



The Hidden Truth Behind Israel–US Relations

— Scott Horton

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Zain Raza (ZR): Thank you for tuning in today and welcome back to another episode of The Source. I'm your host Zain Raza. Before we begin this interview, I would like to remind you to join our alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram. We are not asking you to permanently switch to these channels and leave YouTube. All we're asking you is to join these channels as a precautionary measure because YouTube is owned by Google and Google is a US-based corporation that can shadowban and censor us at any time, especially given the critical view that we are providing on Israel and Ukraine. Even though we have 164,000 subscribers, only a few thousand have made this transition. How you can join these alternative platforms, you will find out in the description of this video. Today I'll be talking to Scott Horton, who is the director of the Libertarian Institute and the editorial director of antiwar.com. He is considered one of America's leading non-interventionist voices and has written several books, the latest being *Provoked: How Washington Started the Cold War with Russia and Catastrophe in Ukraine*. In case you have not watched part 1 and 2 of our previous discussion with Scott Horton, make sure to do so. We've linked them in the description of this video. They're not only one of the most watched videos of this year, but will also provide adequate context to the discussion today. Scott Horton, welcome back to the show.

Scott Horton (SH): Happy to be here. Thanks for having me.

ZR: While our main discussion today will center on the historical context of US-Israel relations, I'd like to first get your assessment of the latest developments in Ukraine and thereafter we'll turn to Gaza right after. On October 17th, 2025, Ukrainian President Zelensky met with US President Donald Trump in Washington to press for long-range Tomahawk cruise missiles. However, the meeting ended without a formal US commitment. A few days later, Zelensky appealed directly to European leaders in Brussels for the same long-range weapons, but the EU's response was cautious. Some states, including Germany and France, voiced concern that such deliveries could escalate the conflict. Throughout October, both

sides have intensified their military activity. Russia has stepped up missile and drone strikes on Ukraine's energy and civilian infrastructure, while Ukraine has carried out cross-border drone attacks into Russian territory, targeting oil depots and supply routes. Despite these exchanges, the front lines remain largely unchanged. The Institute for the Study of War reports only limited movements – Russian attempts to advance near the city of Lyman and minor Ukrainian gains around Pokrovsk. Meanwhile, Trump has floated the idea of freezing the war at the current lines, a proposal Zelensky has cautiously called a workable framework, but which the Kremlin has rejected, arguing it would reward Kiev. A planned Trump-Putin meeting that had been under discussion earlier has now appeared to be put on hold. Can you comment on these developments, in particular your view on Moscow's unwillingness to freeze the conflict where it stands – a position that many major German media outlets frame as evidence of Putin avoiding peace and trying to sustain the violence?

SH: Yes, well, I mean, I certainly agree that he should go ahead and agree to a timeout where things stand. The Russians control I think essentially a hundred percent of Luhansk, about 75 % percent of Donetsk, and about two-thirds to three quarters of Zaporizhia and Kherson. But they decided – it was three years ago in September of 2022 was the last time the Ukrainian army had any real success. They had that really brilliant feint in Luhansk, which led to the Russians dividing their forces, and then they had a successful push in Luhansk and in Kherson. But that was the last time they won anything. That was the weekend of September 11th, 2022. And enraged, Putin said, Oh, yeah, well, I hereby annex Zaporizhia and Kherson too. And the Rada passed a law, it's officially part of the Russian Federation, whether they have boots on the ground there or not. So I don't know how well this analogy translates, but hell, I don't know if any American would know what I'm talking about anymore. But I think it's in Stand By Me, where the kids all got to cross the junkyard to throw their hat over the fence, but now they have to climb over the fence because they threw their hat over. So you know what I mean? Kind of building their own demand that now they have to go. Well, it's officially the law in Russia that these are Russian territories, and therefore they're not stopping until then.

So Trump wants to call timeout when the Russians are winning. So it's not a real big surprise that they don't want to agree to that. Trump is right to look at all of the killing that's already happened, all of the expense in lives and property and future wealth and opportunity costs and everything for both sides here. Of course, it'd be the right thing to just stop here. But I think, probably first of all, Putin has no desire to do that himself, and then politically in Russia, they have no desire to stop the war short of their goals when the momentum is on their side. And they're winning the war but slowly, but they have the advantage. And both sides claim that they're fighting not major offensives to seize territory, but they're fighting wars of attrition, just trying to grind up the other side's forces so badly that they'll be weakened enough that then one day they'll be able to go where they want and do what they want when the other side breaks. And the Russians obviously have the huge advantage. First of all, just manpower overall. They have still not engaged in a general mobilization like they would for a real war against NATO or something like that. It's like the Americans would call police action in Vietnam or something like that. It's very real to the GIs fighting it, but it's not

exactly a real full-scale mobilization and war. So they have essentially endless reserves, and they also have the firepower advantage too, and just overall munitions, and then I think they seem to have really the edge in drone warfare as well. There's a new report a couple of weeks ago in foreign affairs about – it was really an in-depth report about the generals in charge of the effort to have as many feedback loops with their troops as they possibly can take on as much information from the front, learn to adapt, not only just their like on the ground day-by-day tactics, but the operational and strategic art of their entire thing. And if we gotta stop using these kinds of vehicles and start using those instead, we'll do that. If we need to switch from this kind of gun to that one, let the voices lower down, out there fighting be heard, so that the people up top can make adjustments, and at least they're trying. It's very hard. I mean, the military in Russia or anywhere else, but maybe especially in Russia, is a government program and is bound to be completely bound up in inefficiencies and corruption and all kinds of perverse incentives. But they're really trying to be as fluid as possible in the way that they're fighting, sending crews of just a few men at a time on motorcycles and these kinds of things, trying to adapt.

