

**Episode 2,411: Ron Paul Institute Director on Best and Worst Middle East Scenarios**

**Guest: Danial McAdams**

**WOODS:**  So, I actually want to start off not directly with the ins and outs of what's going on in the Middle East at the moment, but instead with the GOP presidential race. Because watching that is quite something.

And you were just mentioning a podcast appearance you made just within the past couple of days in which the host was asking you about this. It looks like there's some crazy competition to see who can be the most irrational in this situation.

What do you make of this? What are your observations about that?

**McADAMS:** Well, the words "crazy" and "competition" are perfectly suited to each other in that phrase, Tom, because it is a crazy competition. Now, we've seen Mike Pence have to drop out, but there is a crazy competition for a crazy foreign policy.

And we had over the weekend, the Republican Jewish Coalition had an event at which all of them spoke. Now, if you remember when Ron Paul was running for president, he was disinvited (or uninvited or not invited at all) because they didn't view his policies as being sufficiently in line with their views.

We can debate that, but nevertheless, one after the other – even people who I felt sounded rather sound and sensible (like Vivek Ramaswamy) they sort of had a long queue of absolutely insane foreign policy positions. Not even radical neocon, but beyond radical neocon positions.

And really, from everything – you know, we watched the polls closely at the Liberty Report, Tom, especially when they go our way. So, those are the ones we pay attention to the most.

But every single poll that you're seeing of Republicans, whether you talk about Ukraine – even when you talk about the Middle East.

And we talked about a CBS YouGov poll about a week ago showing that among all Americans questioned, the majority do not support more military aid to Israel. Among Republicans it's only 57% who support it, which is not a lot even in the GOP when you include neocons within that.

So, the fact is, the American public is not where the GOP candidates are for president right now. And I think it's showing because when you have a debate – I remember, Tom, certainly when Hillary and Trump were having a debate, I would make sure I had a bottle of whiskey handy and would make a good evening of it.

Because it was always good for some laughs. Nobody watches these debates. This is tired old stuff. This is 20-year-old foreign policy that's been an absolute disaster.

**WOODS:** Well, a couple of episodes from now, I'm going to be talking about a subject that's of interest to you and me, which is the theology behind the – I shouldn't say all evangelicals. Not all evangelicals are dispensationalists.

And we'll make sure that we define all these obscure terms for everybody in that episode. But nevertheless, there is a theology according to which there will be an extremely tumultuous series of events, culminating in some kind of a world conflagration from which the true believers will be rescued and raptured and everyone else will suffer very, very badly.

And the problem with that theology – apart from its complete novelty, and that it's dead wrong and would have been recognized by nobody in the history of the Christian tradition. The other problem with it is it makes rational conversation impossible.

Because if you actually have a chunk of the electorate that positively welcomes the end of the world, how can you have the kind of conversation you would have about any topic with a rational person? I don't see how you can do it.

So, I think what's going on here among the candidates is that they're looking at that, which is what they see a lot of. They see a lot. Of religious devotion on this subject, and they do see poll numbers, which they may not be as high as before, but they still lean in the direction of Israel.

And they see the media and they see what's expected of them as Republicans. And I think they feel like: The amount of political capital I would have to expend not to take the position that all these pressure groups within the GOP take is more than I'm willing to expend.

So, even if they were inclined to say: *Can we please try to take a reasonable non-blowing-up-the-world position on this?* I think they think the political payoff may not be there. Are they wrong?

**McADAMS:** Well, if you also combine that, too, with a lack of curiosity, which a lot of candidates and politicians in general have. And saw it for 12 years on the Hill: *Okay, I've got this policy down, and I'll repeat the talking points over and over again.*

There's no like: *Oh, hey. Well, maybe there's another way of looking at this.* It just doesn't exist. And you add in the fact that the sort of narcissism of foreign policy. It's this far off thing that people don't understand, and it makes it that much more difficult.

But, I never thought that I would say that Ron Paul and Lenin in the same sentence both being right, but it's absolutely true. Which is that you don't need a majority, you need a dedicated, motivated minority.

And that's what you have here with this particular branch of Christian Zionism – again, evangelicalism, here in the US. They are not the majority in this country by a long shot, but they are an absolutely dedicated minority. And they're absolutely determined to drive US politics.

And now it looks like they have one of their own in the speaker's chair, who seems determined to use his personal religious views to guide US foreign policy.

Now, if I recall right, Tom, that's exactly our beef with Iran, is that they have a theocracy driven by a certain religious ideology. That's exactly what those exact same people, ironically, are trying to install in the United States.

