

China Just STOLE F-35 Tech After Iran HUMILIATES USA | Scott Horton

Scott Horton discusses Trump's latest F-35 blunder as the summit with Xi kicks off and Iran continues to expose the US's mounting geopolitical crises. Scott Horton is the host of "The Scott Horton Show," co-host of "Provoked" with Darryl Cooper, and author of several books, the most recent of which is "Provoked: How Washington Started the New Cold War With Russia and the Catastrophe in Ukraine." <https://scotthortonacademy.com/> <https://www.youtube.com/@UCbGRav5Z8hKdPEO9oN7ekMw> Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis! Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> #trump #china #f35

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. As you can see, I'm joined by Scott Horton for the first time on the program. He's host of The Scott Horton Show, and he runs the Scott Horton Academy. And we're going to first begin, Scott, with this story because, you know, Trump and Xi are meeting at the White House right now. The Iran war is not going so well. And now we have a story at the same time that they are meeting that supposedly China now has sensitive technology from the vaunted F-35 program that was inexplicably diverted, according to anonymous sources, to Hong Kong while being sent to the U.S. from Australia via UPS, of all things.

People briefed on the incident said. Now yesterday, Scott, Trump tried to humiliate Iran and say that he was going to annihilate the country at the U.N. General Assembly. But it appears now that Masoud Pezeshkian's speech, the Iranian president, has had a bigger impact now, as oil prices rise almost \$7 a barrel, up to \$105 after his speech, where he said Iran would not back down. And news came out that indeed Iran had tested a new missile over the USS George Washington earlier in the month during that surprise attack. Scott, you've written about the U.S. provoking and NATO provoking wars, particularly with Ukraine. But what have you learned given these developments? What could you tell us about where these wars are at and how they're related?

#Scott Horton

Yeah, well, I wrote books about how the terror war was all provoked too. That was all revenge for Bill Clinton, mostly. Well, and other things. But, yeah, look, I mean, the war in Iran is a complete

disaster. I mean, Trump clearly is, for many months now, right, at least since April—well, before that, since March—he's been threatening the total annihilation of Iran, in those exact words and other similar terms, numerous times. He seems to not mean it at all, and people have learned to stop taking him seriously at all, which is dangerous because he does have ultimate authority, you know, to carry out such a thing. It is absolutely within his capacity to make happen. But he's essentially, like, the baseline understanding of the thing coming out of that is just that he doesn't know what the hell to do, right?

He took a gamble that this is going to work. It's going to be great. It's going to be easy. Tucker doesn't know what he's talking about. Blah, blah, blah. And then, no—wrong. And then now what do you do? This is the same reason that the Pentagon talked W. Bush out of doing this. W. Bush wanted to do it back then, and Cheney was pushing him hard to do it. And the Pentagon just told W. Bush the facts of life in a meeting. And I'm sorry, because I got this wrong for like 15 years. I said it was in January of '07. It wasn't. It was in December of '06 that the Pentagon—the chiefs—took W. Bush to the Tank at the Pentagon, the SCIF, you know, and told him, "Look, man, we'll do the surge in Iraq, but we don't want to go to Iran." And the reason why is because once we start this war, it's going to get totally out of hand, and we don't really have good ways to end it.

We can't really sack the country. I mean, you're talking about a World War II-level exercise to get American absolute control of that country. We're just not going to do that. And so once we start the war, we don't really know how to end it. They have various ways of hitting back at us. As I joked for many years, everybody's seen that meme that says, "If Iran doesn't mean us any harm, how come they put their country so close to all our military bases?" And it shows all our bases around Iran. But then I would always joke that, like, look, guys—well, not really joke, but say that based off of that joke—you see, this is why we can't fight Iran, because our government has put all these bases so close to the country that they're essentially in a blackmail position.

They blackmailed themselves that we can't fight Iran because we put too much stuff too close to them that they can hit with their missiles that we just simply can't defend from the volume, even if we have really great interceptors. We only have so many, and their stuff's a hell of a lot cheaper to manufacture, clearly, and so there you are. And I mean, hell, even the drones are getting by at much lower speeds and still getting through. And so they completely took out all our bases in the region, just exactly as I and many others warned for 20 years would happen. And so, um, and really, I can prove that. I said this in 2005, in the summer of 2005, so 21 years. But I was just copying what other smart people were saying and writing about the danger of getting into a war at that time.

So I don't know whether to take him seriously that he wants to do some crazy escalation, that the only way out is through. I can understand how he could feel that way. But then there is no way through either. Again, we're not doing a full-scale invasion, and we're not going to be able to control outcomes on the ground there with anything short of that, which, by the way, for any national

security officials listening who haven't bothered to look it up in the CIA country reports, including the suburbs, Tehran is a city of 15 million people, okay? So imagine trying to send the infantry to sack Mexico City.

No, you're just not going to do that. You can't do that. It's completely outside the realm of possibility that America is going to do anything like what it would take to truly, quote, win the war and dictate terms, unconditional surrender, as Trump once said. That's just not going to happen. So they're the ones left. And so then there's only one other kind of binary thing. They're the ones in the catbird seat. Trump has called his own bluff and the American empire's bluff about our conventional military dominance of the Middle East. Iran is now the predominant power in the Middle East.

And there's essentially nothing we can do about it other than encouraging, you know, Saudi, UAE, and other countries to get atomic weapons to balance against Iran, which, God dang, talk about counterproductive when this whole war was supposedly launched to stop that threat, which of course was a pretext. But still, um, you know, those are just the facts. I mean, you read it. It's on the front page of the Washington Post. Pentagon doesn't know what to do. It's that—move all their bases out of there. Bahrain, our Fifth Fleet is never going to be stationed there again. It's over. And parachute the monarch, you know, the Shah's son, to come and take over Tehran? Forget it. All these fantasies are already over. Those bluffs have already been called. You know, not that America has no cards to play.