And so anyway, the point is it sucks, but the Russians aren't bankrupt and they're not out of men and they're not out of bombs, and they're slowly getting what they want, but then it's just, you know, what can you call it? Scott Horton's lament. Dang old Donald Trump got re-inaugurated for his second term at just the wrong dumb, stupid time. Right when, and in fact, I've been talking about the Russian side, Ukrainians don't want to quit. They're still standing on one quarter of Donetsk. And Trump's saying, "you turn around and walk away". Or he was. Now he's trying to convince Putin, I guess, to call it quits where he is. But he was also was trying to work on the Ukrainians. How about you guys go ahead and give up Donetsk and then maybe we'll get a compromise on Zaporizhia or something. But the Ukrainians don't want to go along with that either. And they're not. I'm sorry if I'm being repetitive from our earlier interview, but if you compare America's effort to prop up the completely phony Afghan national army and Afghan national government in Kabul, that thing was just vaporware, right? That was a ghost army, more or less. And the people who did serve in it, they just handed their weapons right over to the Taliban when they came to town and they didn't have America to back them up anymore. The whole thing was just revealed as a theater, right? That's not the case here. They still have a real state and a real military that pre-existed American intervention, although obviously there's been a hell of a lot of American intervention and on their side too. And I'm not sure how quickly they'd break without American support, but obviously politically, it's very difficult for Trump to just leave them high and dry. He said he was cutting off weapons at first, but that was because he was trying to force them to the table. You know what I mean? Politically speaking, it's very difficult for him to just turn his back on people who are being crushed. It's not the same as calling off Netanyahu, which the American people were demanding. Call off your pit bull that's attacking these helpless people. That's different than abandon your friend who – America, yes, his predecessor Joe Biden, but still the United States of America really helped get Ukraine into this mess, get them attacked by their more powerful next door neighbor, promise them that we'll support them to the ends of the earth and even achieve total victory over their enemy and everything. So to just completely turn our back on them and let them be

crushed is a much more difficult thing politically, even though that's what he ran on, and it's what the American people want. And hopefully it wouldn't have to go that far. They could force enough concessions, force Kiev to just agree to walk their men out of there.

By the way, there have been, and I'll wrap up on this, some reports. And I saw a comment on a YouTube, which I guess I shouldn't look at, that said, I'm delusional because I just read this thing in the Wall Street Journal that said that the Kremlin had floated the possibility that maybe no, they would not compromise on Donetsk, but maybe they would compromise on Zaporizhia and Kherson, because they have so much territory still to take there, including major cities. It could take years. And they had their land bridge, so-called, their strip of sovereign territory from Donetsk all the way to Crimea. And they have the ability to guarantee the freshwater resources from the Dnieper River to Crimea, which the coup regime had previously cut off and Russia has now restored. They control that entire Azov coast, including Mariupol and Melitopol there. And so maybe that could be good enough. Maybe that could be the basis of the compromise. You know what I mean? Something like that. But I have also been told that hell no, man, they're not going to do that. Putin's idea of compromise is give in to me now, and I'll stop killing your guys. But that's what negotiation means – is he wins. And at this point, and look, this has been the same, and the war critics this whole time in America and elsewhere have said, come on, man, we can all see into the future here. Ukraine loses. What are we doing? We're just helping them lose harder and worse. It's just terrible. And even – and I have all the sources and quotes in my book *Provoked*, where at the start of the war, the press secretary – he's like this ham-handed goofball idiot – so, the reporter goes, "well, I mean, aren't we trying to stop the fighting? Aren't we trying to engage in negotiation?" And he's, "no, what's more important is the principle that a nation may direct its gaze in whichever direction it wishes". Like what? We have a hot war on Russia's border in eastern Europe right now. And did you just cite some poem about somebody's gaze or something? What the hell are you talking about? That any weak country next to a major power can join any military alliance it wants – yeah, I guess you can. You can also get yourself invaded if you try. I mean, what are we even talking about here? And they refused to even negotiate. It was so blatant that they didn't want peace here. They did not want to figure out a way to prevent the fighting. They wanted to prolong it – the Russians made the mistake of entering Ukraine, well, we're going to make them suffer for it. We're going to inflict on them a strategic defeat by making their conquest of the East just take a long time and cost a lot more than it otherwise would have. And then that's victory. That's the end of the day for the Americans. That's calling it a win for the Joe Biden administration. When of course, like in any other context, any human being on this planet would look at that and say that that's the height of betrayal. How in the world could the most powerful nation get this weak nation into such trouble with their neighbor? And then, oh yeah, we'll support you, but to what end? When we know that they can't win. We know that if we really intervene with our own forces, it'll lead to general war, and then we'll all lose that one too. So it's been written in stone this whole time how this is going to play out, essentially. The only question was over what period of time? And it's the worst sin. I mean, I don't know what to say about it. It's just absolutely the most criminal thing in the world. And it's 49% Joe Biden's fault, 51 % Putin's.