**WOODS:** Well, let's say a word, though, about the Democrats. This is kind of interesting. The Democrats do seem to be somewhat divided on this. Much more so than the Republicans, at least more openly so.

That is to say, that those who dissent from the pro-Israel point of view are much, much louder in the Democratic Party. And the *Washington Post* recently ran, just a couple of days ago, an article whose headline was, "White House Scrambles to Repair Relations with Arab, Muslim Americans."

So, now all of a sudden – I think partly because of all the immigration. Now you've imported – we've got both sides of ethnic hatreds over here now. And they now are going to be pressuring the president to do this, that, or the other thing in other parts of the world.

So, Biden has to deal with, on the one hand – well, he's got to deal with both issues. I don't know how much the domestic popularity problem is influencing his foreign policy decisions.

**McADAMS:** Yeah, we didn't see this with Ukraine, interestingly enough. The Democrats were pretty much completely on board. All of our old coalition progressives that we've worked with for so long had simply disappeared when it came to that.

But this is different. And I think – it was the *New York Times* you just quoted? I think they were partly right on this. And yes, we have imported a lot, partially because we blew up where they live, so they wanted to come over here. Thanks a lot, guys.

The Europeans have imported a lot. That's why you see hundreds of thousands in London and Paris demonstrating. But think if that – and I haven't read the article. I think I saw the same headline. But I think that only tells part of the story, Tom.

Because there's a Gallup poll that I think came out yesterday, showing that Biden has lost 11 percentage points among Democratic voters.

**WOODS:** I saw that, yeah. That was really the statistic I wanted. You're right.

**McADAMS:** Yeah. So, there really is a crisis in this party, but I wouldn't chalk it up to Muslim and Arab voters, only. I would say what he's lost is a huge chunk of progressive and liberal Jewish voters on the Democratic Party, which really comprise the base of Democratic Party voters.

And these are people that find themselves without a home. And they're demonstrating, they feel very strongly about human rights. And we know a lot of these types in our personal lives, people that we've worked with for a long time are of this ilk.

And I think they are very disappointed with what Biden has done here. And I think that's where he's feeling a lot of losses. And I think there could be a danger. And they say: *Well, where are you going to go? You're not going to go with Trump, who's trying to out-extreme the extremists.*

But they may stay home, Tom. They may say: *Well, forget it. I'm just going to sit this one out.*

**WOODS:** They could have gone to Robert F Kennedy Jr. But he immediately jumped aboard – the big maverick Robert F Kennedy Jr sounded exactly like every other person in Washington.

**McADAMS:** Oh, it's the Tom woods curse. He ended up being John McCain.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**McADAMS:**  And not just him, but Tulsi Gabbard, the same thing. It's bizarre.

**WOODS:** Oh, really? Now that's disappointing. I actually hadn't known that.

**McADAMS:** Yeah. So, she has a terrible quote out there about it. Very aggressive. You know, it's the mantra: Israel has a right to defend itself. Yeah, well, no one questions that people have a right to defend themselves, but this is a different issue.

With RFK Jr, it's very sad because his campaign, I think, has imploded. He's made so many bad moves and dumb moves. And I've said this over and over: *It didn't have to be this way, RFK*.

He could have said: *Look, I am pro-Israel. My family has always been pro-Israel. But I'm a different kind of candidate, and I believe you can best be pro-Israel by looking at the problem differently.*

*Doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results is the definition of insanity. I'm a different kind of candidate. I'm pro-Israel. I have a different approach to it.*

And that would have squared all the circles, I think. And he would have come out looking a lot better to people that were hoping for something different on foreign policy.

**WOODS:** Yeah. And it's very hard to talk about this, because the names get thrown around. The right wing, they hate cancel culture, right? No they don't. They love it. And they love having their own racism.

They love anti-Semitism. Everybody's an anti-Semite. If you're three degrees north of Ben Shapiro, you're an anti-Semite. I mean, at this point, I would assume people know what's going on there. This is just an attempt to ruin and destroy people. I mean, come on.

Yes. I guess it would be anti-Semitic to point this out, but I think it's unavoidable. That if you're Israel with – I don't know what the population of Israel is. But it's not that big. It's not that big.

**McADAMS:** 9 million.

**WOODS:** That's what I thought. Okay, 9 million. And they're surrounded by hundreds of millions of potential enemies. Okay. Hundreds of millions of people who may not be inclined in their direction.

Now, how that was supposed to work in the long run without some kind of – and I know that the Zionist side will say: *But we've been so conciliatory and look where it's gotten us.* How was this going to work without some kind of meeting of the minds here?

