

Scott Ritter: Why Washington Can't Stop the New Middle East

See Full Interview: https://www.youtube.com/live/euTjsj7OonU?si=FhGDSb2_drGj_VqD Follow me: Substack: https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page X (Twitter): https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA Patreon: https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=

#Nima

Scott, how do you see the future of the GCC countries? Because they have two ways to understand the reality — the new reality of the Middle East, the Strait of Hormuz, the Persian Gulf — either you get closer to Israel, the position of Israel... Why? What is your understanding of the GCC countries and the way they're behaving? We see some sort of fracture, some sort of difference happening — you know, the UAE together with Kuwait and Bahrain on one side, and Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Oman maybe on the other side. Is that the same way in your assessment? Yeah.

#Scott

Yeah, with the UAE being the worst of the worst. I mean, they actually allowed Israeli troops on their soil with Iron Dome during the last conflict. So they've become an extension of Israel into the Persian Gulf. So the UAE is Israel. And, you know, I don't know. Kuwait, they can sit there and posture all they want. Kuwait's literally got zero negotiating position. They don't have a military at all. They're not generating any income. Last month they shipped zero. Qatar's is bad. I mean, their LNG is shut down. They've been damaged. It's going to take a long time to get up and running. You know, and so they need peace, but, you know, they have an outdated air base. They have to deal with that reality. You know, Bahrain, poor little tiny Bahrain. You know, they not only have an unpopular, you know, tyrant as their leader, a Sunni.

Uh, but they have a Shia majority that, you know, could very well rise up, and nobody wants that in the Gulf Arab countries. Uh, Saudi Arabia, we now, you know, interesting, uh, you know, statements or an article by, um, Prince Turki, the former head of intelligence, um, you know, talking about, um, the role of Israel and, um, you know, pushback by Saudi Arabia. Um, there is no unity amongst the Gulf, the GCC countries. I think the GCC as an institution is finished. You're already seeing, you know, there's always been long animosity between Saudi Arabia and the Arab Emirates that's manifested itself in, you know, geopolitical contests on the African continent. The United Arab Emirates has been exposed as a nation that is hypocritical as the day is long.

The genocide that they supported in Sudan and elsewhere, you know, is only matched by the genocide that their new ally Israel commits against fellow Arabs, the Palestinians. So the future of the GCC, I think, is very stark. First of all, we just need to recognize that none of them are democratic countries. None of them. They all have these royal families that have been given the throne by British imperialists. And they're still beholden in many ways to Britain and to the United States for their security. They're people who have no legitimacy other than the fact that they have a lot of money that's generated from the wealth of their resources that allows them to create little bubbles of wealth that foreign investors, expatriates, and locals find attractive.

But they're not good people. At the end of the day, many of them aren't. I mean, I'm not saying all of them are bad, but I'm saying that none of them live in the world of reality. None of them know what hard work is. None of them know what it means to have to be responsible with your budget. These are people who, on a whim, can fly to London in a 747, stay in the best hotels, go shopping, and come back and not even blink about it. They don't live in the same world as we do. And they've been able to build up this artificial bubble of wealth and significance under an American umbrella of security that no longer exists.

And I think they're waking up to the fact—everybody but the United Arab Emirates—although I think they know what the reality is, they're so heavily committed to the Israel-American axis that they can't pull back. But the other GCC countries, I think they're waking up to the reality that the world has changed and it's not going back to the way it was. And that if they're going to survive, if these political and economic elites are going to stay in power, they're going to have to adapt to this new reality. And that new reality is that Iran is here. Iran is not going away, and they're going to have to learn how to live in peace and harmony with Iran. Maybe not best friends, but not enemies either. And that the role played by the United States must be diminished or eliminated altogether.

That the day and age of American military infrastructure dominating the region is over. That in order to move forward with Iran, you're going to have to send the American military packing. So that's what I think is happening right now. It's very interesting to see the role that Saudi Arabia is going to play in this. But it's also interesting to see what role Turkey is going to play. People have to remember that Turkey has close relationships with the Qataris. Turkey is a regional player as well. So there's a big Turkish military presence in Qatar. So they're there. But I just think it's a brave new world right now in the Persian Gulf, one where Iran is dominant. And you have all these people right now that refuse to acknowledge that.

I mean, the president calls anybody who recognizes reality a traitor, treasonous. And then you have a bunch of think tanks. I mean, look at Robert Kagan. He wrote a big article in *The Atlantic* that says, you know, checkmate Iran, making it sound like Iran did everything right. But his solution isn't to work with Iran to create a better world. His solution is a bigger war. A bigger war. There's not going to be a bigger war. Where are the troops going to come from? In order to generate the 1.2 to 2 million-strong army America would need to actually physically occupy Iran, if that could even be

done, we don't have that military. We'd have to go into conscription. And the American people aren't, I don't think, ready to die to invade Iran. For what purpose?