ZR: Let us switch to Gaza and I wanted to recap the latest developments there for our viewers as well. On October 9th, Trump announced in Egypt that a ceasefire agreement had been reached between Israel and Hamas, calling it, quote, "the first step towards a strong and everlasting peace", unquote. The announcement came at a summit attended by Egypt, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Nations Emirates, alongside major European participants, including France, Germany and Italy. Notably, neither Israel nor Hamas nor any Palestinian representative took part publicly, although the delegation signed the documents indirectly through Egyptian and Qatari mediation. Under Phase One, Israel agreed to withdraw to the so-called Yellow Line, ease the blockade, and release around 2000 Palestinian detainees while Hamas committed to halting rocket fires and freeing all 20 living Israeli hostages. Both sides have adhered to this initial exchange. Yet the situation remains deeply unstable. Israeli airstrikes have continued killing nearly 100 Palestinian civilians since the truce began. The World Health Organization warns about 15,000 people still needing urgent medical evacuation, and Gaza's civil defense estimated tens of thousands remain trapped or dead beneath the rubble, with a total death count now exceeding 60,000 civilians. The UN reports that although Israel pledged to allow 608 trucks per day, only about 650 have entered in total by October 23rd, while satellite imagery still shows around 40 Israeli military positions remaining within Gaza. Phase Two and Three, which are meant to cover Gaza's reconstructions, the return of displaced civilians and the disarmament of Hamas and governance of Gaza remain highly contentious issues that could easily lead to a collapse of Trump's peace plan. Given this backdrop, can you comment on the current ceasefire? Particularly, why do you think Israel continues to carry out strikes in Gaza and restrict humanitarian aid? And secondly, do you believe Trump's so-called peace plan is even realistic and is capable of bringing lasting peace between Israel and Palestinians?

SH: Oh man. Well, look, on the last question there, the answer is no. I mean, look, the best anybody can hope for right now is some kind of real ceasefire. If you rewind a couple of weeks, the status quo for about the last year and a half, it was worse before this, but for about the last year and a half, I think, – and this is my own just looking at the numbers on antiwar.com every day – is the Israelis are killing about a Waco massacre worth of people per day, every day. About 80 to 100 people, sometimes 120, or something like that. It would seem like there was a piece of paper somewhere that said that's what's allowable, we can do about what the Texans are willing to tolerate in Waco on that April afternoon in 1993. We'll do that to the Palestinians every single day. And the Americans and everyone else will tolerate that, but not too much more. Well, now we have, you're right, they're still bombing the place and they're making excuses and alleged ceasefire violations and so forth. But overall, what we're looking at is a vast decrease in the number of people killed. And what we're all hoping for is that under whatever kind of authority can be finagled here by the outside Arab powers, that they will deprive the Israelis of the excuse to strike inside this zone. And I'm sorry, man, I have so many jobs and I am behind on all the nitty-gritty of what the Arab states are talking about as far as this goes right now. I do know that maybe a year ago, maybe three quarters of a year ago or something, there was some kind of proposal with the Egyptians and the Saudis, and I believe either the Qataris or the UAE, probably the Qataris, they were talking about forming an international consortium to rebuild the place,

take over the strip. Hamas would not be disarmed, because let's be realistic here. Because everybody knows it's built into your question. It's built in for the failure of this program if they want to be sticklers for this part. Hamas is not going to disarm. The proposal back months ago was that, well, they will stand aside because it will not be an Israeli occupation. It will be help, including flush with a lot of money and aid coming from the Arab states to help them rebuild. Right. So that's their side of it. And hopefully you get enough – and look, by the way, I should stipulate here. I'm a total non-interventionist. America should have no say in this whatsoever. The United States government should butt out of the entire Middle East permanently. So I'm not saying that. I'm just talking like my own kind of conception of what might be the least worst scenario, all other things being equal. I doubt there's very many Palestinians who want to be occupied by Egypt again, like it was before '67 or something like that. But if the choice is Hamas running around and Israel bombing the place, or Hamas basically staying underground, letting foreign, essentially blue helmet types, UN peacekeeper types, Arab troops stand around and do the police function while reconstruction goes on, then that hopefully will keep the Israelis away. And the Americans will be able to argue to the Israelis that no, stay on your leash, you don't have a good excuse to go back here.

Now then that brings up the question of, first of all, Benjamin Netanyahu's commitment to murder as many Palestinians as it takes until the rest leave. That's still what he wants. He said himself in May, "we're destroying all their homes, so they have no homes to go back to", right? Just like he instructed his military chiefs at the beginning of the war. This wasn't just something he said on TV. This was in a speech to the officer corps of the army, that the enemy is Amalek, and it says in the Bible that God says, you know what God says to do to Amalek, and that is to kill every man, woman, and child, baby, and their oxen and chickens too, and whatever old testament craziness. So those were always his orders. We can hear Smotrich and Ben-Gvir virtually every day, they're already saying, "Great, the hostages are back. So now there's no reason to hold back. Now let's finish the job and just unleash full firepower and kill them all and drive them out". So that remains the goal of the Israeli government, right?

