, we're talking about here — because they're a bunch of conservative, rich, old, property-owning men who are not revolutionaries and radicals and who stand for election and who aren't totalitarians in their outlook about forcing their way on everybody else.

So once they were overthrown in 2013 after about a year in power, America, Saudi, and the Egyptian military went ahead and cancelled the elections and put el-Sisi in charge. And then Ayman al-Zawahiri said, "Ha ha, I told you. The Americans will never let Islamists come to power, even moderate ones, by electoral process. Anywhere that our democracy and freedom contradicts American interests, they're always going to get their way. Told you so." And so the Bannons of the world helped prove Ayman al-Zawahiri, the leader of al-Qaeda, right about us, that the American empire must be destroyed first before anybody over there can have even a chance at self-government. So really good own goal their. But that's the difference between Scott Horton and Bannon. He will be right; he will say no, no, no, we should not overthrow these secular dictators. But I'd bet if you ask him, he'd say we should back these secular dictators,

right? And that's absolutely the wrong answer. That's a huge part of what got us attacked in the first place.

WOODS: Right, yeah, I totally agree. Yeah, totally agreed. But at this point, we've got to solve one problem at a time, and the first problem is: don't be bombing these people. So if they were to somehow get rid of Assad, who is going to go in there? Do they have another stooge? Who would go in there?

HORTON: I mean, if they have the next mustache in line, some general in the army or something that they have in mind to do a coup or something like that, I have no idea. I mean, my understanding — and I'm not the expert at all on Syria or anything, but my best understanding is that objective experts don't seem to think that the government could outlast Assad, that if Assad fell, that the government would unravel. So if you're asking me what comes after the Baathist state in Damascus, the answer is al-Qaeda. The answer is al-Julani, Ayman al-Zawahiri's servant.

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah. And if that happens, you would like to think that you could say, "Now, look, people. This has happened again and again. Look at it right in your faces. Yeah, I know, I know about the gassing, and I know about the terrible tragedy. But you know how many tragedies are now going to happen because of your idiotic response? But yet, the thing is we have previous examples of this and it doesn't seem to phase them, because the next CNN report — and by the way, those are just the useful idiots, the people who are moved by the CNN report about the gassing. I mean, that just serves the purposes of the deep state. Obviously they couldn't — given that these people would gas children in a moment, without a second's deliberation, not for a moment are they losing any sleep over this. But what drives me crazy are these interventionists who are both neocon and liberal who are moved by CNN reports, when they're being manipulated. They're being manipulated by CNN itself and by the whole regime that wants to exploit this for its own purposes.

HORTON: Right.

WOODS: I don't know. It's unbelievable. It's unbelievable. I mean, you would like to think, in other words, that you would be able to at least have the silver lining that you could take the ensuing disaster and hang it around their necks, but yet, Scott, how do these people — I'm asking this rhetorically, but how do these people somehow manage to get out from underneath every single disaster they fasten upon us? How is Bill Kristol still out there? How is Max Boot, who — by the way, both of whom are now cheering Trump. I hope he likes his new neocon friends, the creep. How are they still out there? And I don't even expect an answer.

HORTON: No, it's easy. No, I can answer it because it's a good question. It's not just a rhetorical question; it's a good question. And it goes like this: the Congress appropriates tens of billions of dollars per year to these various military industrial complex firms, and then those firms —

WOODS: Can it really be that venal that that's what it really boils down to?

HORTON: Oh, it' so simple, yes. You know, there's a great article by Tim Shorrock about the COINdinistas, all the Center for a New American Security Democrats who pushed the surge into Afghanistan, and he goes through there and he just showed that all these think-tanks, left, right, center, neocon, and the rest of them, are backed by Northrup Grumman, Lockheed, etc. And so in other words, there doesn't have to be a demand for Bill Kristol's wisdom among the consumers of the media. There's a demand by the advertisers and there's a demand by the arms manufacturers to have him out there lying to us, and so that's where he comes from, him and the rest of them. It's, you know, the iron triangle, right?

