

Scott Ritter: Russia Threatens Strike on Finland & Baltic States

Scott Ritter is a former Major, Intelligence Officer, US Marine, and UN Weapons Inspector. Ritter discusses Russia's threat of a retaliatory strike against European targets. Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennndiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glennndiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glennndiesen> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We're joined today by Scott Ritter, a former UN weapons inspector, U.S. Marine Corps intelligence officer, and author. Thank you, as always, for coming back on the program.

#Scott Ritter

Thank you very much for having me.

#Glenn

We see now that the Europeans are speaking quite loudly and proudly, I would add, about all the drones they're sending to Ukraine to fight Russia. But at the same time, there are also reports now, as we all know, that some of the drones hitting the Russian Baltic seacoast are coming from Ukraine, the Baltic states, and/or Finland. And we now see that the Russian Defense Ministry has published a list of European facilities that are potential targets of Russian strikes, as they're producing drones being used to attack Russia. I even saw the Russian Security Council Secretary, Sergei Shoigu, making the point that Russia has the right to self-defense, given that these are attacks from European territories. I was wondering what you make of all this — is it just hot air, or do you think they're actually going to start stepping up efforts to restore their deterrence?

#Scott Ritter

I think that Russia is looking to bring an end to this conflict this year. Um, I think they have plans in store for this summer. You know, the Russian approach has always been to avoid escalation and focus on mission accomplishment. They've allowed so-called red lines to be crossed because, strategically, you would lose more by being seen as over-responding — you might mobilize or stiffen support for Ukraine that is otherwise diminishing. I think this time, however, it's different. We see

that what had been done in the shadows is now official policy. We see nations at Ramstein bragging about the role they're playing, that this has become a de facto proxy conflict. And when we speak of drones, we're not talking about the tactical drones on the battlefield; we're talking about drones used to carry out strategic strikes deep inside Russia.

This is an unsustainable model for Russia. And I think that, you know, the time has come for Russia to step up and make Europe understand there's a price to be paid for irresponsible activity. What Europe is doing, just so everybody understands, is an act of war. It's not that Europe is an innocent party here — they are active participants in the conflict. They are planning these attacks. These drones are being produced with the knowledge that they'll be given to Ukrainians, who will then use European-provided intelligence to strike deep inside Russia. And as I said, I believe this is an unsustainable model. I think the Russian Ministry of Defense and the Russian Security Council have made it clear that there will be consequences if this continues. So I think that's where we're at right now.

#Glenn

It's very strange that this is—well, I've made this argument myself, just to be a bit cautious about the path we're going down—but it's very easily dismissed these days, which is kind of strange. The reason most of these European states never supplied weapons to any country in a war was because that would make the Europeans participants in the conflict. Yet now we see the involvement as deep as it can be, to the point where the Ukrainians might play a very minimal role. And yet the whole idea that the Europeans are becoming, or have become, participants is just rejected as Russian propaganda—which is what you say when you want to make dissent go away. So it is shocking. But what do you see as the possible... Do you think there could be a warning strike first against Estonia or Finland, or do you think they'll do something larger, going after key logistic nodes in Germany, for example?

#Scott Ritter

I'm not one to advise the Russian government on anything. I think warning strikes would be inconsequential. And actually, I mean, if you're going to strike a NATO country—or as they say, if you're going to strike the king, kill the king. I think Russia gets one shot, and it should be a devastating one that takes out the totality of the target set identified by the Russian Ministry of Defense, in a way that completely obliterates Europe's potential to carry out its stated goals and objectives of supplying Ukraine with drones to be used in a proxy manner against Russia's strategic depth. It also sends the signal that Russia can change the target deck anytime it wants to, and the outcome will be the same.

I think Europe needs to be put on notice that they're playing in the big-league arena. You decide to step into the ring with a super heavyweight fighter, and he just knocked you out. Because otherwise, this will just continue to be a war of incrementalism that solves nothing. The other thing is, by

hitting decisively, you fundamentally define the debate. Now it's put-up-or-shut-up time for Europe, and Europe will find out that they simply cannot go to war with Russia. They're not positioned to go to war with Russia. They don't have the resources. And then Europe will also have to have a debate about whether they're going to drop everything, in a time of existential economic crisis, and rebuild a European army that cannot exist, does not exist, and won't exist. You know, the United States is leaving.