Then the question comes down entirely to Benjamin Netanyahu's good friend and recipient of the Adelson fortune, Donald Trump sitting in the Oval Office to restrain Benjamin Netanyahu for Trump's own interests. And Trump has seen it in his interest to go along with whatever the Israel lobby wants and whatever the Israeli regime wants. He is, I think, beginning to see that that's really not the way to play it for what's good for him. And in fact, his son-in-law said on 60 Minutes that – after they bombed Qatar and tried to kill all the Hamas negotiators in Qatar – that was when Trump said, All right, enough is enough of this. These guys are going crazy and they're spinning out and need to be reeled back in here. And they're threatening America's interests now. And I don't mean America, the country, I mean America, the world empire, but that's his concern, that their interests in the Middle East are being threatened. And so enough of that. So why is Vice President Vance there? And why is Jared Kushner back there now? They're, as Saagar said on Breaking Points this morning, they are babysitting. They are there as a big counterweight, looking over Netanyahu's shoulder.

In fact, I talked about them taking advantage of alleged ceasefire violations. The first big one here was a bulldozer that got blown up, and they said it was RPG from some terrorists that popped up way behind enemy lines and blew up this bulldozer when apparently, and this is according to reporting by Ryan Grim from his sources, it was not like satellite guys back in the United States. It was American forces on the ground in Israel. They now have a base in the Negev desert where they are – remember, we saw that report that hundreds of troops are going to Israel. They're not there to fight, they're there to oversee the implementation of the ceasefire. And in this case, they're the ones who called BS and said, nope, they just ran over a landmine. We can see it from here. We know what happened. And whoever placed that landmine, it was a long time ago. And it may have just been a dud. It may have been just an artillery shell laying in the ground that they ran over, but that no Palestinian fighter did that. So it was not, in fact, a ceasefire violation at all. And what did the Israelis do? They tightened up on aid even more and started bombing the place and killing a hundred-something more people. But then they said, okay, okay, back to the ceasefire. And the White House insisted back on the ceasefire. And then Vice President Vance got off the plane and said, look, we're interested in seeing this thing through.

Now, I'm not saying I have faith in Donald Trump. I'm not saying any of your audience should either. I'm just trying to describe the situation as it is. And it's a bleak situation, quite frankly. The only real incentive that Donald Trump has to keep this peace is that he bragged really big and tall about just how peaceful it is and just what a great job he did achieving it. Now he did achieve a ceasefire before his inauguration, and which he allowed Netanyahu to break in March of this year with impunity and kill tens of thousands of more people in the meantime, and didn't say anything about it. But he didn't climb way up on top of the pyramid and declare himself the greatest peacemaker in the history of the world over that ceasefire. He was just trying to buy a little bit of quiet for his inauguration period, right? A little bit of happiness for right around then, and then we'll get back to the killing in a minute or whatever. This time he's got up there and said that he's Trump the great, the great peacemaker of all time and whatever. So that's all that we have going for us, right?

There are people on the right who are sick and tired of Israel. There are very few people on the right who really care a lot about the Palestinians. There's no pro-Palestinian lobby, certainly not on the Republican side in this country. And it would be a poisonous association in the first place, I guess, if anybody on that side did try to talk with them at all. But it is also true though that – and the Israelis just really underestimated this, I guess, or they're counting on it and they don't give a damn – but the whole world, and including the United States of America, saw what they did to these helpless people for two years with our own eyes in high quality. I mean, man, I got images in my brain right now that are just beyond belief. What's the point of watching any slasher flick ever again, right? What's a horror movie compared to what we've all seen now. I think the Israelis have created for themselves a major problem in undermining any good faith. People just took it for granted that the Israelis are our friends, right? I don't know. You know, you don't need to know anything about it. You just need to know they're our friends, like the Canadians are our friends. Like what else is there to know? We get along with the British, the French, the Germans, the Israelis – you know what I mean?

The Japanese – we just take it for granted. So you have to give them a real reason to undermine that faith. Like, what do you mean the Japanese are raping Nanking right now? You know what I mean? That would be a real problem now, wouldn't it? You know? That's what's going on here. And it's impossible to hide it. And it's impossible for them to say that there are no innocents, the Palestinians are all guilty, the women and the children and the elderly too, which as though fighting age males' lives are just somehow magically forfeit for no reason whatsoever, just because you're a boy, it's okay to kill you. I never agreed with that anyway, but especially everybody else who's not even capable of fighting – that's not the Western way. It's really just not.

And we fight horrific wars and way too many of them – America rules the world empire. But in the W. Bush's wars and in Obama's wars, they didn't have ratios of acceptable civilian casualties like the Israelis do. I mean, you can read it in the Israeli press – it's acceptable to kill 300 civilians in order to kill one high-value target. That is not the same as the rules of engagement in any Western nation. This is barbarism. This is a denial of the rights of human beings as individuals. And the real outrage on top of that, of course, is that as everyone knows, if the Israelis want to reach out and touch you, they can. You don't have to blow up your whole neighborhood, you don't have to kill 300 people to kill one guy. They kill 300 people to kill one guy because they want to, because they like to. And that's the other thing that can't be ignored. And a lot of this comes out of the Israeli press and confessions of Israeli soldiers, but they are killing women and children. They have just like America had in Vietnam, admittedly, free fire zones. We told everybody to clear out, and that means anybody between here and here, you get to kill them. Well, a lot of times they didn't tell everybody to clear out. People have no idea they're in a free fire zone. And then people, that could mean an 11-year-old boy and his little sister riding on his handlebars on their bicycle down the road, and they get killed too. There's no warning shots. There's no, hey, little boy, you turn down the wrong street. They just kill them. And Israeli troops have said that they kill Palestinians for, quote, "sport" when they're, quote, "bored". And this is the level of war crimes. And it is, it's like a Hollywood movie about the Nazis. And it's the Israeli Jews right now, kind of reenacting their own worst trauma on their poor victims in the same kind of way. It's completely crazy.