Was it just going to be that the US was just going to keep bankrolling them forever? Even the US can't ultimately, in the long run, fix a problem in which 9 million people are surrounded by hundreds of millions who hate their guts.

Some other kind of approach had to be taken, and it never was. I don't see what's anti-Semitic about pointing that out. That would seem to be the most common-sense thing you have to say in this situation.

**McADAMS:** I mean, analysis can't be anti-Semitic. And think this is another fallout from the Ukraine-Russia proxy war, the US using Ukraine as a proxy to take down Russia. Because in the process of so doing, there has been a tectonic shift in the (as Lenin would say) the correlation of forces.

Things have changed. China has come in and made peace between the Saudis and the Iranians. US influence in the Middle East has waned perceptibly. You can see it everywhere. The rise of Iran, despite sanctions, by finding other ways of working, working with India, working with Russia.

Finding new – we've sanctioned the hell out of the rest of the world so much that all the sanctioned people have gotten together and formed this coalition against the US.

So, when you combine that with what you would call the moral hazard of Israel thinking: *Hey, Uncle Sam's got our back, we can do whatever we want. Compromise? No, this is our land. We're going to take it.*

And which they have been doing. We've seen in the West Bank continuing the settlers taking land, continuing, and continuing: *America's got our back. We can do whatever we want.* And that's the moral hazard of having America there.

But the problem is, they're basically a small guy in a bar getting drunk with a big, big friend behind them. And they look behind them, and that big friend suddenly is not that big anymore. The US has been wounded militarily.

I mean, you can go down the line, Tom. The weapons systems have performed very poorly in Ukraine. These wonder weapons that we were told are so amazing that we have spent so much money on are being – you know, $4 million tanks taken out by $400 drones over and over again.

So, the US military has been exposed as a paper tiger in Ukraine. And now you're finding Israel, which is isolated in the region increasingly because of US foreign policy with regard to Russia and Ukraine.

Now it's looking around, it has no friends in the neighborhood, it has nothing to reach out to. And the America that's been this backstop is not the same old Uncle Sam it used to be.

**WOODS:** No, that's for sure.

**McADAMS:** [laughing] It's Uncle Joe.

**WOODS:** Yeah. And it's funny, I think back in the '80s when I was growing up, the US really – we still had the Soviet Union, but it seemed more or less invincible.

So, that when 1990 came along, and 1991 and the Persian Gulf War, it just seemed like – I mean, I was still a dumb kid who thought that it was fun to watch war on TV. I mean, that was about my level.

I eventually matured out of that, but that was where I was. It just seemed like: Oh, well, we can destroy whatever country we want, or any regime we want. We're just unstoppable. But for one reason or another, that is no longer the case.

It's like the more not the case that becomes, the more unhinged our war party becomes: *Oh, sure, we can afford two wars!* What are you talking about?

I mean, you go around America, this actual country, because any moral system worth anything says that your obligations proceed in a series of concentric circles, beginning with your own family, and then proceeding outward.

The obligations I have to Ukraine are just nowhere even on that diagram. They're just not. I wish you the best, but I have only so much that I can do.

And yet the more obviously untenable it is to carry on this type of foreign policy, the more some of the political class seems to act as if we should take on even more obligations. And you're probably an anti-Semite if you don't think we should.

**McADAMS:** Yeah, well, Tom, you're the historian, I don't dare talk history to you. But it does remind me of the British, you know: *Sail Britannia!* Then all of a sudden, Suez came along and it was like: *Wait, hold on a minute! We rule the world, this isn't fair!*

And that's where we're headed for. And Colonel Macgregor talks about the fact that we reached the apex of our military power around 1990, right at the end of the Cold War, and it's been downhill from there.

And it's really not that hard to understand why, when you look at the way the military industrial complex functions. It doesn't function to make great weapons that do what we need them to do. It functions to make a lot of jobs and a lot of people rich.

And that's why we're seeing things like the F-35 fiasco, which billions upon billions upon trillions have been spent. And it's not very good. All the wonder weapons sent over that are not very good because they're not designed to do specific jobs.

And in fact, when you have something like the A-10 that's designed and works very well and the military loves it, they say: *No, we've got to get rid of that. We need a new one that's got a lot more cool stuff in it, because it brings in a lot more money.*

And I was just looking, there's a new US News and World Report ranking of the top militaries in the world. And whereas in 1990 we could have said: *We're number one!* It turns out we are number two because they've ranked Russia above the US in terms of total military power, and China is third.