I don't think the United States will have any sympathy for the Europeans for doing what they did before. This is fundamentally an act of war taking place. The Europeans, I think, are hoping for incrementalism that could draw the United States back in. The longer you have an open-ended debate, the more likely bad things are to happen in terms of the outcome. But if you present Europe with, you know, a bloody nose—and the fact that your hand is cocked to hit them again—and the United States now has to look at this, you make everything very clear with a decisive strike. So I think the time has come for a decisive strike. I don't think the Russians would be publishing this list, and Sergei Shoigu would be saying what he's saying, if they weren't prepared for one.

#Glenn

Well, if it were a large strike—not just against the Baltic states and Finland, but primarily Germany as well—the big question is, what would the Americans do? Lately, we've seen all these tweets from Trump saying, you know, NATO's a paper tiger, you didn't do anything for us, we're not going to be there for you. Do you think they would just ignore it altogether, or would there be some kind of response? What would the United States actually do? Would it be nothing, or would they go all in? Well, I'm doubting the "all in" by now, but essentially NATO would be over if they didn't do anything. Trump might be fine with that. So what do you expect the American reaction to be?

#Scott Ritter

First of all, this isn't your classic "we were attacked, we want collective defense." This is selective countries in NATO acting outside the NATO framework. NATO as an institution hasn't made a decision to provide drones. It's a German decision, it's a British decision—it's a decision by individual nations. So legally, it's going to be hard to make the case that Article 5 is even triggered. But at the end of the day, the United States knows more than anybody about "fool around, find out." And here we have the Europeans fooling around, and if Russia makes them find out, I don't see the United States rallying to their cause. I actually see Donald Trump saying, "You brought it upon yourself."

This was stupid policy. We told you to seek peace. Instead, you promoted this war. And you weren't there when we needed you. We're not going to come now. I think this is the end of NATO. And that's another thing that's going to go into Russia's calculation—the accelerated death of NATO by launching a strike. Of course, it's a gamble. I mean, who knows how things will play out? Europe may rally, the United States might come back, and NATO could unify. But I think all indicators suggest that's not going to be the case. I think the Russians are looking for a decisive summer, and

that decisive summer will come, I believe, with offensives in the Donbass region that will bring back the totality of the Donbass, plus deeper penetrations.

And I think it'll be putting NATO—or Europe—on notice that Russia's done playing games. You can only sit there and threaten Russia with war so many times before Russia actually says, "Okay, let's do it." I think Russia's at the "okay, let's do it" stage. Especially—look, Garrett—their economy is doing quite well right now, thanks to the global energy crisis. And no matter how this shakes out, Russia has now fixed a lot of the economic problems that might have held back the Russian government before, out of fear that a conflict with Europe could trigger an even deeper economic crisis. I don't think Russia is afraid of that right now. I think all conditions are green for Russia to strike Europe if it continues this policy.

#Glenn

Well, as all of this is happening, I think one of the reasons the Europeans might be escalating now is that the war isn't going well. It appears that the Russian spring offensive is now underway, or at least has started. Do you see it that way, or is it too early to tell?

#Scott Ritter

Well, I see indications. I wouldn't go to Las Vegas and put my mortgage on anything at this point in time. But Russia has been preparing the battlefield. If you follow what's going on—I follow a very good Russian journalist who publishes a Substack page that provides updates on the battlefield, with very good maps and explanations of what the Russians are doing. And what you see is that the Russians have been painstakingly setting up the front for a major effort: taking critical terrain, cutting lines of communication, and attriting the Ukrainians—luring them into counterattacks, having well-thought-out cause-and-effect actions, doing something on the assumption the Ukrainians would then counterattack, and then receiving that counterattack in a...

And destroying the Ukrainian forces, thereby eliminating their reserves. Ukraine has no reserves now because of these ridiculous counterattacks they've been carrying out. The Russians have continued to prepare the battlefield for what logically would be an offensive designed to deliver death or ruin. No idea what they're banking on, but there we go. Sloviansk and Kramatorsk are the last two big populated areas in Donbas. If that urban belt falls, all of Donbas falls. So I think the goal this summer is to bring an end to the issue of the Donbas—meaning it's no longer a question of Ukraine giving up territory; Russia's going to take it.