And so yeah, anyway, I'm sorry, I'm rambling. Point being the Palestinians are screwed and powerless. The only people who could potentially protect them are these Arab states under a consortium with a real and extremely sound and ironclad type agreement with the United States, which just sounds impossible as I describe it, in some near future. I can't see it. The Israelis are absolutely hell bent on continuing at their first opportunity to exploit any excuse that they can in order to continue. And I guess on one more thing there is because the Israelis are so hell-bent on their agenda, I think that it's impossible to expect that they will tolerate this Arab country nation consortium to come in and take over the strip and rebuild it. Rebuild it for the Palestinians? No. They want to bulldoze that whole thing and rebuild it and then take it for themselves. Back to Jared Kushner's Riviera project, like, "wow, that's some nice beachfront property, it just got rid of all the vermin on it". You know, like whoa. But that's what they have in mind still.

There's a clip of Trump – Trump actually talked about this a little bit on Fox News over the weekend, and it I think it is important though, I'm not sure how important, but he said, "initially the plan was that the Palestinians would just leave, that they would find it so miserable that they would want to go somewhere else". Like, that's war crimes right there. I don't know all the chapter and verses of all the Geneva conventions, but to collectively punish the civilian population in order to force them to flee so you could steal all their property – I know it's in violation of Article 46 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, but it's probably in violation of a hell of a lot more than that. It's just insane that he would even say that in the first place. But then he seemed to acknowledge, he didn't quite say this, but he seemed to acknowledge that, and said, "then we found out the Palestinians are not going to give up". He only thought that because he didn't know the first thing about it. Now that he knows the first thing about it, he knows they're not going to leave. And he also knows that no bribe is going to convince any other Muslim country to accept them because that would make them accomplices in a heinous war crime, and they're just not going to do it. And it would also make them accomplices in the Muslims' loss of control of the last of the holy sites. I mean, especially, once the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip are removed, now you have a much smaller minority, much more helpless minority in the West Bank to be cleansed out of East Jerusalem and the rest. And Trump, he went on, "there's lots of land in Jordan, there's lots of land in Egypt, there's lots of land wherever". But then he did say that was his initial idea. He seemed to now accept that that's not going to work. You can get some Palestinians to leave for health care or whatever, but then they'll try to come back if they can. And the two million of them in the Gaza Strip, they're not going anywhere. And I mean, you can see them. They flood back north away from the Egyptian border as fast as they can to pitch a tent on what used to be their property, right? Like right on top of the rubble. Like, you're not taking this from me, man, plant their flag. Which is what any Texan would do, which is what any man would do anywhere in the world if someone tried to come and steal his property this way.

So the American-Israeli policy is, you know, what can I say? Overall, they're delusional in thinking they're going to get what they want. On the other hand, the best we can hope for is some kind of ceasefire and some kind of charity from these neighboring states for the Palestinians. But we'd be raving loons to sit here and argue that, yes, and now we're headed toward a two state solution or a one state solution or any kind of freedom and prosperity or independence or citizenship or anything for these poor people. I mean, who's got that plan? All those things have all come and gone already. You have these Western European countries and Anglophone countries recognizing a Palestinian state. Well, that's pretty great. But what does that mean? It doesn't mean anything unless they're willing to now say that they're going to do something to enforce UN Security Council Resolution 242 – you better get your settlers out of the West Bank, we are declaring it a sovereign nation and in fact an ally of ours or whatever. Unless they're really willing to enforce a Palestinian state, it's still up to the Likud whether there's a Palestinian state or not. And as Netanyahu has said time and again, no way, there will always be only one security force between the river and the sea – us.

ZR: Let us take a step back and look at the broader historical context of US-Israel relations. In much of the independent media scene, the prevailing view is that Washington provides Israel with unconditional support, be it militarily, diplomatically or economically, even when Israel pursues annexation, occupation, ethnic cleansing, and genocide in Palestine. We see this full display today. Despite Israel devastating Gaza to rubble, and despite findings by the UN Commission for Human Rights and even organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch that Israel is committing genocide in Gaza, the United States has not halted its diplomatic backing, let alone its military support, regardless of which party or president is in power. As someone who has studied the evolution of this alliance, can you walk us through this relationship and how it has developed? And from your perspective, has this relationship actually served US national interests or has it put it at greater risk?