And you look at the neocon movement specifically. Half of them are Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, technocrats, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for doing a coup d'état and starting a war somewhere, right? And then the other half of them are writers and they dominate in the newspapers and in the magazines and on the center left and in the center right, and it's such a powerful echo chamber. It's almost impossible to get around, you know?

WOODS: All right, I found that article that you're talking about. I'm going to link to it at TomWoods.com/886, about the COINdinistas. I was not familiar with this article, but I'll go ahead and read it. So Scott, I don't know why I'm so demoralized about this. It's because you had a 3% glimmer of a possibility that things could change. And I guess what's most eerie about this to me is that it really does show what we all knew in our heart of hearts, that the regime is the regime and it does what it wants and it doesn't matter who's in there. I mean, I've been talking about that for years and we have seen it with our own eyes for years. But even when they have somebody they've demonized, they did everything they could to stop from getting in there, once he gets in there, even he gets in line. It's chilling.

HORTON: Yeah. Well, you know, I mean, I'm sorry for the rest of the people of the world and ultimately for the Americans too. It's going to get worse and worse. We're only just at the very beginning here. But in a way, I have to say I really kind of appreciate the whole practical joke here, where the one and only man in our society who is rich enough and famous enough and tall enough and brash enough to destroy the Bushes and the Clintons and bum-rush the entire process and literally actually win and become the president of the United States, and it's Donald Trump, the kook from *Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous*, right? This idiot, this know-nothing who can't even read a thousand-word article to the end without his brain melting down, who's dumber than George W. Bush, who's only there because he likes himself a lot and he thinks that it would be nice if people called him President Trump, but who otherwise has no doctorate, has no understanding, has no curiosity. I mean, hell, at least George Bush was obsessed with proving that he was a tougher guy than his dad and he was going to go to Iraq. At least it's an ethos, Donnie, this insanity of George W. Bush and his policy. But Donald Trump is just some bum. That's all he is. He's a kook with the 14-karat-gold gilded penthouse apartment. He's the most crass, most paper-thin idiot. And just — yeah, I love it. Every single morning with my coffee I just absolutely laugh my ass off at the idea that Donald freaking Trump is the president of the United States of America — which, by the way, in contrast, if it were Hillary Clinton, I probably would have hanged myself already.

WOODS: Right, right, right. But I'll tell you something — well, you were really, really on to something in this particular — I hate the word "rant," because it wasn't a rant; it was a good soliloquy there. What you were onto was the bizarre situation we're in that, as you're describing the utter unlikeliness of this person, at the same time we're all thinking, "And yet, he's the only one who can stop it." Isn't that bizarre? Given all the characteristics you just described, he's the only one who was in a position to stop it. I mean, as you say, he held off the Bushes, he held off the Clintons. He can't just stand up and say, "No, I'm not going to let you creeps railroad me into more bombings and more killing because I think America has had enough of that. I'm here to make America great again, not to turn the world into any particular thing, but to make America great again." His supporters would have cheered that. Even the warmongers would have cheered that because there's nothing you can say against that sentiment. And he couldn't even bring himself to do that. That's the amazing thing, that here's the one guy who because of his lack of affiliations and because of his money and because of who he is and because of the strength of his personality, he could have done it. And even that guy won't do it. It's amazing — I mean, there's something — it's almost — there's something satanic around all that. I mean, even — I realize these are all sociopaths. I get that. But it's almost like even that little tinge of humanity that you might have, it's like it goes away when you cross that threshold.

HORTON: Or it just gets twisted, right? I mean, he said, "Look at the little babies. We have to help them. We're doing the right thing."

WOODS: Yeah, this is the same guy who four years ago was tweeting about how dumb it was to think that way. And it's incredible, Scott, that you and I — I mean, you're a little younger than I am, but we were both alive at least, we were kids under Jimmy Carter. And Jimmy Carter has his problems and I don't endorse Jimmy Carter wholeheartedly, but the guy basically said, I'm going to do my best to go four years without bombing anybody. And now that seems like something out of science fiction [laughing]. That doesn't happen. It's out of historical fiction or something.