They have been, I guess, more successful lately in escorting some ships through the Gulf, but nothing like a full breaking of the blockade and a return to the status quo ante. So, you know... And the guy's still got two years there, you know, to sit in his frustration. I think that's the real danger, is he doesn't really have a solution. And now, you know, as you mentioned there in the Iranian president's speech there, they've added Gaza to the MOU, not through any negotiation with us. They just said, "Oh yeah, by the way, and the Houthis too. You got to stop fighting. You better not do anything to our friends in Yemen either." These are now added stipulations to the Iranians' demands. Now, maybe some of that can be negotiated.

Maybe it can't. I mean, just like when Vladimir Putin gave a speech five weeks ago or six weeks ago or something, where he says, yeah, until we're done liberating the Donbas and Novorossiia. Which is like, oh, wait, what? Because now, did he just add two more provinces to the thing? Four? What exactly? You know what I mean? And it's just, you know, these... Look, I'm from here. I'm a Texan. That makes me, like, ultra-super American or something. I don't give a damn about these other countries. I'm not, like, arguing in their favor. I like people overall. But all of this is just—my point of view here is simply America's national interest and my own interest in America, living in the kind of Texas I want to live in. And it just doesn't make sense for us to keep hiring these people to run our national government this way.

You know, who's—if I asked you in sincere terms, like, who are the brightest and most competent administrators that we have had in the United States on the national government level and the

national security state level over the last 25 years, in the Bush, Obama, Trump, Biden administrations—Trump too—I mean, who can you name? You know, I mean, the most, like, centrist consensus-agreed-upon experts out of all of them were the absolute worst failures, like David Petraeus. And, for that matter, Joe Biden and John McCain, the leaders of American foreign policy in the Senate, you know, all our secretaries of state and our secretaries of defense, the CondoleeZZas and Susan Rices and everybody else. They're just the worst. I don't want to—whatever.

Anyway, I'm sorry. I'm just saying that no matter what their intentions are, they have been incredibly irresponsible stewards of American power, and there's just no way in the world that we can or should continue on like this, or that our government should be able to continue to count on the consensus of the American people that they can do these things if they really think it's necessary, because they just have absolutely nothing to show for 25 years straight. And never mind if you want to go back to the end of the Cold War. They've got nothing to show for any of their interventions here. I debated Bill Kristol, and someone in the audience asked him, "Well, can you name a success out of all of these things?" And he goes, "I mean, Bosnia," which is totally not even right.

And of course, I answered the idiot answer, which is, "Well, technically, in Bosnia, they had the Lisbon deal," when what I should have said was, "Did you hear that? Like, even the king of all hawks, he can't stand by a single one of these 21st-century interventions, not one." And this was on the eve of mongering the war that broke out within just a few months in Ukraine, which has been an unlimited catastrophe for the people of Ukraine, of Europe, Russia, the United States, and the world. So, like, I mean, I don't know what to say other than it is time for all of us to simply withdraw our consent from these people. There's no better administrators coming. You know, every time they say, "Oh, thank goodness the adults are here because the previous guys were a bunch of children," it only gets worse.

#Danny

Yeah, well, great point, Scott. I wanted to ask you then what you make of these accusations. We hear them all the time, and now they're getting very specific. Now China is being accused of stealing F-35 secrets. Well, actually, they didn't steal them. They were just handed to them, according to this Bloomberg report. Given that you talk a lot about the U.S. provoking these wars, what do you make of such a report at a time like this, where Trump and Xi Jinping are meeting? And there is, of course, a lot of—maybe one big, huge quagmire—that the United States finds itself in globally, just on many different fronts. What do you make of this report?

#Scott Horton

Well, it's interesting, right? I don't know. I guess we'll see over the coming days whether there are further reports about what was the origin of this and whether this is like, you know, the CIA getting Gary Powers shot down to ruin the Khrushchev summit coming up or not, you know. But it certainly

looks like that, doesn't it? Like someone inside the national security state decided, "Oh, this would be a good time to put this in the paper," would be right when Chairman Xi is on his way to the United States. And, I mean, it raises all kinds of questions about why F-35 parts are being manufactured in Australia.

Anyway, um, we're just—I mean, obviously they're a close ally and are always going to be here for the foreseeable future, but why build a supply chain that long in the event of a real crisis? We've got to be able to rely on spare parts from Australia? I mean, it makes no sense at all. And the F-35 is a complete and total piece of junk anyway. If they threw them all away and just sent out fleets of F-15s, we'd be better off. The thing is not fast. It can't turn. It can't climb. It can't fly. And it can hardly carry any munitions. And it doesn't even have stealth capability. As we saw, the Iranians shot one down with an old World War II-era long-wave radar and an advanced microchip.

It blew one of these things out of the sky. You don't know how many times I've been told, "Oh, don't worry, Scott Horton, the F-35 will never have to fight because it's so advanced that it'll just direct all the other planes to destroy everything before anything can ever get close to it." And I was, "Yeah, right," until a SAM just knocks it right out of the sky. And that's when they don't just fall right out of the sky because the engine kaputs. Or, you know, there's been nothing but... I mean, you might well imagine that the F-35 was designed to separate the American people from their money, not to be an effective fighter jet. As simple as that. I mean, you talk about war is a racket.

That is exhibit number one, is that piece-of-crap jet. You know, they say the F-22 is at least an effective jet. I don't know how effective it is as a fighter-bomber, but certainly as an air-to-air combat frame, you know, the consensus seems to be they worked out all the bugs in that one. But of course, they stopped making those and switched only to the F-35, which is supposed to replace everything and can replace nothing. I've had people brag to me, "Oh, dude, you don't know, man. I've seen these things fly so slowly." Like, "Oh, yeah, huh? They were flying it over Nevada, and they flew it kind of slowly and turned around. Yeah, that's really impressive. I'm sure the CHICOMs are just shaking in their boots over that," you know.

And then also, who's in charge of security around here where they can just swoop in and take whatever they want? They were shipping it by UPS, and this was something that we're supposed to believe was so sensitive. I mean, who even knows if the story is right? As you kind of implied there, the story could be here that the story came out, and that's really the only thing that's important. That could be this is run-of-the-mill espionage, or it didn't happen at all. Or maybe this is a bit over the line compared to what usually happens. But probably the most important thing is this hit the news right when she is in Washington, which hopefully isn't going to make much difference.