SH: Oh, well, the last one first, that's easy. They're nothing but a millstone around our neck. We have here, I don't know if you guys study this, the rhyme of the ancient mariner and the story of the albatross, which was always a symbol of good luck, but some stupid sailor shoots down the albatross, and then it becomes a symbol of bad luck. They get in a storm and a bunch of men drown, they hit on the rocks and everything goes terrible, and it's all his fault because he shot down the albatross and they make him wear it around his neck. And that's why there's the saying "an albatross around your neck". But the thing is about the albatrosses, it started out at least as a symbol of good luck, right? But what's Israel? It's founded by a bunch of communists in alliance with Joe Stalin, and was not even pretending to be a part of the West for the first couple of decades there, first few decades anyway. They ingratiated themselves with the Democrats originally. They threatened Harry Truman, the president that recognized Israel – his daughter wrote a memoir where she said that the Zionist terrorists were sending him letter bombs trying to kill the president because he was too hesitant to recognize Israel, give them the support that they wanted then. And they played real hardball.

There's a guy named John B. Judas, who's a professor and member of the Council on Foreign Relations and is very fancy-pants-credentialed establishment academic, and he wrote a book all about this, which I haven't read, but I read all about it and I heard interviews of him about it and this and that, about the Zionist role in bankrolling Truman's presidential campaign and how important it was, and how then he owed them one, recognizing Israel then, over the objection of his Secretary of State, who said this is going to bring us endless problems. But they were mostly in the Soviets' camp, I think, at first, and then eventually they decided that it would be better for them to suck up to the West. And of course there are important Zionists in the West, especially in England and the United States, which were their more important supporters. And the United States obviously was far more powerful than the Soviet Union at that time. And they saw their advantage in using the Israelis to check the power of nationalists and socialists in the Middle East during that time.

Now, I wouldn't count that as really benefiting America's national interests because I'm against all that first Cold War II. I don't think any of that was really necessary. And probably if they had let just like what actually happened when America got sick of containing Soviet communism and actually allowed it to expand, that's when it fell, right? Once they bit off

more than they could chew in Afghanistan and Angola and in El Salvador and Nicaragua – we're like, man, this is expensive trying to bankroll all these commies all around the world this way – and they couldn't do it. And that finally brought them down. So if we hadn't contained them, Soviet communism might have ceased to exist a lot sooner than it actually did. But anyway, I don't think there's any question. I mean, if people want to argue with me about it, they served as an important American satellite during the first cold war, I don't know, whatever, fine. But I don't think there's any question that they've just been nothing but a problem since the end of the cold war. And they helped in important ways – I wouldn't say they were nearly as crucial as later on, but they helped to lobby for the first Gulf War. And they definitely pushed – it was the Israeli government that demanded Bill Clinton's policy of so-called "dual containment". It said that after the first Gulf War, we had to stay in Saudi Arabia because America beat up on Iraq so bad they weren't powerful enough to contain Iran anymore, to balance against Iran anymore. So now America had to stay in Saudi to balance against them both, which is of course the primary reason that America and Britain and Saudi's own terrorist mercenaries turned on the United States, was the permanent bombing campaign of Iraq from bases in Saudi Arabia at Israeli insistence.

And then of course the rest of their war crimes against the people of Palestine and Lebanon are a huge part of what inspired Al Qaeda's war against the United States in the 1990s. If you go back to Al Qaeda's first hit in America was when they killed a right-wing Israeli rabbi, Rabbi Kahane from the Kach Party. He is the guy who said, get rid of every last Palestinian off of this land, one way or the other, and his party was named fascist by the Supreme Court of Israel and outlawed then. But that's of course consensus in Israel now. But that was his position. That's the first guy they killed in New York City in an assassination in 1990. Then, after they blew up the World Trade Center in 1993, the guy who cooked the bomb sent letters to all the New York newspapers saying he did this. Why? Because of Israel and Palestine and because of America occupying Saudi Arabia in order to bomb Iraq. And then it was the same all the way through the 1990s. They hit us over and over and over again. And this was their motive – America's Israel centric foreign policy. And for so long, people just say, Well, those are the breaks like that, that if that's part of the cost of being a good friend to a good friend, then okay. But it's not being a good friend to a good friend. It's being a good friend to a country that's not a good friend to us at all. And it's being a good friend to a country that they're not motivating this terrorism against us just by being a nice little Jewish boy over there minding their own business. They're ruthlessly killing children. And they're therefore in these people's minds, justifying, right? They are driving people to revenge against who? Against Americans for supporting what Israel is doing. So that's how we got into the dang terror war in the first place.

That's the principal cause of the September 11th attacks. You're in Germany, right? This is such an important anecdote, and nobody ever really talks about this. They'd rather get off onto kooky stuff instead. But the principal hijacker from September 11th is a guy named Mohamed Atta, and his best buddy Ramzi bin al-Shibh helped to organize the thing. He couldn't get into the country, but he helped organize the thing. He's in Guantanamo to this day. But Mohamed Atta, he was the lead pilot and lead organizer in the United States and

flew Flight 11 into I think it was the North Tower, if I get it all straight, I forget these days. And then the thing is this though, is it was Shimon Peres when he invaded Lebanon in 1996 in Operation Grapes of Wrath, that Mohamed Atta and Ramzi bin al-Shibh, who were upper middle class Egyptian engineering students studying in Hamburg – they decided that instead of being engineers, they wanted to go and join the Mujahideen. They wanted to take the war to Israel or whoever they could in this fight. And so they signed their last will and testament as their symbol of their joining the army, that kind of thing.