HORTON: Right.

WOODS: We can't even imagine it.

HORTON: Well, you know, Peter van Buren was saying to me the other day that, you know, look at it right now, that a lot of these kids running these newsrooms, these kids in their late 20s, early 30s, they were kids when 9/11 happened. They don't know anything about the 1990s or the 1980s. To them that's like what the '50s and '60s are to you and me. It's ancient history. And so for them, they've lived their entire lives — they don't even know what it means to have peacetime. They've lived their entire conscious lives or their life conscious of the outside world at war this whole time. And they have no reason to think it's not normal, just like they have no reason to think it's not normal that their deputy sheriff is dressed up in black fatigues like some type of Gestapo Nazi.

WOODS: Did you happen to see — if not, I'm sending it to you — the CNN clip with a woman — I don't know her name, the anchor — interviewing Congressman Massie?

HORTON: [laughing] Yeah, wasn't that great?

WOODS: It was unbelievable. Now, okay, Massie stood his ground even though he didn't have a lot of knowledge, but on the other hand, it's precisely because we don't know the situation. Whereas she's speaking as if she's absolutely certain of what's going on. And at the end — I have never in all of the time I've watched news, I have never seen an anchor be so disgusted. At the end, she has just pause, make a face, and say, "Congressman Thomas Massie, thanks for being —" I mean, it is — she just — and her whole argument was, "Didn't you see those pictures? Like, it's really sad." I mean, that was her entire argument.

HORTON: I only wish that he had said to her, "Look, the reason that you're so upset is because I'm challenging your beliefs, because you don't actually have any evidence. So what I'm saying is that maybe your faith is misplaced, and that's shaken you to your core."

WOODS: Yeah. Yeah, or you know what —

HORTON: That is the answer. That is the reason she was so upset. He wasn't challenging her on her facts, because she didn't have any. He was saying, Well, I don't know why we should all have to believe the same thing, and she was saying, Well, what do you mean? It's like denouncing religion in church.

WOODS: No, I think we've got — let's one up each other here to see what Massie could have said. Which, by the way, I'm really impressed with him these days, and I've been tweeting and congratulating him because I don't think it's in his temperament to be a super duper confrontational guy, but he has nevertheless taken that on himself because the situation demands it.

But I would have liked to have him say, "You know what? I can tell from your tone that you're outraged that I would actually say there's something in the world where the U.S. shouldn't be bombing. I realize that that has shaken you to the core. But you know what? Isn't CNN about done setting fire to the whole world? How's that been going for the past 15 years? Where are all these democratic utopias you promised us? And now we're going to have one more if we bomb some more people? Show me your success stories. Where are they? How has CNN made the world better?"

HORTON: Well, and this goes back to your question about how can they just keep going on no matter how wrong they get everything. And a big part of that is because there is no overall story about what's going on here that's told. I mean, your World War II narrative, it's pretty simple: us and the Brits and the Reds teamed up to defeat the Nazis and the imperial Japanese, and so happy ending and all this kind of thing, pretty simple kind of narrative. In this thing, the best that they can say is that, Well, we're fighting terrorism; we're fighting radical Islam; we're fighting this dictator or that dictator because he happens to be a human rights abuser in this one particular case, or something. And so in other words, there's no real context to any of the things that are happening.

So for example, I saw David Sanger on the Andrea Mitchell show, the *New York Times* reporter, and they were in North Korea. And David Sanger is seeing, Yeah, see, well, when we attacked Libya, that really reinforced the message to the North Koreans that they'd better hold on to their nukes and they'd better never negotiate

them away, because Qaddafi negotiated away his — he didn't have an actual program, but he had some equipment that he had bought that he could have used. And Qaddafi negotiated that away, and then he got bombed and regime-changed. And Andrea Mitchell is going, "Yes, mmm, that's very interesting; you're right; I see what you mean." But of course she was the greatest champion of the war against Qaddafi in 2011. She doesn't have to stop and say, "Oh, you know what? I guess you're right that that is an unintended consequence of that that I didn't think of or that I thought didn't matter enough, but, huh, now we're dealing with North Korea armed with nukes and maybe even H-bombs soon. Huh." It doesn't matter. They just go on to the next day.