Why? You know, it hasn't been articulated. It's not as though Iran carried out a Pearl Harbor attack against the United States. We carried out the Pearl Harbor attack against them. So I think it's a new world, and the GCC countries are going to have to adapt to this world. And I don't think the GCC is long for this world, because you can't speak of a GCC whose existence is predicated on opposing Iran continuing to exist when Iran... It's like saying NATO can exist and have good relations with Russia. It's impossible. NATO will never be able to have good relations with Russia. So if Europe wants to have better relations with Russia, NATO has to go away. And if the Gulf Arab states want to have better relations with Iran, the GCC has to go away.

#Nima

Yeah. You remember Russia, one of the main objectives of Russia in this war in Ukraine was to reach a security architecture for the region. They're basically, China and Russia together with Iran, talking about a new security architecture for the Persian Gulf. And do you see it would be the same way that we've been witnessing with the case of Russia, where, you know, one party doesn't want to participate in that sort of security architecture — I'm talking about the Europeans. They're not willing to, you know, cooperate with Russia to reach that sort of agreement. But how is that going to, putting that case of Russia aside, how is that going to get, you know, these countries in the Persian Gulf coming together and having a new security architecture? Is that going to happen, in your opinion?

#Scott

Well, first of all, I think you say put aside Russia, but we can't. We have to start with Russia and Russia's relationship with Europe. Your assessment of Europe not being prepared is outdated.

#Nima

Yeah.

#Scott

Because right now, as we speak, Europe's getting strangled economically because of the energy. Exactly. And what we see more and more is Europe saying, we've got to learn how to talk with Russia. And you have Europeans saying we have no choice but to talk about how we can get back on, you know, and start getting Russian energy flowing in. It's required for our survival.

#Nima

They're really dying, you know — the conflict in Milan.

#Scott

Yeah, so now we have the Gulf Arab nations. And it's sort of that they don't need Iranian oil, but they need Iran to give them permission to sell their oil, to sell their energy. They're dying. They have no future. They're going to have to do business with Iran. This is the thing. There is no alternative. They can choose a path of confrontation where they seek regime change in Iran, but that's already been tried and it failed. And, you know, Iran is on a different level of escalation management now. They manage their escalation up to the point of no return. But the next time this war starts, I think Iran crosses the point of no return and eliminates the Gulf Arab states as economically and politically viable nations. And I think the Gulf Arab states are starting to recognize this reality.

And therefore, there is the absolute necessity of normalizing relations with Iran under a new paradigm, a new security architecture. So I think, you know, in a way, Europe and the Middle East are both facing the same harsh reality. How do you adapt to a world where the United States is no longer present and no longer capable of providing the security guarantees that it once did, around which you built everything? Now you have to take responsibility for security. And by doing so, can you sustain the hostile posture that Europe, for instance, has against Russia and the Gulf Arab states have against Iran? The answer is no, you can't. You're going to have to learn how to de-escalate and work in peaceful harmony with Russia in the case of Europe, or Iran in the case of the Gulf Arab states.

#Nima

You've mentioned that Donald Trump is not going to get any sort of agreement, or he's not capable of making a new agreement with Iran. But you believe that he may get a deal with Iran. What does that mean for the United States and for Donald Trump himself as he's headed toward the midterm elections in the United States? And we know, what's the tone, what's the understanding of the American people right now?

#Scott

Well, understanding that, A, as I said before, it's impossible to accurately describe what's going on inside the brain of Donald Trump. And you can't really answer that question unless you know what's going on inside his brain. And B, I don't pretend to speak on behalf of the Iranian nation. I mean, they get to make their final decisions. And I've heard Iranian officials say, we're not here to create a politically viable off-ramp for Donald Trump. Because that's something I've been saying, and I continue to say, that the only way this war comes to an end is if people make it politically possible for Donald Trump to declare some sort of victory.

Now, what are the two issues that are the most important right now? Nuclear and Strait of Hormuz. On the nuclear, I think, you know, the key here is for Donald Trump to be able to tell the American people that the pathway for an Iranian bomb has been closed permanently. And the deal that the Omani government had been able to help facilitate and negotiate as of February 26th did just that. And that means that from a purely political standpoint, the president is going to say he got a better deal than Barack Obama did, and that's a political victory. So I think anything Iran can do to make the February 26th agreement a reality, and there may have to be some other things.

First of all, we don't know the total details of what was in the February 26th deal, but, you know, I do think that, you know, Iran shipping the 60% enriched uranium out of Iran to a non-U.S. party, let's call it Russia, is the path forward. The Iranians right now seem to be reticent—not not supporting that—but that's because they don't want to be seen as caving in to the threats of the United States. But if this issue is pitched a different way, perhaps with a middleman—Russia or China, or both pitching it—and the president is told maybe don't declare victory till after the deal is consummated, I think you can solve the nuclear problem. I don't think it's an insurmountable issue, regardless of what the president says.