And, you know, I saw a thing in the Wall Street Journal about how they negotiate for weeks and weeks and weeks over just the length of the red carpet that was going to be on display, whether this was going to be a full state visit or whether it was going to be a lower category of this or that. I mean, come on, man. It costs us absolutely nothing to treat the dictator of all of China with respect

when he comes to visit, for God's sake. That doesn't mean give him anything. It doesn't mean sign on any dotted line at all. But he had to negotiate whether he gets a nice carpet or not. He had to negotiate whether he gets the fancy dinner or not the fancy dinner. Like, what in the—what possible—it's not like, oh, we should put ourselves in a position of weakness and kowtow to our new overlords or whatever.

But it's just... like, what do we have to lose for being polite here that they would even quibble about stuff like that? It seems like... you know, they ought to be working more on, you know, trying to get along and relaxing tensions, you know, on other lines. But, you know, overall... you know, I'm not the world's best expert on China. I respect the fact that it does exist, unlike Osama bin Laden's Islamo-fascist caliphate, right? Like, there is such a thing, and they built a giant navy, and they have massive revenue streams, and they're a near-peer competitor with the United States as far as being, like, a commercial competitor. I mean, in trade and capitalism, it's all about mutually beneficent exchanges.

So where government subsidizes or intervenes or taxes or regulates in a way that favors one side over the other through tariffs that favor one side over the other or whatever, that's all wrong. But just as far as Chinese men and Americans exchanging in trade, there ain't nothing sinful about that at all. You know, they're our biggest trading partner, and they should be. That's the best way to keep the peace. Bastiat never really said this, but he should have said that where goods do not cross borders, armies will. Well, so yeah, let's keep this economic interdependence. That doesn't mean political interdependence or alliance, but let's keep this economic interdependence so that there's too much at stake for us to fight, you know, because that is, of course, the absolute worst outcome.

And, you know, I published a book by a guy named Joseph Solis-Mullen, a good friend of mine and a university professor. And he wrote this book called—we published it at the Libertarian Institute—it's called *The Fake China Threat and Its Very Real Danger*. Again, recognizing that could we have a problem with an extremely angry and active nationalist China at some point in the medium-term future? We sure as hell could, and particularly if we write ourselves a bunch of self-fulfilling prophecies about how this has to happen. Oh, some Greek guy named Thucydides or whatever says that you have to fight when your empire is falling and there's a new one coming. You have to fight them. Well, maybe you're supposed to not be an empire in the first place, and you don't really give a damn whether they become, you know, have more political weight in the future in Singapore or whatever.

Like, maybe you don't care about that at all. I don't know. Maybe the far western Pacific is not 100% an American lake until the end of time. Who would've thought that, you know? So, for people who say that it's just destiny that we have to come into conflict with, what, one-fifth of the population of the planet, or whatever it is—somehow the world ain't big enough for them and us in an era where both of us have hydrogen bombs and so therefore just absolutely cannot fight. Like, what are we gonna do here? There's no point in the world about, you know, even on Taiwan.

The policy, more or less since Nixon, but especially since Carter—in other words, since I was a toddler, and you can see how gray my beard is for those of you watching this on the YouTube there—has been that, well, of course, China is—I mean, Taiwan is part of China, but we would prefer to see them reunited peacefully. And we're kind of implying that maybe we would prevent China from reabsorbing Taiwan violently. But we're not promising that. And we're certainly not encouraging the Taiwanese to declare independence and pick a fight that they can't win. And so that was sort of the dual deterrence policy. Hey, you guys, we're not promising we would fight you, but we might. So leave them alone, and you pipe down, right?

And so now more and more, especially this change under Biden, not under Trump, was Biden kept routinely blurting out that absolutely we would fight for Taiwan if China ever tried to take them over. A country that our country has recognized as not a country for all of this time, for my whole lifetime, 45 years at least. And then also, you know, we're in a situation where people always cry about all these microchips are made there and not here. Well, we can move as much of that as possible here and then otherwise make it here. And I said that on the Joe Rogan show, and people made fun of me for being so not even stupid to think that you could move the semiconductor industry from Taiwan to Austin.

But they're building a gigantic semiconductor factory in Taylor, northeast of Austin, right now. They're always building giant high-tech manufacturing this and that right now. When I was a kid in junior college, I was a rent-a-cop at Samsung, where everybody walked around like they were surgeons in full outfits, manufacturing whatever the hell. We can do all of that here. It doesn't mean it's that easy to pick up all of Taiwan's tech sector and move it here in one big shipment or whatever, but almost all of that is engineered by Americans in the first place and just offshored for the price. Well, if it's that much of a security threat, well, then reverse that policy. And then, on the other hand, too, it's worth mentioning that we can't defend Taiwan. And every sailor knows that.

America's aircraft carriers are absolutely obsolete and can't get anywhere near Taiwan. Our F-35—pardon me, our F-18 Hornets—cannot get anywhere near Taiwan without getting blown out of the sky or without just running out of gas and falling out of the sky, because they don't have the range to outmatch the supersonic sea-skimming cruise missiles that China has, that at least their first generations came from blueprints that America gave Israel, that Israel sold China, that they can use to keep all of our naval assets essentially beyond standoff range. We can fight with subs, but the Taiwan Strait is shallow and narrow, and the subs have very limited ammunition before they've got to sail all the way back to Guam. Meanwhile, San Diego is 7,000 miles away. And Honolulu is like three or four.

So whatever it is, I should have a better number on that. But it's still far as hell away from Taiwan. And so then that's it. Our cruisers can't get anywhere near there. Our Air Force can't get anywhere near there. Now, you can try to launch, I guess, every Air Force and naval air asset that you have and hope that they can get off some shots. But as we've seen, air power alone won't cut it. And especially when China's right there, you know, a Cuba's distance offshore, and have essentially

unlimited resources. If they decide that they want to quadruple down and take that island, they can take it.