#Glenn

I've got a feeling that the European enthusiasm for sending more money and weapons, and for getting more directly involved in this war, was partly held back by the Hungarians—Orban specifically blocking a lot of the military aid that was supposed to go to Ukraine. Now that Orban has

been defeated, what do you think the significance of that is? I think some people might have exaggerated how much of a Europhile the new prime minister is, but it's still quite significant that Hungary's new leadership might define the country's national interest somewhat differently from how Orban did.

#Scott Ritter

Look, who cares? I mean, I don't mean to be too harsh, but who cares? So what—Europe's now going to be able to spend 90 billion euros on Ukraine. Where does that money go? Is it actually going to bolster Ukrainian capabilities? Are they going to provide Ukraine with the Patriot air defense systems Ukraine says it needs? Where are the Patriots going to come from? The United States isn't providing any Patriots to Europe; all Patriots are being diverted for American use. So I just think this is a lot of talk. The reality is on the battlefield, and nothing that happened in Hungary is going to impact what's going on there—nothing whatsoever. This is all inside baseball, European wannabe-ism.

The fact of the matter is, the Hungarian elections don't do anything to resolve the fundamental dysfunction of Europe. I mean, yes, they can pass a 90-billion-euro aid package, but that doesn't solve France's problems, Germany's problems, England's problems. Those problems still exist. It doesn't end the economic crisis. It doesn't resolve the energy security issues. The International Energy Agency says Europe runs out of aviation fuel in six weeks—that's right in the middle of the summer travel season. What happens when the entire European aviation industry is grounded? What does that do to the economy? How does Orban affect that? Orban doesn't affect anything—nothing.

This is just theater, and it's always been theater. This is dysfunction in the extreme. Europe isn't suddenly going to be united with resolve or able to get things done. They're still trying to turn that 90 billion dollars into something else. You're still dealing with an inherently corrupt Ukrainian government that's falling apart as we speak, fighting among themselves. All you do is encourage corruption. I'm glad they got this resolved, because now we get to watch what happens to the 90 billion euros—how quickly that disappears and how little impact it has on anything. And then maybe Europe will wake up to the fact that nothing they do is going to turn the situation around in Ukraine.

#Glenn

Yeah, no, that's an excellent point. I often say that myself—that is, all this money they don't really have, but they have to use it to buy American weapons that Americans can't sell anymore. If they were running short before, now they have to spend it on the Middle East. Anyway, the key problem in Ukraine seems to be the manpower issue. But the Europeans appear to want to help in that area too. We see Chancellor Merz seemingly agreeing to Zelensky's demands to expel refugees so they can be sent back to Ukraine to fill the trenches—which is another problem that goes under the banner of a pro-Ukrainian policy. It's quite extreme, what they're doing. But I wanted to ask: overall,

how do you think the war in Iran has affected the war in Ukraine? Because besides the weapons being diverted and Ukraine being pushed out of the headlines, are there any other problems or impacts from that war?

#Scott Ritter

The biggest one is economic. You've already taken a very bad energy security situation in Europe and turned it into an absolute disaster. In order to resolve this, they're going to have to buy energy that doesn't exist on the spot market—they're going to be gouged. So you're taking a continent that's already knee-deep in economic problems and making it even deeper in economic problems. It's going to make European industry more dysfunctional and create internal political rifts inside an already divided Europe. I think the big takeaway from this war for Europe is the economy. The second thing, of course, is also the economy.

I think the permanent damage that's been done between the United States and Europe—the end of NATO—I think NATO is over. I don't think there's any trust left between Europe and the United States, for any number of reasons. I mean, the United States has not been a trustworthy ally, and it created an impossible situation for Europe by demanding that they respond to the Iranian crisis—a crisis Europe didn't want. But, you know, Trump is holding it against them. He's literally the boy taking the ball and going home. And I think that's problematic, too, because now Europe is confronted, for the first time, with the necessity of having to defend itself.

In the past, there were theoretical discussions about what would happen if the United States walked away. Well, the United States is walking away—and Europe knows that. So now they're having the uncomfortable discussion, and Europe is realizing they don't have anything. Europe has nothing. There's no army, no defense industry, no air force. Without the United States, Europe is literally nothing. And yet they're involved in a proxy war with Russia using drones. I think this is the other big thing—the absolute realization of how little power Europe has from a military standpoint.