So, we spend, I think, 10 or 15 times as much as Russia. I don't have the numbers in front of me. We spend so much more than they do on our military. But it turns out, in fact, it doesn't get us very much bang for the buck. At least those of us chumps who have to work so hard to pay the bills.

**WOODS:**  I hosted a debate on my show a few – I don't actually know how many episodes ago, 1 or 2 episodes ago – on the Israel-Palestine issue. And I personally think it was a very productive debate that shed a lot of light.

But I, as the moderator, was able to exercise a prerogative to ask each debater a question. And I did ask the pro-Israel side to comment on some statements made in the not too distant past by Benjamin Netanyahu about Hamas, and the strategic significance of supporting and helping Hamas because it divides the other side.

Then they can legitimately say they don't have a legitimate partner to negotiate with. Now, he might not have been quite that blunt, but he was pretty blunt.

And I was wondering what the pro-Israel side would say, because when we first started pointing this out to people a few weeks ago, people were saying: *Oh, you're some kind of crazy conspiracy theorist. Nobody believes that.*

But there it is right in their own words, that we've helped to support Hamas. And the response I got was: Governments make mistakes. So, he openly admitted it. He didn't try to pretend that the Israelis haven't done this. He openly admitted it.

So, that's a problem. But the other thing I want to say from a recent episode is more of a question that I asked Scott Horton, and I want to get your thoughts on it. So, after what happened on October 7th, we saw (and continue to see) a huge number of pro-Palestine demonstrations around the world.

And my devil's advocate question to Scott was, if, let's say the tables were not quite turned, but they were different tables. And let's say Armenians had launched an attack on Azerbaijan that amounted to just a random slaughter of civilians at a music festival.

I personally wouldn't take that particular moment to have a big pro-Armenia rally. I wouldn't. Or if I did, I would make darn sure everybody understood that as just as I consider my cause to be, that's not legitimate and I have nothing to do with that.

But yet I don't see any of that. I see very, very little of that, or any appearance of nuance. Instead, I see these huge demonstrations at that particular moment. So, why shouldn't I – let's say I'm a hypothetical Israeli.

I could say: *Daniel McAdams. I know that you object to some aspects of the way the State of Israel was formed back in the late '40s. But it's not the late '40s anymore. It's 2023.*

*A lot of us live here. We don't want to die. We're dealing with a lot of psychos over here. And when they do psychotic things, people cheer them. Can you at least understand why we feel the way we do?*

**McADAMS:** Well, certainly. I mean, if I was Israeli, I wouldn't be very happy with what's happening. But a lot of that has to do with Israeli policy. And again, like we talked about the feeling of being backstopped by the US.

They don't feel like they've had to make compromises. And you talk about the two-state solution. Now, if you look at what's happened to the West Bank and the settlements, it's literally impossible. You're going to have to move out thousands of people.

It's not excusing an attack like October 7th to say: *Well, why did this happen?* You remember, Ron Paul was attacked: *Well, how dare you say that we provoked them. How dare you look for a reason why they bombed the towers?*

Well, in any crime, you have to look for motive. Why did they do it? It doesn't justify. It doesn't mean you think it was cool. But nevertheless, you have to understand what brings you to the boiling point.

And the idea that: *Oh my gosh, how dare you say that Netanyahu would have helped start Hamas, they're a bunch of crazed jihadists.* Well guess what? We did the same thing with the mujahideen in Afghanistan.

Thanks a lot, Brzezinski: *Hey, here's a good idea. Let's take down the Soviets by training and arming a bunch of crazy jihadists.* That sounds great.

So, governments do stupid things all the time, and they've got neocons over there just like we have neocons over here, who literally come up with the stupidest ideas known to man.

They launch these stupid ideas. They do badly, and then they say it's everyone else's fault: It's not my fault! They're never going to take the blame. Blinken's never going to take the blame. Sullivan's never going to take the blame. Vicky Nuland is never going to take the blame for this.

They move on to the next thing. And that's what happens. As to the pro-Palestinian – I should say "pro-Hamas", because that's how they're trying to write it off. Although I haven't seen – I don't watch a lot of them. I haven't seen any pro-Hamas banners.

But people genuinely feel in favor of the underdog. And people who don't have a theological dog in the race – which we talked about earlier, that drives everything that they think about the Middle East.

They genuinely think, when they do avail themselves of a broader than just mainstream view of the world, that the Palestinians have gotten a pretty bad shake over these last few decades.

They have been occupied. They have been deprived of food and water. Is this saying that they behave perfectly? No. But saying when you live in – and Dr. Paul said it in 2009 on the House floor – an open-air prison.