Their entire merchant marine has been designed under regulations where every single one of those boats can become a troop transport ship with a snap of the fingers, you know, at a beck and call. And, you know, you just ship the entire PLA over there. There's just nothing we could do about that. We're going to go to a nuclear war with Beijing, kill hundreds of millions of Chinese, and lose our entire civilization, all die trying to protect the independence of Taiwan that our own government has recognized for 45 years is part of China anyway? And where most Taiwanese people, I mean, they have like open travel and trade back and forth now. For many years they have.

And, you know, I've heard people say—I don't know if this is universal—but I've heard Taiwanese people quoted as saying, like, if China takes over, if mainland China takes over Taiwan, what's going to change? The logo on my driver's license? It doesn't mean anything. It won't mean anything to them. And, you know, of course, any political government in Beijing might have a lot to lose in terms of political capital domestically if they kill a bunch of Chinese people in order to take back Taiwan when they can just wait them out. Like, who says that Chairman Xi has a W. Bushian time preference here?

Why can't he just wait? And now it is a thing where it—look, in fact, let's go back in time now. So John Mearsheimer, for example, I ain't saying he's totally wrong about this, because who knows what would happen in the counterfactual, this and that, who knows? But he says, like, obviously China wants to be as strong as it can because all states want to be as strong as they can be, and so it's going to do this, whatever, whatever. But I can just tell you, like, I know because I learned this from experts over the years, from people who follow this intensely, including inside government and whatever. You can read about all of this stuff, that it was in direct reaction to Iraq War I and all of the footage, which was basically fake, of all the laser-guided munitions flying down chimneys and in windows.

Like, a lot of that was just test footage. And it was like 92% dumb bombs dropped in Iraq War One. But with all that footage, they made it look like we had nothing but these laser-guided precision weapons. And the Chinese reacted to that by launching a revolution in military affairs. And then in 1997, Bill Clinton started sailing the Seventh Fleet up and down. In 1996, the Chinese were firing a couple of missiles near Taiwan. They had nothing like an invasion force. This is the barest kind of political posturing. We could have issued a statement saying, "Please don't do that. Come on." And that could have been it. Instead, Clinton sailed the Seventh Fleet up and down through the Taiwan Strait.

And so the Chinese launched another revolution in military affairs. We have to devote a whole new part of our budget to this and that, particularly the Navy, I believe it was at that time. Then Bill Clinton bombed the Chinese embassy in Serbia, which they said was an accident, except that there is reason to believe that the Chinese might have gotten their hands on what was left of an F-117 so-

called stealth fighter, which the Serbs took out with World War II-era long-wave radar then. And then they bombed the embassy, potentially destroying it if necessary. You know, whichever version of the story you prefer there. And the Chinese, again, launched another revolution in military affairs in reaction to that.

And then I used to know this better because I think there were some—I had some better ones from the 21st century—but I don't want to get out over my skis since I can't remember what I'm talking about exactly. But certainly during W. Bush and Obama, they have continued to ramp up. But, you know, in those major Bush Senior and Clinton-era moves there, it was all in reaction to things that America was doing over there. I mean, after all, Brazil doesn't try to arm up to be as strong as they can be. They don't need much of a military to deter any of their neighbors from trying to sack Rio or whatever. They're not really threatened in that way, and it doesn't serve their interest to be as strong as they could be because that would be at the expense of a lot of other things, right?

So there's no reason to presume that China just—as soon as Deng Xiaoping invented property rights over there again—that they would be like, "Aha, next stage: world empire." You know what I mean? Like, how could they even dream of that? And, of course, then their entire—according to our Navy, they call China's naval posture A2/AD, which is anti-access, area denial. In other words, in American terms, it's all defensive to keep us the hell out of there, which, that's aggression if the Pacific is an American lake. But if the South China Sea possibly belongs to China, or at least would be dominated and policed by them past twelve and a half miles offshore or whatever it is, then, like, yeah, I don't know.

Then it's actually not so unreasonable, but I think this is where you talk about a self-fulfilling prophecy. You know, we don't have any good proxy wars to fight with China right now. You know, if we want to go toe to toe with the Russians, well, we just get a bunch of Ukrainians killed. Who are we going to get killed in a fight with China? There's not really anyone to do it, right? We're going to arm up their allies, the Pakistanis, against them or something, right? But so then what's left? We fight them ourselves. But if we fight them ourselves, we all die. They have—it was like three, again, another revolution in nuclear affairs, you know, over there in response to American buildup in the Pacific and Hillary's announced, you know, Pacific.

Oh, that's one. Hillary's article in Foreign Affairs, "Our Pacific Century," and the pivot to Asia. I'm sure there, you know, that was a big part of it. So now they're expanding their nuclear weapons arsenal. Last I read, they were like on their way towards 600, including H-bombs. And so that means that they can destroy our entire civilization in one day, no less than the Russians can. The Russians have far more than they need. The Chinese are perfectly capable of taking out every important American military base in North America and our major cities and leave the people in the countryside essentially having to start all over again.

#Danny

Yeah, those are great points, Scott. I wanted to ask you then, given all that you just said, some of this feels like a humiliation with people because even the accusations against China—China has this F-35 tech now—it feels like one blunder after another. The same goes for Iran. We've had this war going on for nearly eight months, and you outlined exactly how the U.S. military has looked quite raggedy and quite—I mean, we hear reports now that eight sailors tried to jump overboard or take their lives. We're hearing more casualties coming out.

So what do you make of the fact that, I mean, you said the U.S. doesn't have any good people to kill in Asia, like Ukraine, or we could maybe even say, like the bases that were destroyed and the oil infrastructure and everything that was destroyed during the early days of the Iran war. Well, why is it that I've noticed, I don't know if you've noticed, that the more the U.S. is accused of drumming up war, the more it almost makes the U.S. look less like the dominant and exceptional empire that it claims to be.

#Scott Horton

Oh, yes. Um, no question about that. Um, oh, and I'm sorry, I'm just seeing a note in there to tilt my camera. Yeah.

#Danny

Sorry about that.

#Scott Horton

I'll lean back. Hopefully you can see. I hope my eyes weren't cut off.

#Danny

No, no, no, no. You're just—just a little bit of your head. You still look great.