And then just two months later, three months later, bin Laden put out his first declaration of war. It's called the "Declaration of War Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places". Pretty subtle, right? That's Mecca and Medina. The Americans. But then on the first page, he goes on and on about Operation Grapes of Wrath, and especially the Qana massacre, that's Q-A-N-A, and we now call it the first Qana massacre because they did it again in 2006. But in 1996, get this – it was literally Naftali Bennett who called in the artillery strike on a UN shelter full of women and children, killing 106 women and children. And bin Laden went on and on about that in his first declaration of war. And when Mohamad Atta and Ramzi bin al-Shibh read that, they said, okay, this is our path. And they then went to join the Jihad. They both tried to go to Chechnya. I forget now if they ever got to fight in Chechnya or not. I think they both at least tried to stop there and then ended up just going to Afghanistan. So here you have Egyptian engineering students, studying in Hamburg, Germany, decide that they want to go and volunteer for a Saudi Sheik to kill Americans for what Israel's doing in Lebanon. Right?

And so then George Bush goes, yeah, they hate us because we're free and they hate us because we love Jesus and our mama and all this stuff. And that was never what it was about. These were America's own mercenary terrorists. And I'm not saying it was the inside job thing. In fact, I think all the inside job stuff distracts from the fact that these are real people with their own motivations. And bin Laden made it clear that what he was trying to do was essentially what America had helped him to do to the Soviets and bog them down and bleed them to bankruptcy and force them out of Afghanistan the hard way in the 1980s. He wanted to do that again. And it worked by getting America to invade Afghanistan. That was what all that was about. And every bit of this is the cost of supporting Israel.

And then what happens? They prolonged the Afghan war. Why? They could have been in and out of there, killed a few Arabs and left. And then what'd they do? They stayed. And why? Just because they had to make the war last long enough that they could go to Iraq. But that was going to take a year and a half to build up the forces in Kuwait and they helped Turkey to invade Iraq. So they extended the Afghan war. They ended up extending it 20 more years. They extended it just so they could go to Iraq. And why did they want to go to Iraq? For Israel and Israel's fifth column in the United States – the neoconservative movement and the Israel lobby. They were the key to getting that war done and laundering all the lies and propaganda that they used to get the American people into that war, the weapons of mass destruction, the alleged ties to bin Laden's group, and all of that.

And why? It was because the Likud and their neoconservative fellow travelers had been convinced by an Iraqi Shi'ite liar, who was a convicted embezzler and con man and whose headquarters was in Teheran – you might take note – but anyway Ahmed Chalabi, the Iraqi Shi'ite exile, convinced these American Likudniks, essentially, that if America got rid of Saddam Hussein, it would empower the Iraqi Shi'ite supermajority, and then they would be best friends with Israel. They'd build a pipeline to Haifa and they'd tell Hezbollah to stop being friends with Iran. And then Israel and their friends, Jordan and Turkey, would be dominant in Iraq. And the Iraqi Shi'ite supermajority, they'll just bend down and pray all day and do whatever you tell them. Which was actually guess what? Turns out not how the war worked at all. But it's what these neocons thought, and they did it for Israel. And that was the whole purpose of this thing.

So you take a look – let's just say, forget all the motivation for September 11th. Let's just say they did hate us for our freedom, okay? And just forget the 20th century entirely. History begins on September 11th, 2001. We got 400 Al Qaeda hiding out in the Nangarhar province in eastern Afghanistan – that's the whole terror war. They could have all been dead, and the whole thing could have been over by Christmas Eve. It would have been the end of that. None of this terror war, 20 years of war – Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, they always leave out, but of course, also Pakistan, Libya, Syria, Iraq War III against the Caliphate that we built in Syria to spite the Shiites there, and then the two different wars in Yemen, now three, I guess, different wars against the poor people of Yemen – none of this had to happen. Every bit of this is because Israel's the devil on America's shoulder, making sure that people decide to do this and to do that.

A big part of what happened after September 11th was, even though people out here in the country were pretty clued into this threat, people in Washington, they just didn't understand at all the menace that Al Qaeda was and that they were coming this way and that this needed to be their priority. And they really were just shocked and just didn't know what to do. They didn't know who to be mad at. They didn't know. What do you mean the Muslims did it? Which ones? What's the thing? And what is Al Qaeda anyway? They didn't know the first thing about America and Britain and Saudis pet mercenary terrorists that we'd been running for years at this point. They didn't know anything. But the neoconservatives said we know what to do. Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle and Scooter Libby and all those guys are going: oh, we already have this whole list of enemies of Israel we want you to fight. And so the fight against the guys that knocked the towers down is Israel's fight against all their enemies too. And including Hamas and hell, including Yasser Arafat and Fatah, including whoever you got that stands in Israel's way of creating a greater Israel and seizing the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, much less, southern Lebanon and parts of Syria and whatever from there. But so that's just a huge part of it.

And for people listening, hell, this may be illegal to say in Germany. I don't know. But I have to tell you, I am not an anti-Semite, and I'm not trying to feed into anti-Semitic paranoia or propaganda or conspiracy theories or anything like that. This is just the true history of the world. And I wrote about it all in my book, *Fool's Errand*, which is about Afghanistan, and

Enough Already is about all the wars in the Middle East. And I covered all of this stuff, and there were a lot of neoconservatives that were not Jewish. There are a lot of Zionists who are not neoconservatives or Jewish. There are a lot of Christian Zionists, there are a lot of people who, again, just take it for granted that Israel's our friend, and geez, if they need a hand, I don't know, whatever. And there were a lot of people who had a lot of money on the line, a lot of careers on the line to go along with that whole thing. So I'm not saying it's everything, but it is the key to why Iraq War II happened and why the terror war was fought the way it was fought.