When you live in an open-air prison for generations, then you raise a generation of people who want to break out. And I think it was Professor Finkelstein was talking about, – Norman Finkelstein, his parents were Holocaust survivors: *These people are raised in Gaza with nothing to look forward to. They have no future.*

And we know they're given just a certain amount of calories to survive, a certain amount of water and energy and whatever. When you keep people this way, you can say: *Well, we're trying to prevent them from attacking us*.

But what you're doing is you're nurturing and creating a monster that someday will attack you when they find the time is right. And I think that's what's happened. So, it's been a huge mistake, and the rest of the world sees it. They see the injustice, increasingly.

**WOODS:** I don't mean to push too hard on this point, but it reminds me of something Michael Scheuer used to say. Now, he was the head of the CIA's bin Laden unit for a while. He endorsed Dr. Paul. He was very gracious.

He's a very good, decent man, actually quite soft-spoken usually, when you talk to him. But the part of Scheuer's message that our side generally more or less ignored, was he would say: *Look, all we're doing is enraging the Muslim world for no good reason.*

But then he would say: *But at this point, we've enraged them so much that nothing further we do is going to enrage them. They're as enraged as they're ever going to be.*

*And so, now we've created a problem where we now have people who hate us for things we've done in the past, so we probably just have to go in and wipe them all out at this point. And yeah, we shouldn't have done it in the first place. But now that we have, for the sake of our own survival, we have to go in.*

And now, obviously, you and I don't support that idea, but I think that may be where some Israelis are right now.

That: *Yes. Right. Okay. You got me. It was a stupid, unbelievably idiotic strategic error to support Hamas over the years. But look, again, I've got kids. I live in Israel. It's 2023. If people hate me, even justly, as a matter of self-defense, I've still got to wipe them out.*

I think that would be their attitude.

**McADAMS:** Yeah. And when something like that happens, you find yourself incredibly pissed off at everyone. A lot of Americans felt that way as well after 9/11. Most Americans felt that way after 9/11. And it's very understandable you're enraged.

But interestingly enough, I mean, in the Israeli media, there's much more of a debate on what happened on October 7th than there is in the US. And you have, for example, I'm sure you know Max Blumenthal, who he is, and the *Gray Zone*, which I think is a great publication.

Max came out with a story a couple of days ago simply following the Israeli press, primarily Haaretz and a couple of TV stations. But the testimony of those people who were hostages and other information shows that things didn't really happen the way they are being presented.

It turns out the Israelis – and this is understandable, because governments screw up all the time. They can't do anything right. It turns out that the Israeli army, it seems like they use tanks and they blew up a lot of these houses in the kibbutzes.

That's why so many of the bodies were burned. And so many people were shot – they used the Apache helicopters to shoot a lot of people, including a lot of the hostages. So, there's always a lot more than meets the eye to these things, and they come out slowly.

When you start to see the truth – just like in 9/11, you start a few years later thinking: *Well, hang on, there were so many warnings, and nobody listened. Nobody paid attention. What's that all about?* And I think you're starting to hear some of that.

But the anger is too raw and too fresh. But the problem is, Tom, now you have (as of the time we're recording this) I think, over 8,000 Palestinians killed, including 3,000 children. We're talking on Monday.

I was just reading that the Turkish Palestinian Friendship Hospital has just been hit by Israel, the cancer ward. So, you see a lot of this happening. You see a lot of lives being destroyed. But you talk about "kill 'em all". You can't kill them all. It just can't be done.

And so, my hope is that if an Israeli who's living there really wants to continue, they would shy away from the extremists and the neocons who say: *Oh yeah? Well, let's hit Iran. That sounds like a good idea.*

No way. I mean, if you hate Israel, the number one thing you'd want them to do is to hit Iran or provoke Hezbollah, because it's going to be a lot more Jewish Israelis dead. It's just a bad idea. This is not the Iran of the mid 1980s. Let's just put it that way.

**WOODS:** Well, that leads to a question I wanted to ask you. Which is, if you could spell out what you think are potentially the – when I say the "best" outcomes, obviously we already have a bad outcome. But what is the least bad way this could all be resolved? And what is the potentially worst way?

Because obviously it could very easily become a wider war, especially because of the allegiances that other great powers have. So, if Iran becomes involved, then it's only a matter of time before Russia becomes involved in some way. This could become a major war.

So, can you describe the best- and worst-case scenarios for us as you see them?

**McADAMS:** Well, we have a speaker of the House who went on Hannity and urged the Israelis to attack Iran. That's not a good idea. And these guys aren't always the smartest bulbs in the bunch. And I would say definitely he's not.