#Scott Horton

Yeah. You were being spared my bald head. Now you have to look at it. Um, look, as I was saying before, I mean, the guys in charge of the American empire just absolutely suck at this. And I'm not saying I could do better, but I can certainly criticize them. I mean, they are just—they have short time preferences. They have lazy-ass kind of TV-viewer understandings of politics and things. And, you know, I kind of like to joke that it's sort of like if Joe Biden had got elected in '88 instead of getting drummed out for his plagiarism scandal and all that, but he had won the election of '88 and had been inaugurated in '89. And then we just had Joe Biden ever since then, dude.

That's basically what it is. This absolute idiot, know-nothing, know-it-all blowhard, asshole. Just what can you say about the guy? Joe Biden, at his best, was the lowest scum of the earth. And he didn't

know what he was talking about, ever, ever. Everything he did, especially in foreign policy, was just the most harebrained idiot stuff, man. And the small moments when he would display some kind of self-awareness, he would do it anyway. He'd give a speech where he'd go, "Boy, I mean, don't get me wrong. I'm not saying we should expand NATO into the Baltics. That could get a real reaction. But anyway, don't worry."

#Scott Horton

He leads the charge to do exactly that.

#Scott Horton

So that if Russia and Estonia ever have a fight over Narva, we got to fight in a nuclear war with the Russian Federation to protect Narva, Estonia, which is the first time anyone in your audience has ever heard those two words next to each other in their lives, because of Joe Biden, the absolute idiot, know-nothing, know-it-all blowhard asshole. And then no different from Bill Clinton. I mean, Bill Clinton, you might give him a couple of IQ points, but he's certainly no better in motives. The guy's an absolute psychopath, face-biting rapist, child-killing, you know, lunatic. And so, and then what, W. Bush? Need I even mention the eight years of W. Bush administration and Barack Obama? Jesus Christ. So anyway, you take my meaning. Barack Obama, you know, the guy that built the caliphate and then blew it up again.

Yeah, that guy. You know, this is the best that they can do. Or maybe the best they can do is like I was saying before, when the Pentagon told Trump, "Don't do this. It's a bad idea." They told W. Bush, "Don't do this. It's a bad idea." Obama, I don't think, really needed to be instructed by the Pentagon why it would be really stupid to attack Iran. He did not want to, to his credit. He did not. You know, he wasn't even almost talked into it the way Bush was. But also, you know, that wasn't Netanyahu. Bush only had to deal with Olmert. If Bush had had to deal with Netanyahu on a full-time basis, that might have been different. You know what I mean? I don't know. But it was easier to tell Olmert no. But yeah, I mean, look, it's true. The professional government told Bush not to do this. You know, it's funny.

There's an article at Foreign Policy this week called, "Oh, this is Trump's fault because he destroyed the deep state, so the deep state wasn't there to stop him." He fired everyone on the National Security Council, but the National Security Council included people from the other agencies who actually know what they're talking about sometimes. And so the thing is, it's funny because there's no self-awareness in the article, that like, oh, maybe you guys shouldn't have framed him for treason. Maybe you shouldn't have ratted on him on some BS charge and got him impeached. Maybe the deep state should not have declared war against the one and only individual person in the entire national government's executive branch who's elected by the people of the country to be the chief executive.

And maybe you shouldn't wage this entire war against him because then, yeah, who's left? Just a bunch of Israeli spies, right? Just a bunch, and no one else to object, right? Maybe that's oversimplifying a little bit, but barely, right? And so, yeah, there's some truth to that. But then, you know, we know that Tulsi Gabbard told him. And we know that, I think, we know that, one, you don't have a real casus belli here as far as the nukes, and two, this isn't going to be easy at all. And I think he was told that in no uncertain terms by his cabinet, mostly, right? That's the reporting, right? Is that his own cabinet told him, "Jeez, boss, I don't know. But okay, if you say so." And then it was the Israelis and the Foundation for Defense of Democracies has just beaten that drum. And that was enough to get him.

And just appealing to his hubris. I guarantee you, man, it'll never come out. I promise you. I saw it through my third eye, out-of-body astral experience. There's an Israeli national intelligence estimate about Donald Trump, and it says, "Just flatter him." And then that's it. I'm just telling him he's going to be great. Tell him he's going to be the greatest guy since the last greatest guy he's heard of, bigger than him even. And then he'll be stoked, and then that'll do it. And I think that's what it is. Well, there's a couple of things. One, all the money. I don't think it's really Epstein bribery stuff, because I think that would have come out. The FBI and the CIA would have used that against him in his first term if they really had anything good there. But, um, I think it's also these assassination attempts, and, um, in fact—oh, crap.

Man, I used to be so good at this with the footnotes. I just saw this last week. There's a new book out. Or maybe it was the Maggie Haberman thing that someone was quoting. And someone was saying—oh, I know. It was Arthur Bloom was saying, "I told you so." See, and it was—the quote was about how even though nobody really knows what was behind the Butler shooter, and he's a local white boy that did it, that the next day the FBI hit Trump with the arrest of this Iranian guy. And they had two more, you know, embellished Iranian plots that were basically, you know, typical FBI entrapment jobs. But they convinced Trump that, see, Iran is trying to kill you. The Ayatollah has sent hit teams to kill you. And, you know, it's only thanks to us that you're still alive here and all that.

Because remember, at the start of the war, he said, "I got him before he got me." And so I think that, you know, and the Israelis kept telling him that too. It was, you know, coming from Netanyahu: there were two different teams. We stopped two different teams of Iranian agents sent to kill Trump, which is BS. And by the way, there's a really good expert on this. I just happened to have published his book. You may know him. His name is Ken Silva, and he wrote this book, *The Trump Assassination Plots: What the Investigations Missed and Why They Matter*. And he has a bit in here all about these fake Iranian plots. And I'm certain that they played a huge part in Trump's thinking here, which is completely retarded. And it's his own fault for being so uneducated, essentially. Right.