And that is the best way to understand the neoconservatives. Who are the neoconservatives? They're essentially Israel's fifth column in America, more particularly Likud's, and more particularly Netanyahu's faction. I mean, even when it was Netanyahu versus Sharon, they were Netanyahu's guys, even when Sharon was the prime minister. And so that's who they are. They're the vanguard of the Israel lobby. What do the neocons want? They're speaking for Israel. So you can finish that question with, well, you know, what's Tel Aviv saying this week? And then it won't be a big surprise. So the cost to the people of the United States of America for carrying the Israelis around in this way is just far beyond the trillions that we've given them, or hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions in aid that we've given them. The opportunity costs are just incredible. There used to be this big fight in the government – well, I'll politely put it like this: Israel versus oil. That was the way they put it. This is the argument in the State Department. They're like, okay, okay, Israel, Israel, Israel, but still we have all these important oil interests in the Gulf. And we have to figure out there has to be some kind of balance there. And then that ends up becoming a major turf war inside the government, where the people who get along with the Arabs and are more interested in business, they end up getting pushed out in favor of ideologues from the think tanks. Because if they know too much about it, they can raise objections. So they just get run out.

So this is a perennial problem. Israel doesn't even have any oil. They may get away with stealing the Palestinians' gas at some point, although I think that's probably mostly overblown. But otherwise, what do they do for us? Joe Biden says, "Well, Israel is like an unsinkable aircraft carrier". But that's not true. We don't have an air base in Israel. And we do have advanced weapons stores there, but they just raid those and steal all those weapons. So it's a pretense that those weapons are there as forward positioning for the United States in the first place. We don't have a naval port in Israel. We don't have an official military alliance with them. We fight wars for them, and then they don't even come along. They don't even help. You could say, yeah, but Scott, didn't they help Barack Obama back Al Qaeda in Syria back 15 to 10 years ago? And I go, yeah, but that was him helping them back Al Qaeda in Syria. Why? Because they hate the Alawites, because the Alawites are friends with the Shiites and friends with Iran and friends with Hezbollah. And since Iraq actually empowered Iran instead of weakening them, now they were trying to weaken Assad as their consolation prize as a runner up, which they finally succeeded in doing last December. And literally, you have an Al Qaeda guy sitting on the throne in Damascus right now. All that is treason. That's treason. This guy, Abu Mohammad al-Julani, al-Sharaa, they call him now, or maybe they say that's his real name. He boasted that he fought Americans in Mosul and Ramadi in Iraq War II

when he was fighting for Zarkawi and Osama bin Laden. And now America under Biden and under Trump are proudly his allies, putting him in power, standing by him. Why? Because that's what Israel wants when it's high treason against the 3,000 dead in New York. It's high treason against the 4,000 guys who died fighting the Sunni-based insurgency in Iraq War II. And they just go on like it's nothing. And why? Why? Because that's what Israel wants. Why can't we have a normal relationship with the Ayatollah? Because that's what Israel wants. They're nothing but trouble, nothing but a cost to the United States. The only question is if America truly just turn our back on Israel, then how dangerous would it be when they go and ally with China against us and give every secret that we ever gave them? They already sell our supersonic sea skimming missiles to the Chinese, whatever they want. They've been busted selling our secrets to the Chinese over and over and over again.

But how about after a real clean break between America and Israel? And they just say, okay, fine, and give everything that they've got, including their F-35s and whatever. Well, F-35, that's probably a sabotage Trojan horse, but otherwise, turn over our secrets and all of their agents and spies in the United States who obviously are willing to commit treason against the United States in favor of Israel as it is now. How much more dangerous is that going to be when Israel goes to suck up to some other major power in the world? That could be a real problem. So there could be drawbacks, and like, I see the thing about keep your enemies close, but how about not too close? I don't know. But otherwise, yeah, no, I blame them for Iraq War II. In large, large measure anyway. Obviously, George W. Bush pulled the trigger on that, but Ariel Sharon was riding shotgun and his and Netanyahu's men, especially in the United States, helped push us into that thing. And so there's a chip that's never getting off my shoulder. And I don't see how any American should ever forgive them for their role in that. American sons' lives, our purpose is to serve a foreign nations, foreign policy goals? Oh no, that's not right. And me and a lot of other people are mad about it and getting madder.

ZR: Scott Horton, Director of the Libertarian Institute, author and editorial director of antiwar.com. Thank you so much for your time and insight.

SH: Thank you. I appreciate it.

ZR: And thank you for tuning in today. If you like the journalism that we undertook in this video and would like to follow us going forward, then make sure to subscribe today by clicking on the subscription button below. It costs you nothing and only takes you a few moments. Also, if you'd like us to continue with our journalism, journalism that does not take any money from corporations or governments, all with the goal of providing you with information that is free from external influence, then make sure to donate to us today. How you can donate to us, you will find out in the description of this video below. I thank you for your support and for tuning in. I'm your host Zain Raza. See you next time.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:

Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:

E-Mail:
PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:

<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:

Link: [Click here](#)