Same as the Iraq War. Look back at Iraq War II. All they ever said was that it's the Americans and the Iraqi people versus the terrorists. They never said, "Who are the Sunni? Who are the Shia? Who are the tribal leaders? Who are the Baathists? Who are the Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq, and why have they been living in Iran for the last 30 years?" They didn't ask or answer any of these questions at all for eight years; they just, "We are fighting bad guys." And so if you ask the average person about whose side are we on in Iraq now, they have no idea. John McCain complains we're flying as Iran's air force in Iraq. Well, but we have been ever since John McCain got us into the Iraq War in 2003.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah.

HORTON: And they're bombing the Islamic State, so which does he prefer?

WOODS: Here's what it boils down to. It looks like you elect Trump, you get McCain. You get Jeb. I mean, domestically and foreign policy, other than some brashness, it seems to me we got Jeb and McCain. But the funny thing is — well, funny in a macabre sort of way — if we were to have elected a McCain, we would have gotten a McCain. So it's kind of like an elaboration on Horton's Law, that yeah, an outright bad guy, he's definitely going to be a bad guy. A guy who gives you a glimmer of possibility that he might be independent of the same old B.S. military industrial complex will never do that. He'll also be McCain. So everybody's McCain. In fact, that's the rule of American life right now: everybody's McCain. No matter which one you vote for, everybody's McCain. And yet you hardly ever run into somebody who actually likes McCain. Now, that could be a selection bas in my case, that I hang out with certain types of people. But I just run into people constantly who are just disgusted with McCain, and yet somehow, that's what the regime turns out constantly.

So anyway, listen, I'm going to let you go. I'll link to that article you mentioned. Anything else you want to recommend, certainly I'll link, but also I want people to know how to listen to your show and say something about the Libertarian Institute. Don't turn the episode off, people. I'm asking you as a favor. Scott puts in a lot of uncompensated time into this movement, and so we owe him at least this. So tell us about how we can follow you.

HORTON: All right, well, at ScottHorton.org/interviews, I've got about almost 4,500 interviews there going back to 2003, almost all antiwar stuff. And Libertarian Institute, that's my new thing. Me, Sheldon Richman, Will Grigg — who's out of the hospital, by the way, and doing a little bit better — and Jared Labell. That's at LibertarianInstitute.org, and all the interviews get posted there

first, LibertarianInstitute.org/scotthortonshow. And by the way, I'm actually really proud of a few interviews I've gotten in the last week or so, a guy that wrote a really great thing about Russia for *Foreign Affairs*, a real expert on Iraq who I talked to who is reporting from Irbil, and also a guy named Arnaldo Claudio, who was a military police officer who investigated the current National Security Advisor, H.R. McMaster, for war crimes in Iraq in 2005. So I'm on a pretty good roll over there. If anybody wants to go and check that stuff out, it's at LibertarianInstitute.org/scotthortonshow. And then I'm on Twitter @scotthortonshow.

WOODS: Okay, I'm going to link to all this at TomWoods.com/886. But also, folks, now is the time, if you have not been contributing to Scott, now is the time. This is why we need somebody like Scott. Now is the time to start doing it. And I'm not going to guilt you into doing it, but I am going to tell you that I donate $100 a month to *Scott Horton Show*, even when I can't always listen to it, because I'm glad it's there and we need it there. So I bet if I went to ScottHorton.org/donate, would I find something at that page?

HORTON: Absolutely, yes. Thank you for mentioning that, Tom. I really appreciate that.