That he doesn't know why that doesn't make any sense. Like, maybe some random kook in Iran took it upon himself to do something somehow, maybe. But the Ayatollah ordered a hit on Trump because that's how he wants to kick off a massive war with the American superpower, is by just

settling a personal vendetta over Soleimani and killing him, or bombing his nuclear program with very limited casualties in 2025. That's idiotic, right? You'd have to just be a pro-Israeli partisan to believe that crap, or Donald Trump. And so I think that's a big part of what started this war, is he believed that the Ayatollah would be so careless as to do something like that, when instead of saying, "Come on, this is the same FBI that framed me for treason. Maybe they're framing the Ayatollah." I don't know, you know.

#Danny

But he ain't that sharp, man. So here we are. Well, Scott, I wanted to now ask you about some reports that definitely hearken to your book, *Provoked*. There are reports that the CIA is warning Europe of a Russian drone threat, and I'll pull up the story here. This comes as BBC—MI6, I guess we should say—is warning the UK that it has to be prepared for war and that psychologically the UK just isn't. But the U.S. has warned—the CIA has warned—southern states, Spain, France, and Italy, that Russia would fire 600-kilometer-range drones from commercial ships at those three countries. Now, Scott, you just outlined the folly of the Iran war and just how disastrous U.S. provocations on China have been, to the point where they're now planting stories potentially about F-35 secrets. How does this relate to all of this? And what do you make of the situation when it comes to Ukraine and, of course, Europe attached to it?

#Scott Horton

Well, I don't have any reason to believe these claims about Russia, you know, preparing to attack NATO. That seems to be certainly—they have not done so through four and a half years of this war, despite the fact that NATO countries have given them a lot of reason to, including the United States blatantly shipping so many weapons and helping with the targeting and, you know, all kinds of things that they have done, providing logistics and whatever this whole time. So we're, I think, very lucky that the Russians have not decided to expand the war outside of Ukraine's borders. There's some more recent reports that I haven't dug into, but based on what I did report in my book, *Provoked*, there are a lot of rumors that don't really add up about Russian pseudo-terrorist attacks and sabotage, economic war, and whatever throughout Europe.

Again, some of the more recent ones I haven't really looked into as much. But, you know, they had like some old man in Spain mail a couple of letter bombs, and they said, "Oh, it's white supremacists backed by Russia." You know, Fiona Hill was like, "Yeah, that sounds right to me. I'm an expert. Quote me saying, yeah." But that's what's going on here. And then it was just some old man with no ties to anyone at all. And then there's like a fire at an IKEA furniture store, and they're like, "Oh, see, it's Russia sowing discord." And like, yeah, I'm not buying that. There was a drone—something happened with a drone in Germany where they just said, "Oh, it must be the Russians." I'm just not taking their word for it. But on the other hand, like, I'm not sitting here to vouch for the Russians' honor or whatever.

I just think they've been more cautious than that. Vladimir Putin, you know, for all the accusations against him, is, I think, to everyone's benefit, that he's such an ice-cold sort of a sociopath type, where this is all business, right? He doesn't seem to really ever get upset. If he got upset, things could be very ugly over there. But instead, he just seems to calculate, like, no, this is how we're going to fight it, and I don't really care what y'all say or do. We're going to do this. And so, you know, I don't know. But then, I'm not trying to play down the danger. I mean, could they provoke this guy further into saying, "All right, that's it. I guess I have to hit weapons stores in NATO countries to stop you all from shipping new ones in," or whatever.

He could do that. I mean, they're putting him in the position of, I guess, having to choose whether to do that or not on a pretty regular basis. And especially the more that they ramp up attacks inside Russia, which, you know, I think is already widely reported again in, like, Post, Times, Journal-type officialdom, that, yeah, CIA has built the drone industry over there in Ukraine. So these are not Ukrainian attacks. These are proxy war, American-adjacent, you know, American-involved, co-belligerent-style attacks far behind Russian lines. And so, yeah, I guess we're supposed to—we should consider ourselves lucky that the Russians have such great air defenses, or things could look a lot worse.

I mean, they did a massive attack the other day where the Russians claimed they shot down almost everything, except a couple of drones got through and hit a refinery. But the rest of Moscow—they said they launched 2,000 drones. Imagine trying to shoot down a drone swarm of 2,000, or imagine 2,000 got through. And then Russia—and then, you know, the strongman president over there—has no choice but to get emotional now and do something much more drastic. Like, for example, risk entire bomber crews by flying heavy bombers over Kyiv and annihilating it, or worse, you know. So, yeah, I mean, for all the talk of nuclear weapons use here, I think that there's no reason that the Russians need them.

I think if they really thought that they did, they might use them. And they have said that repeatedly, but it's just that overall the tide is with them, even if in super slow motion. And so they haven't felt the necessity. But they have even loosened their nuclear doctrine about where it used to be. I forget—forgive me—the exact wording, but it was like for the vital existence of the state, and to just threats to the state's wholeness and sovereignty, or some kind of... right where they defined down a notch when they might deploy nuclear weapons. So this whole policy is insane. I can't believe that this is still going on after four and a half years. I mean, this is the one... Like, never even mind Iraq.

Like, as bad as all of that was, humanity was not hanging in the balance. You know, this is one... I just, I know there's no real mechanism to do this, right? Like, as soon as the war broke out, in my imagination, eight billion humans all just go on general strike and just say, like, no, everyone who matters in this, go to Geneva and don't come out of the room until you have a deal. That's it. Humanity has forbidden hot wars on Russia's western border. We're talking 300 miles from Moscow

of nothing but open plains, no rivers, no mountains, no hills, no nothing to protect them. They got the itchiest trigger finger in the world with the most powerful thermonuclear weapons beyond your worst imagination. And so, no, sorry, humanity says you're not allowed to have a hot war here.

Whatever it is, solve it. Blinken, Lavrov to Geneva now. And if we got to hold guns to their heads, we hold guns to Blinken and Lavrov's heads and tell them, work it out right now or we'll kill you. Sign a deal. End the war now. How could we allow this to continue? Four and a half years of hot war on Russia's border. It's, I mean, we're talking just luck. And you listen to the hawks in D.C. They go, "Well, they haven't nuked us yet. Maybe we should have sent in a lot more tanks and a lot more planes and a lot more missiles earlier and sooner. We were afraid to do something. Well, apparently they ain't nothing but a bunch of little bitches. We just do whatever we want and they'll never do anything." And you hear them talk like that.