#Glenn

Yeah, no, I don't always understand what the strategy is. You'd think that at the point when the Americans are pulling back and the big American support behind you goes away, you'd be a bit more cautious in how you approach other great powers, like Russia. But it doesn't seem to affect their posture, though—they're still doing the same as before. On the topic of Iran... do you think this might be coming to an end now? I mean, we all watched—well, we don't have to take everything Trump says too seriously—but he seems to think the war is coming to an end. The Iranians did say that the Strait of Hormuz is open, but the way they define "open" is very different from what Trump is describing, which sounds like an unconditional surrender for the Iranians. So what do you think is happening at this moment?

#Scott Ritter

What's happening is exactly what I said would happen. We have two realities in the world. There's the real geopolitical reality—the ground truth in Iran. The United States and Israel lost the war. They didn't accomplish any of their objectives and hold no leverage over Iran whatsoever. Iran holds all the cards. The U.S. has reached the limit of its ability to escalate conventionally without crossing into outright war crimes. This is why Donald Trump chose to move toward a ceasefire—a ceasefire that Iran didn't want but was pressured into accepting because of China, which is suffering economically from this conflict. So you have the Iranian reality, and then you have the American reality, which is really centered on Donald Trump's ego. This is a political problem for Donald Trump.

This isn't a national security problem for the United States. Uh, we're not trying to, you know, solve a giant international foreign policy crisis. We're trying to solve a domestic political crisis for the president, because he entered a war he said he would never enter—and he lost. Um, he can't admit he lost. So now, what's been happening is that the negotiations that took place almost a week ago almost succeeded in producing a final treaty. But politically, Trump couldn't accept it, because accepting that treaty under those conditions would mean the United States was acknowledging defeat. So Trump scuttled the agreement and then spent a week posturing. That posturing was designed to create the perception of American power—that America is compelling Iran to do things.

What Iran is doing are things that were already agreed to in the Islamabad Memorandum of Understanding that was almost signed, but Trump killed it. This is just a game—an act of political theater. What we see the president doing is trying to create the impression that without his decisive intervention, without his massive blockade, without his threats, none of this would be happening. This is all happening because of him. And the Iranians are basically just concluding the agreement. I think there are too many people who look at what's happening and accept Trump's statements at face value. The reality is, nothing he says conforms to what's actually going on.

The Strait of Hormuz isn't open. The Strait of Hormuz has been selectively open. The Iranians are in control—they dictate what passes through, how it passes through, and what fees are charged. Trump can claim that he's the one responsible, but the bottom line is that the Strait of Hormuz is open under terms acceptable to Iran—terms that Iran put on the table. The other thing I want to remind people is that while all this theater is going on, there are technical teams in Islamabad that have been at work ever since these negotiations began, finalizing and clarifying the technical details of what will be an eventual peace treaty.

But I—again, unless something very bad happens politically to Donald Trump—he can't go on with this war. It's politically devastating for him. The American economy will suffer, and you know, we all know in elections, it's the economy, stupid. So, you know, Trump has no choice but to find peace. He's just finding it in his own little weird Trumpian way, where he has to convince a portion of the American public that he's playing 5D chess, that he's a genius, and that everything he does is brilliant—that none of this outcome would have happened without his intervention. Meanwhile, the Iranians just deal with reality.

#Glenn

Yeah, I've noticed the way this has been reported—you can see a clear split. What can now almost be described as the MAGA cult sees this as a massive victory. But it's a good point: he keeps lying over and over again, and yet we're supposed to take everything at face value. It doesn't really make sense. If the United States, under Trump now, decides to go back to essentially a total war—or at least a full, intensive war—with Iran, how long can the U.S. keep that up? Because from what I understand, there have been a lot of flights into the region since the ceasefire, and a lot of the stocks have been replenished. What's the fighting power versus the restraint on how long the U.S. can keep this going?

#Scott Ritter

Well, you know, there's a saying that's attributed to Albert Einstein—I don't know if it's actually him or not—but the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different outcome. The Israelis lost the war. Remember, they started with all the precision-guided strike weapons they wanted, all the defense capabilities they had, and they got beat. So you're telling me they've restocked the same capabilities they just got beat on? So what are they going to do differently this time? Their target deck is totally diminished. Anything of value was struck. Anything of retained value has been evacuated.