But like you say, the world is different now. And if you have an Israel attacking Iran, the Russians now have an increasingly potent alliance with Iran, let's put it that way. Plus, the Russians feel themselves very vulnerable in Syria.

They, in fact, just moved a thousand more troops into Syria. They have a base there in Tartus, and other facilities in Syria. If Israel attacks Iran, there's also going to be an effort to finish the business in Syria. That's what the neocons want more than anything else, is to finish the business in Syria.

So, if the Israelis listen to the neocons in the US, then they're going to find the worst-case scenario, probably for everyone. Which is getting Iran involved, getting Hezbollah involved, getting Hamas even more involved from wherever they are now.

And getting the rest of the Arab world – and Erdogan, I think, does a lot of talking. And I think he talks out of both sides of his face. He has an enormous Sunni constituency in Turkey. His base are religious Muslims in Turkey.

And he gave a fiery speech over the weekend about: *We need to go into Gaza and take care of these guys and save our people*. Now, I think a lot of it was just a lot of hot rhetoric.

Nevertheless, it's going to be hard to contain (as you point out) hundreds of millions of people in that vicinity that are going to be inflamed. You can't kill them all, even with their nukes.

So, the worst scenario would be to listen to the neocons and to escalate. The best scenario – and I think, ironically, we're going to start seeing it from the BRICS countries, from what we call the global South.

Who now are very busy in the General Assembly of the UN (for all of its faults), busy in the General Assembly trying to put forth new proposals. And I think there was one that just was voted on a couple of days ago.

And it turns out the US is in a very small minority. Only 14 other countries voted with the US, voted against the proposal by Jordan for a truce. So, even – I think it was France, the UK, and Germany voted against us.

So, you're finding the US more isolated in the General Assembly in the UN. So, I think you're going to start to see some more momentum among the BRICS nations, among the previously non-aligned countries that are becoming aligned because of US aggressive foreign policy.

The best kind of solution would be for it to become obvious, even to Joe Biden (or whoever's pulling the strings, even to them) that you are isolated. And probably with a phone call, Biden or whoever does his talking could say: *Listen, Bibi. We've got to pull the plug on this*.

Because they did it before. Netanyahu pulled out of Gaza before. This is something I was just relooking at the other day. When he got a call from the US president saying: *Look, it's about enough right now. Things are getting hot. You need to pull back.*

And I think that could happen, and look for some kind of truce. So, that's the best-case scenario. The world slowly but surely gets more and more opposed to the US position, and the pressure on Biden, the 11 points that he's just lost in the polls.

He starts looking at that and thinking: *We've got to fix this problem somehow. Give me some sort of a solution.*

**WOODS:**  As you were describing the BRICS matter, I was thinking that the answer to some of these things is actually going to come as the US becomes more isolated and weak. And other countries say: *You know, by the way, the US does not get to dictate everything that happens around the world.*

I know there are a lot of people over the years who've been very worried about the UN becoming a world government. But since World War II, the United States has acted as the world government. The UN has issued feckless declarations, but the US has been the world government.

And there's no way that was going to go on forever. And especially when, as you say – I mean, yes, maybe Micronesia supports the US. I don't even know who the countries are, you know? But that's not a long-lasting coalition that's going to be able to move the world when you have major, major forces against you.

And so, it's incredible that I went, in my lifetime, from, in the '80s, cheering for Ronald Reagan against the Soviets. And now, same lifetime, I'm thinking: *Well, the less influence my country has, the better.*

Half the time, if not more than half the time, because it means there will be less unnecessary violence and less lunacy everywhere.

**McADAMS:** And look what we do to our allies. Remember the old Kissinger line: *To be an enemy of the US is dangerous, to be a friend can be fatal*. And that's when we blew up the German's pipeline: *Hey, guys, we didn't want you to get cold feet, so we blew up your pipeline.*

We have such a history of stabbing our allies in the back. We're in the process now of stabbing Zelensky in the back. And I'm not saying he's a great guy, because he's not. But he's dumb.

He allowed himself to be "Noriegaed", and that's what's going to happen. He's going to be "Gadhafied" pretty soon, probably. This is what happens. So, not only do we treat our "enemies" badly, we treat our "friends" very badly.

And so, we continue to isolate ourselves. It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy that the rest of the world – it's just like you say, Tom. They're just sick and tired of being told what to do. They're done with it. They've had it.

And so, I mean, our best hope is to bring middle America around, working-class and middle-class America around, to understanding that this does not serve our interests. It's destroying our economy and making us a lot poorer and more vulnerable to people who now a pretty good reason to hate us, I have to say.