And they talked like that before the war. But even now, are they like, "Ha, you know, we were afraid to send in tanks, but we sent in tanks and they didn't do anything. Maybe we should have sent in more sooner. Maybe we should send in more now," and on like that. So I don't know. I'm glad that, at least in spirit, Donald Trump is trying to get along with Putin and find a way out of this. But in practice, he's not. You know, so at least, you know, that ratchets the tension down a little bit compared to idiot, you know, Joe Biden up there saying, "This man must not be allowed to remain in power," and this kind of thing. So we could be worse off in that sense, for sure. But, but see, sorry, I'll say one more thing and shut up.

Trump can't solve this. Now, the Russians could, by finally taking the rest of Donetsk and then saying, "Okay, fine, unilateral ceasefire. We're drawing the lines in Zaporozhye and Kherson where they are, and we're drawing the lines around Donetsk and Luhansk where we already stand. And then we're withdrawing from Kharkiv and Sumy and Dnipropetrovsk. I don't ever want to have to say that stupid word again." And then, so fine, haha, I won, and that's it. That's the only way this thing's coming to an end. Ukrainians are not going to turn around and walk away. The Europeans are not going to stop financing and arming them. Trump and the Americans are not going to stop arming them as long as the Europeans are paying for it. I'm sure we're the ones paying for it one way or the other. They're going to at least stick with the status quo.

All the talk about the Europeans arming up for war, I mean, I don't know what they're thinking, man. I have to tell you, see, I got this idiot thing I do called thinking, to plagiarize George Carlin. And I look at it like, hey, you see, Danny, they got H-bombs. And that's the end of the conversation, right? You can't fight them. They got H-bombs. So what are we talking about? They got H-bombs. But, you know, I'm wrong to project that most simple and correct thinking onto all the people with power. That is not necessarily their most important concern. I did a debate at Oxford where, you know, these people are going to be in power soon. And there were very influential people in the room, including, you know, one of the guys on the other side of the debate was a reporter for The Telegraph, whatever.

And my argument was, they got H-bombs. Nobody believes that Great Britain has a conventional force that they could deploy to Ukraine that would force Russia out. And I learned the other day from Daryl and Bill Buecher—Daryl Cooper and Bill Buecher—that they probably got 10,000 fighters, like actual trigger-pullers or less, in their entire army of actual fighters that you could put on the ground. And even then, one-third of them are in the rear at all times, being rotated and whatever. So you're talking about less than 10,000 men available. But I got a room full of Oxford Union going, "No, the consensus is we, we must stand on valor and principle and honor and do the right thing and go to war with Russia." That was the question.

This house, meaning, I guess, Britain, should go to war with Russia rather than lose Ukraine, which was overstated because we're only talking about far eastern and southeastern Ukraine. But anyway. And then I said, "But guys, they got H-bombs." And then I lost the debate. They scoffed at me. "Oh, H-bombs." Like, what is this? Like, you don't actually believe that H-bombs exist? Because I got a stand-up comedian friend who's completely crazy who believes that H-bombs are, like, propaganda. There's no such thing as H-bombs. But I think—like, I hope—I think that the student body at Oxford knows that, yeah, no, thermonuclear weapons are a thing, man. See, what you do is you take, like, a Nagasaki bomb, and then that's the percussion cap for detonating a thermonuclear bomb.

Go type in Ivy Mike and take a look at that. That's what they look like. You can look up the Atomic Bomb Archive and see film and still photographs of these thermonuclear weapons being tested in the Pacific. And it's the kind of thing where one or two of them could kill all of Dallas, all of Houston. Picture your favorite megalopolis in the United States of America. What's Chicago after you drop one big H-bomb in the center of it? Nobody gets to come back to any of it ever again. It's just over. Right? You're gonna have, you know, whatever. Anyway, you just can't fight them. You've got to come up with a better way to handle these things.

And that doesn't mean kowtow and beg and scrape, but the thing is, it was the West that was demanding that the Russians kowtow to us, not the other way around. They were the ones appeasing us and decided to finally stop, not the other way around. And so they put Ukraine in that position of weakness. And then they go, "Oh, look at the bully." But it was America that pushed Ukraine into Russia to get their block knocked off in the first place. And so that's the most cynical kind of way to do it. Which, by the way, too—and this goes back to your earlier question—I was talking with a friend of mine. He's like, "This is all deliberate."

They're trying to destroy America. And I'm like, nah, they just suck. And the thing is, I used to be a New World Order kook in the '90s. And the New World Order theory, for people not familiar, is that America, one day, the empire will fall, and then there will be a real world empire under the United Nations, a real federal government of the planet with a monopoly on nuclear weapons, and then eternal living death slavery, as Philip K. Dick would say. Right. And then, and I used to think that was right because, one, they did talk about, gee, I wish we had a one-world government a lot. And they still do sometimes, you know. Right.

But also, I thought it made sense that America's imperial managers, as the John Birch Society conceived it, that they were deliberately driving our country into the ground because they hate it so much. And the only way to destroy America, other than an H-bomb war, is simply through imperial overexpansion and the American people's inability to afford the cost of waging a world empire. So whatever last little rogue states out there, we'll break our budget forcing them into the world order, and then we're the last rogue state, and we will be subsumed under the same damn system we foisted on everybody else and all that.

And it made sense to me because our government kept doing things that were running up the national debt to levels that we could never pay down. They're doing things that are completely destroying and undermining American power and influence essentially everywhere they go. It's the reverse Midas touch. Who could argue with that? And it ain't just Trump. ForeignPolicy.com would love to just blame Trump, but they're the ones who made the American people hate them so much that they elected Trump. Just because, as Norm Macdonald said, we hated Hillary Clinton so much, we elected Trump, who we hated even more than her, just to show her how much we hated her and that establishment themselves, to let them know.