WOODS: All right, so I'm telling you, folks. Take the time. Jot it down. Write yourself a note. Even if you're just sending Scott $5 a month or something, just do something, because man, the libertarian movement does not have a whole lot of foreign policy experts. We've got a few, but a lot of them are wonkish or whatever, but Scott is just going to tell you the unvarnished truth, and he'll talk to anybody in the world. It doesn't have to be ideologically somebody who's pure; it's just somebody who's against killing for no good reason. That's pure enough for me. So anyway, a very, very worthy thing to do is to support Scott Horton. So thanks — and Scott, I appreciate you last minute coming on with me like this. Really great.

HORTON: No problem. And hey, thanks a lot for saying that, and yeah, those $5-a-month ones really get me through. No question about that. So yeah, no need to play that down. You can play that up if you want, and those are really great. And I really appreciate you saying that. And let me just add before we go here that I'm very happy to have been invited by you and Bob to be on y'all's cruise, on the Contra Cruise this October. I'm really looking forward to being there. And I've gotten quite a few emails from longtime Internet friends saying, "Good, I finally get to meet Scott Horton on this cruise."

WOODS: Isn't that great? Yeah, when we said Scott Horton — You know, we say Bob Murphy's coming, Woods is coming, people go, Yeah, yeah, yeah, we get that. But when I said Scott Horton was coming, I actually had people saying, "All right, I was on the fence before, but now I'm going to have to scrape together the money and go." So it's going to be great. If you check it out at ContraCruise.com, I mean, we've got to have some fellowship among ourselves in the midst of all of this, so do check that out. All right, Scott, you go do your good work, and thanks for joining us today.

HORTON: Great, thanks again, Tom. Appreciate it.

WOODS: Oh, wait a minute, Scott. One quick thing. You're doing a book on Afghanistan, the situation in Afghanistan, and I'm curious to know how that's coming along.

HORTON: Yeah, well, I mean, of course the joke is that this was the book that I started to write with you that was going to be one chapter about each of the wars of the terror wars and try to wrap it all up. But I got bogged down in the Afghan quagmire, and my chapter two turned into a whole book. So I really can't wait to get this out of the way and then continue back on that chapter again, only now the final draft and all the commas and everything is going to have to be your problem instead of mine, because —

WOODS: [laughing] That's fine.

HORTON: I've been finished writing it for months. It's just the work on getting it actually really well written and all my run-on sentences refined and all of this stuff is just killing me. It's almost done, though. The plan is it should be ready at the end of the month.

WOODS: Okay, and this is coming to people of course in April, because they know that's when they — they can date it from the bombings, unfortunately, and then —

HORTON: Yeah.

WOODS: So it'll be ready on your end, but then you want to send it out to a few people. Do you have any guess as to when people will be able to read it? That's the real question.

HORTON: Well, yeah, that's what I mean, that's what I'm hoping. I plan — well, today's Friday, so I'm hoping that by the end of this weekend, I'll be able to send it off to my very best Afghanistan reporter friends to read and see whether they like it or hate it before I hit the "publish" button. But otherwise, I'm planning on moving forward with the cover right now and with the other bells and whistles to get it all set. So I really hope to be able to sell this thing by the end of the month.

WOODS: Wow, that's —

HORTON: Although, maybe — yeah, maybe it'll be six weeks or something.

WOODS: Yeah, because I was going to say, I mean, getting it laid out for printing and whatever — you know, whatever. But it's good to know that basically the real grunt work of it is done. That's good to know.

HORTON: Just waiting now for Trump to announce that he's sending 5 or will it be 10,000 more Marines.

WOODS: Yeah, it's a perverse silver lining, but it will make the book more timely than it already is. All right, so we're going to keep an eye out for that, and obviously the

second that thing becomes available, you're coming on here and we're going to talk about it.

HORTON: Well, it's in your email box, so let me know what you think, Tom.

WOODS: All right, thanks a lot, Scott.

HORTON: Thank you.