**WOODS:** And incidentally, early on in this, you remember there was an absolute hysteria if you did not accept every story coming out of the Middle East, if you didn't accept every atrocity story. Now it seems like there were atrocities aplenty, so there was no need to invent atrocities.

But if you didn't accept them, though, again, that shows you're an anti-Semite. No, no no no, you don't know me very well then, because I didn't accept what was coming out of Ukraine. I didn't accept any of these stories.

I mean, Dave Smith reminded me of this not too long ago. You remember when Trump was thinking of pulling out of Syria and everybody said: *The Kurds are all going to be killed!* Remember that? *All the Kurds are going to be killed! The Turks are going to come in and kill all the Kurds!*

And this was like an absolute definite, no question that was going to happen. And then we never heard about this again. This was never mentioned again, so I assume it didn't happen. But nothing these people say can be relied on.

So, it's possible that every once in a while they will say something that's true. But how on earth can you be a reasonable person and begrudge us some skepticism?

**McADAMS:** Yeah, and libertarians of all people should understand this, even if you sympathize with Israel. Governments lie. They've always lied, and these are some whoppers, and we've seen some whoppers.

And I have to say, with all of his faults, thanks to Elon Musk's Twitter, things can be debunked. Because you have this kind of amazing coalition of people who can independently verify or debunk things.

And that wasn't true a couple of years ago, of course, on Twitter, you'd just get banned. That's all it was to it. But some of the more outrageous and ridiculous pieces of propaganda – I mean it's bad enough what happened on the 7th.

But whoever was running the Israeli propaganda machine, they are so ham-fisted – as governments are. They had that goofy thing about the hospital where you could tell that they edited it. The timestamp is wrong.

The beheading of the baby – I hate to even say that. That was all debunked. The rape stuff – as if, yeah, you're rampaging across the countryside. Let's stop for a while and do some rapes. It's bad enough what they did, but all of the propaganda – it was like, you're right.

Like, in Ukraine, the Ghost of Kiev, and that story of the brave Ukrainian woman who knocked down a bunch of MiGs with a pickle jar. It's just it's just so absurd, the propagandists. But having free speech is great because it helps us get closer to the truth.

**WOODS:**  Let's finish up with this, and then I want to say a little something about the Ron Paul Institute. But obviously if I turn on a cable news network, I'm going to get the standard line. I know that. I know that if *Foreign Affairs* puts on an event, I'll probably get the standard line.

Although occasionally with *Foreign Affairs* you might get a few dissident voices here and there, but generally everybody knows what the standard line is.

I have this sense, though, that even though the political classes are out to lunch on it, and the newspapers and the major networks are out to lunch on it, I have a feeling that there is, nevertheless, a growing feeling of skepticism, maybe among people who aren't so powerful, who aren't opinion molders.

But there are more people who won't necessarily be fooled the next time. Do you think I'm right about that, or is that wishful thinking?

**McADAMS:** I'd like to think you're right. It's frustrating – and I'm sure Scott Horton feels it. Anyone who's dumb enough to have gone into foreign affairs must feel it. Who is on the right side?

Because it's the only profession on earth where, if you're right, you get kicked in the teeth. And if you're wrong, you get a promotion, you can be Vicky Nuland. So, it's a thankless task. But I do think that you're seeing a lot more people who are skeptical.

As Dr. Paul always says, the challenge is for us getting our message out and overwhelming odds. We don't have cable, we don't have anything. We just have a little show. And all of us have our own shows, getting it out with overwhelming odds against it.

And our own inadequacies – speaking for myself, only – inadequacies of delivering the message in an understandable, palatable form. It's not easy to do, especially when people have been so brainwashed for so long. It's a real challenge.

But we should be rejoicing in a way, despite all the sadness and bloodshed. Because this is our time. This is the time where we can say: Look, everything has clearly failed. Non-interventionism is the solution to our problems, and here's why. So, it's just a question of, how best can we do it?

**WOODS:** Can you say a word, please, about the Ron Paul Institute for Peace and Prosperity? I want to note, I have donated to it. I support it 100%. I love what you guys are doing. People may not know much about it or even that it exists, and I would like folks to support you guys.

I would note that in the same way that it really says something about who Ron Paul is, that the Ron Paul Liberty Report is always referred to by Dr. Paul as, "the Liberty Report". The Ron Paul Institute for Peace and Prosperity, he always refers to as "the Institute for Peace and Prosperity."