They don't have a target deck, so they're just going to blow up buildings to blow up buildings—which is what they were doing near the end of this conflict to begin with. That's not victory. The more they bomb, the stronger the regime gets. There's no regime change there. And Iran has shown that these underground missile cities are pretty much invulnerable, that they can keep launching missiles, and there's nothing the United States can do to prevent that. And remember, while the United States has been replenishing, so have the Iranians. They've been building more missiles, more missiles, more missiles. They've been repairing.

And so we're just going to start where we left off—with Iran inflicting huge damage on U.S. bases, on nations that support the United States, on Israel. And then, in the end, the United States, confronted with the fact that its normal strike packages don't cause any change in Iranian behavior, will threaten to strike energy targets. Then the rest of the Arab world will step in and say, "You can't, because then they'll strike us and it's all over—we lose everything." The Saudis aren't happy about this. I think the United Arab Emirates might be the only country that's happy about what the U.S. is doing, but that's because they have no choice.

They're facing their own existential crisis. I just can't imagine Trump doing this, because this would be the war that cements the fact that he lost. There will be no recovery from this. Our economy—the global economy—will collapse. Again, I just want to ask people to think about what happens when all European airlines shut down. It's not about tourism, people. That's how things are moved, that's how commerce is done, trade is done. And if you're shutting that down, remember: as goes

aviation fuel, so goes diesel fuel. So you're going to see a reduction in the ability of trucks to transport. It's the end of the European economy. The European economy will not function.

And the same thing is going to happen to the United States. So Trump can't continue this disastrous model forever. Iran literally holds all the cards. Trump has to be smart enough to know that the lies Pete Hegseth told him in the first phase are still lies today—nothing's changed to suddenly make them true. This is why I think you're seeing Trump be so aggressive. Because remember, half the play here is Trump's ability to convince a significant portion of the American audience that he was the decisive player—that without him, we wouldn't have a peaceful outcome. So there's this theater taking place right now.

#Glenn

Yeah, I think he went on social media and wrote something along those lines—if he weren't president right now, the world would be ripped apart, or something like that. Which is usually the kind of thing you hear from an arsonist masquerading as a fireman. But another area where all of this could spread the war further is the Chinese aspect, because it seems that the blockade on Iran, to some extent at least, is aimed at targeting China, given that they're overwhelmingly the main importer of Iranian oil.

And we also heard some comments from an American senator, and also from Glenn Diesen, that the Chinese shouldn't get oil. This was kind of part of the objective, but there were also threats of sanctioning Chinese banks for trading with Iran. It looks like, whether or not this was initially an objective or if it's just becoming a—yeah, a side effect—it nonetheless seems to be intensifying or worsening relations between the U.S. and China as well. Not the best move, probably, given the problems they're already facing with Russia and Iran. But do you think this is contained, or how do you expect the Chinese to respond if the blockade continues?

#Scott Ritter

Well, first of all, we need to understand that this issue of oil and energy security for China is a very sensitive one, because this war has basically exposed the soft underbelly of the Chinese economy—its sustainable supply of energy. The cutting off of Iranian oil to China is significant. There haven't been replacements found. China needs this energy, and this has now caused a different stance. The Chinese have been quite clear in saying, "Do not challenge the dragon on issues of sovereignty." You know, Beijing can say what it wants, they can sanction banks, but they have to be careful, because China's loaded for bear. And, you know, there are a lot of cards China can play economically now that this has become an existential issue.

Because, you know, in the past, China wanted to avoid causing economic difficulties on the periphery of a larger, well-functioning Chinese economy. But left unaddressed, the issue of energy security could cause great harm to the Chinese economy. So I don't think the Chinese are messing

around. First of all, how many Chinese tankers has the United States turned around? The answer is none. So I think, again, this is rhetoric on the part of the United States. I think the impact is zero. I don't think we've stopped one Chinese-flagged vessel, nor do I think we're going to stop any Chinese-flagged vessels, because there is no legal justification for this. And China has been very strict.