So the thing of it is that I guess this is why all empires fall, is because of, like, public choice theory, right? The economics of politics, economics of being involved in making these decisions for the empire, will necessitate idiocy and short, high-time preferences and bad decision-making. You sit around daydreaming about what's America going to be like in 75 years, and are we doing the very best thing to shepherd it in the right direction and whatever. They're not thinking that. They're really not. They're thinking, what am I doing this week, this month? How many fundraising phone calls do I got to make? What do I got to do? Think about John McCain and Joe Biden again, the two identical twin know-nothing, know-it-all foreign policy hawks from the U.S. Senate for the last generation or two or three in the case of Biden, right?

Right. They're always on their way somewhere. They don't stay up late reading even the Wall Street Journal, much less any other damned thing. John McCain doesn't sit around. He's dead now, thank God, but he didn't sit around in front of his computer going, "Man, I really need to—I'm very curious about this. I wonder what would happen if I click this link and follow it and read this giant feature piece," that probably never happened ever. You know, because his incentive is not that. His incentive is, "I got to get up early because I got to that fundraiser breakfast with the Christian Zionist committee," or whatever crap, you know, and that's what he knows, is he better do whatever they say. Doesn't matter if it makes any sense or not.

It might not even have occurred to him in 50 years about what's America going to be like in 50 years. They're just not thinking about that. They just don't care about that. And this is why all empires fall. And, in fact, it's funny because there's this famous book you may have heard of. It's called *Tragedy and Hope* by Carroll Quigley. And he was Bill Clinton's professor of foreign policy studies at Georgetown University. He's the one who I think coined the phrase "world empire" that we use all the time. Only I got it from John Basil Utley. But anyway, Quigley wrote the book, a

couple of books that are like the Bibles of the conspiracy, the New World Order guys, for good reason: The Anglo-American Establishment and Tragedy and Hope.

But even in the title of Tragedy and Hope, which does reveal a lot of kind of secret history behind the scenes of the American establishment in the kind of post-World War II, 20-year era—the book came out in '66. Anyway, the title of the book, Tragedy and Hope, the tragedy is that all empires fall. And a lot of the time, it's an entire civilization that falls when their empire falls. And he says, luckily, the West has been able to reinvent itself through ancient Greek and Roman society, and then Christendom, and then the Enlightenment and the Industrial Age, and the transfer of power from Europe to the United States, and all these things. And somehow, we've more or less stayed the West this whole time. But he says, but we might not. And there's no magic promise there that guarantees such.

And that's what we should do is—and this is the hope part—is that if we're smart, and if we read history books, and if we pay attention to how all empires kill themselves while they're busy killing other people, that then maybe we could be prudent, as George H. W. Bush might say but not do, and we should abandon the pretense of world empire, and we should maintain our humble little commercial constitutional republic and cling on to it for dear life as long as we can before we put ourselves in a situation where essentially we're killing ourselves to kill our enemies, like our terrorist enemies, you know, kill themselves to kill us. And although he wasn't on the jihadi thing, but you know what I mean. And so he's saying that's the whole purpose. That's the whole point of Tragedy and Hope.

It's like, hey, everybody, wise up, man. Just because you have power doesn't mean you should abuse it all day, every day until it's all spent. Maybe you should not do that. That's really what it's about, or at least that's what the title is about, and overall, I guess, is the theme of the book too. Only what's funny is because he's representing that Eastern liberal establishment, that they're the ones who did this. They're the ones who built the world empire that we can't possibly sustain, is now collapsing around us. And yeah, the whole thing is suicide. But what's good about this, though, is unlike the Soviet Union, we have at least the potential of a very productive economy if our government was not destroying so much of our wealth all the time through taxation and inflation.

And never mind all the regulation and welfare state and whatever stuff that I don't want to argue about with you. But just like on the basic level of their great deformation through the inflationary monetary system and the world empire, without all that, we'd be fine. I don't need to hear a bunch of crap about cycles of civilizations and all these things. Like, that's like Marxoid talk about the inevitabilities of history and stuff like that. None of that is right. America could be a perfectly productive and prosperous constitutional republic with a free society. And as Dr. Paul would say, lead the world by example and just have no part in any of this, any more than Japan right now has a world empire.

Any more than Brazil right now has or needs a world empire. We don't need one either. It's, you know, as Garet Garrett wrote back in the fifties in *The American Empire*, everything goes out and nothing comes back. All the money is made by the arms manufacturers and the bankers stealing from the American taxpayers. We're the conquered ones being forced to finance this thing. But then what do they do when they invade Iraq? I mean, yeah, they stole some gold bricks and whatever, but if you think the gold they stole from Saddam and those few pictures you've seen paid for the cost of that war, plus—you're wrong. Ha ha ha. You know what I mean? So all this is stupid. We could just stop right now.

And if China rises, so what? That doesn't have to be at our expense. We could get along, as Trump mused out loud in his first days in office in his second term. "I don't want to pivot to anywhere. I don't see why we can't just get along with everybody. Why can't we just trade with Russia and China for the rest of the century and just all get rich together?" Yeah, yeah, exactly. Except that he doesn't have 15 of his closest friends around him who agree with that and are determined to be his bodyguard in protecting that policy. Instead, he has every courtier in the world demanding action on this and that, and, of course, the Zionists first. And so, you know, he's completely blown it.

#Danny

Scott, it was a great program. I want to make sure everyone knows that your YouTube show is in the video description below, your YouTube program, as well as [ScottHortonAcademy.com](https://www.ScottHortonAcademy.com). Thanks so much. I really appreciate it. Everyone, hit the like button before we head out of here. That helps boost the show and YouTube's algorithm. I'll be back at 9 p.m. Eastern Time tonight to cover the rest of the Xi-Trump summit with Ben Norton and KJ. No, thanks so much for watching, everybody. See you all in about eight hours, 9 p.m. Eastern Time. Scott, any final words before we head out of here?

#Scott Horton

No, just if you like reading books, check out my book, *Provoked*, on the Cold War with Russia and the war in Ukraine, and *Enough Already* about the war on terrorism. And, as you said, I do *The Scott Horton Show*, and I do *Provoked* with Daryl Cooper, and I'm over at [LibertarianInstitute.org](https://www.LibertarianInstitute.org). It's my institute.

#Danny

Great. All right, everybody, we are out of here. Hit the like button before you go. Check all those things out, and I will see you all again soon. Bye-bye.