Because he doesn't want to make himself the center of things. It's always the ideas, and we all love him for that. But tell us about what it is you guys do over there.

**McADAMS:** In fact, you know after he announced that he wasn't running again, back in 2012, and a few weeks later, I came and talked to him saying: *You know, I've kind of had this idea in my head*.

And I'd been talking to Lew Rockwell for probably a couple of years before this, about my big dream would be to do this after he's done, to keep those memories, to keep that policy alive.

And I told him when thought it should be called. And he said: I don't like the first part. I like the second part, I don't like the first part. And so, ironically, I mean, our only sticking point was he didn't want it to be named after him.

Because like you say, he just didn't want to do that. Here's a guy – and I'm with him every day, and it's a delight to be with him. He doesn't need this, Tom. He doesn't need the frustration. He's got a beautiful house just a couple miles from here.

He's got a wonderful family, wonderful wife. As you know, he's set for life. He doesn't need to do any of this. But he gets up every morning and he pours over the news. And he tries to figure out: *How can I keep trying to help? How can I keep trying to push peace and prosperity?*

And he works harder than people a quarter of his age. Trust me, he does, on this. And he's just he's more dedicated than ever to it. So, he's definitely and should be an inspiration to all of us. But as to your first question, this is our 10th year.

And you remember very well, Tom, because we talked probably right after we'd started it. The consensus was: *They're never going to survive. They won't survive a year. You can't raise money on foreign policy.*

All that's true. It's been damned hard to keep the doors open, to keep going. But we slowly build and we're slowly increasing. We have 2 or 3 conferences a year. We had a huge conference in DC just last month, which was a huge success.

We do a student seminar, a scholar seminar. We do the Ron Paul Liberty Report, it's produced by the Institute, and we publish thousands of articles a year. So, yeah, we don't have the millions of dollars that go to other Beltway organizations to repeat the same lies that the Military Industrial Complex wants you to have.

And probably if I was more adept at fundraising, we'd have some more money than we do. But we keep trying to keep Ron Paul's message alive. And our website is RonPaulInstitute.org, and we are live on Rumble every day at noon eastern time at the Ron Paul Liberty Report.

**WOODS:** Excellent. Okay. I remember – this the first time, I think, I've had you on the show since it happened. But we recall Dr. Paul had a stroke some time ago, and then he was going to be returning to the show on Monday.

And I remember everybody who was anybody tuning in that day. They wanted to see Dr. Paul and how he was doing. And as I recall, Daniel, if it had been me, I would have devoted half the episode to my ordeal and what it was like in the hospital and everything else.

I think he spent 45 seconds briefing us on what had happened, and then off to the next thing. I can't be him. I can admire him. I can't be him.

**McADAMS:** Yeah. And I remember – he's probably going to be mad at me for telling the story. But he was in the hospital. He'd just gotten a treatment. Thank God, they caught it quick enough.

And he called me, and he said: *Daniel, I hate doing this. I hate when politicians do this. But my daughter-in-law took a picture of me here in the hospital bed with my thumbs up. And if you wouldn't mind, just put that out to let people know I'm okay.*

And now he just physically pained by doing this because he didn't want to make it about himself. But he knew that people wanted to know that he was okay. So, now that story's out there. It's never been told.

**WOODS:** All right, well, then you know what? I'm going to tell a little story, maybe perhaps slightly out of turn, but don't think he'll be unhappy about it. We were at his house some months later.

So, after he posted that picture, Donald Trump retweeted it and wrote: *Great*. You know, like: *Great to hear that he's doing okay.* And so, we were at his house, and I said to his wife, Carol: *So, what did you think about Donald Trump on Twitter wishing your husband well?*

And she said: *He did?* So, Ron hadn't even told her. Again, that would have been the first thing I told my wife. She hadn't even known. He didn't even think to bring it up.

**McADAMS:** That's classic.

**WOODS:** Anyway, RonPaulInstitute.org, folks, is where to go. Help them out. They can easily get on the mailing list, too, there, I assume?

**McADAMS:** Yeah, and Ron Paul has a brand-new book out, by the way, I should mention. It's an absolutely terrific, terrific book. And we're offering that to our donors in our fall – I don't want to step on your toes, but you invited.

In fact, I have a copy it over here. It's *The Great Surreptitious Coup Who Stole Western Civilization*. It's his longest book that he's done in several years. And it's a really terrific book. And we're offering it to people who participate in our fall fundraiser.

**WOODS:** Excellent. Okay. RonPaulInstitute.org Daniel, all the best to you and Dr. Paul, and thanks so much for today.

**McADAMS:** Thank you, Tom.