You know, the United Arab Emirates sent a high-level delegation to China to meet with the Chinese, and they started lecturing the Chinese about Iran and the need to cut back support. They were cut off, and the Chinese Foreign Ministry said, "You don't get to tell the dragon what to do with its foreign relations. We do what we want to do, when we want. We've been friends, but not friends enough that you get to tell us what to do." And this is the Chinese approach right now. So, I think again, Scott Besson, first of all, you have to understand we don't have a well-thought-out plan. If we did, we would have executed it up front. This is a plan that's being made up as it goes along. You know, and again, it's designed to shape perception, not reality. The perception is that the president put China in its place. The reality is, the president's words and American actions haven't impacted this at all. China continues to get a flow of energy from Iran, and the United States hasn't been able to stop that.

#Glenn

If this is compelling China to take a more forceful stand in the international system, that's quite a terrible achievement, given that for decades their key strategy has been not to create too many waves, not to raise their voice too much in the international system, so as not to provoke any great power rivalry. But if they're put in a situation like this, where they're now forced to take some action—well, this is a disaster if one wanted a benign China.

Just my last question, though, is about, you know, behind all the bluster—all these statements by Trump that they're going to give up all of their enriched uranium, that is, the Iranians—and we're going to give them nothing back. They're not going to get any money, nothing. I mean, behind all this, it doesn't make much sense. So, behind all this, is there any negotiation going on that gives you any reason for optimism, either with Iran or Russia, for that matter? Or is diplomacy—does it seem dead at this point?

#Scott Ritter

Well, we know for a fact that the peace talks in Islamabad never ended. J.D. Vance, Witkoff, and Kushner went home. The senior Iranian delegation went home. But both sides left a number of technical experts who are continuing to work out, you know, to finalize the Islamabad Memorandum of Understanding as a final deal. And so, you know, I think there's a deal here. I think we're going to see a deal. I think Donald Trump just has to create the perception that this deal wouldn't have happened without his decisive intervention.

#Glenn

Well, that would be one of his crazy comments. They seem irrational, but it could be a rational move if it's in expectation of a deal being made. Because if he thinks a deal is going to happen, one of the biggest constraints would be selling a defeat to the U.S., to the American public—since, as I said before, he's got a midterm coming up. But if he can do enough chest-beating and strongman poses before the peace deal, then perhaps this will help him sell a defeat as a victory. Maybe he knows what he's doing. I often get the impression that he's a bit all over the place and getting more erratic about it—I'm hoping I'm wrong. But yeah, how about the Russian issue then? Because we haven't really heard much more about the negotiations. I mean, there are still talks, but I get the impression from Moscow that they're not putting much weight into this anymore, that they don't really think it's going to lead anywhere significant.

#Scott Ritter

I think, I mean, again, this is analysis done in a vacuum because, as you said, there's not much data out there to get your hands on. My feeling is that Donald Trump has given the Russians a blank check and said, "Do what you need to do to get where you need to get." And, you know, the window isn't going to be open forever. But I think Trump has said, "You have this year—until the November election, or right before it—to deliver what he wants," which I believe is a Ukrainian peace deal he can present to the American people before the midterm elections. So he can now become the peace... this is his whole theme right now.

My decisive intervention leads to world peace. And he keeps talking about, you know, "We have overseen the greatest reset of the world," and so on. I think Trump has a completely hands-off posture on Ukraine and has basically given the Russians an open door to do whatever they need to do to get this thing wrapped up so that, come August, there won't be a discussion about Ukraine giving up territory—because Russia will have taken it. And I think you'll see a more fundamentally weakened and chastened Ukraine and Europe. Again, I think a decisive Russian strike against Europe would be extraordinarily demoralizing for Europe and could help push Europe into accepting the necessity of a peace treaty.

#Glenn

So that's what I think is happening right now.

#Scott Ritter

I think, you know, Trump wants—Trump needs—this war to come to an end politically. This is all about politics, all about the politics of Donald Trump. So I think he's basically telling the Russians,

"We're not interfering. You do what you need to do." And then, if the results get to where we can bring—what we hope you do is create the results that make many of the Ukrainian objections moot—then we can finalize it.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, it appears that it might be coming to an end now—in Ukraine, that is. It could still go on for many months, but I don't think it's going to be possible to, you know, turn it around. It seems like the advantage is shifting only in Russia's favor, so it's going to be impossible to reverse that, especially after the consequences of the Iran war. It still surprises me that none of the Europeans are picking up the phone to call the Kremlin and at least start talking about possible solutions. But here we are. Anyway, thank you very much for taking the time.

#Scott Ritter

Well, thank you very much for having me.