I think it's actually one of the more easily resolved issues. The Strait of Hormuz is more complicated because Iran can't give up the control that it now has manifested, because that is the key to their deterrence against continued conflict. But, you know, it's very difficult to imagine any peace agreement where the world and the Gulf Arab states allow themselves to be held hostage by the whim of Iran. So I think there's a compromise there. This is where I think the Chinese will step in, offer certain, you know, reconstruction incentives for Iran there, work with the United States to get sanctions lifted—not in the long term, but in the short term—to get frozen assets unfrozen quickly.

And in exchange, to have Iran agree to some sort of joint stewardship agreement of the Hormuz Strait with maybe Oman, which they've already talked about. You know, some sort of compromise there where it's not 100% Iranian-controlled, where there's a joint thing and it's based upon... See, even though the United States is agreement-incapable, I do think that China can create an agreement within the GCC states and Iran regarding the implementation of some sort of deal with the Strait of Hormuz. And if you solve those two problems, everything else resolves itself because, you know, Iran can insist on having U.S. bases.

That creates a political problem. But the reality is the U.S. isn't going to be able to keep their bases in the region because they've been blown up. And for these other states to be part of this Hormuz project, you know, maybe you can't have military bases on your soil or something of that nature. So I think, you know, the United States' footprint will be reduced significantly, which, again, is one of the Iranian demands. You know, when it comes to sanctions being lifted, I think you're going to see the nuclear sanctions go away. I think the missile sanctions might stay in place—one of those unspoken things where we don't talk about them getting rid of their missiles, but we're not going to reward them, you know, some sort of compromise there.

But it'll go away over time, because I think in the long term, what the Russians and the Chinese are going to tell the Iranians is, the closer you embrace us, the more difficult you make it for Israel and the United States to resume military operations down the road. If you want a security guarantee, then pivot to the east, embrace, and start investing, start becoming part of that system. And you'll make it impossible for the United States and Israel to talk about resuming conflict. And once you get the Gulf Arab states to agree to peaceful coexistence with Iran, you know, you undermine the Abraham Accords, which means now Israel's in a huge problem. It's like, you know, going to buy a new house thinking you had collateral to put up, but finding you have no collateral.

You know, the Abraham Accords are the collateral for Greater Israel—you know, the potential of economic development and prosperity. When that shuts down, there is no more economic prosperity, no more economic development. And Israel is not talking about sustaining Greater Israel; it's about surviving as Israel currently exists. Is that even possible without the Abraham Accords? I think the answer is no. So, but this is, I think, there's a grand deal, a grand bargain to be made there. I also think that the United States and Russia—that Russia stepping in to help out the United States—will put more pressure on Ukraine and the European nations to accept terms that will be acceptable to Russia.

Trump will get a twofer. And that's the other way you sell it to the American people: I broke the global paradigm. I helped resolve the Iranian problem that nobody else has been able to do. And I also get credit now for bringing an end to the war with Russia. Because that's all the malignant narcissist wants—credit. To be honest, to stroke his ego. He doesn't care about, he's not smart enough to understand the substance. Stroke his ego, and I'm all in favor of that right now if it brings about a just and equitable peace for Iran and for the region. Scott, as we talk, we know that Lavrov is in India—he just arrived in India—and the foreign ministers of BRICS countries are going to...

#Nima

You know, they have a meeting there on May 14 to May 15, two days of meetings. And when it comes to Donald Trump, you remember that Donald Trump was so much concerned about the dollar and the future of the dollar. And right now, with the new war in the Middle East, I see these BRICS countries coming together in a way that they need some sort of alternative. They have to do something about it. And how do you see BRICS finding its way? Because we have all these countries together. We know the differences among these countries, and they're not perfect.

But they understand perfectly their differences, as we saw with the case of Russia and India during the war in Ukraine, as we saw with the case of Iran and India during the war between Iran and the United States. India somehow being tricky toward Russia, toward Iran, but after all, they're part of BRICS. And you don't see any sort of tension between Russia and India, between Iran and India,

because the states, the two governments, perfectly understand the position of the other. And these countries are getting together. What is BRICS? What is the future of BRICS? And how do they see a better future for the peace and prosperity of the countries that are part of BRICS?

#Scott

You know, BRICS has great potential. There's no doubt about that. But, you know, Donald Trump is openly hostile toward BRICS. And the United States still retains the ability to move the global economic and geopolitical needle. And so, you know, Venezuela was a... is to take Venezuela off the board. Venezuela was courting BRICS membership. That's been eliminated. It's a message to Brazil about the dominance of the United States. And then this whole, you know, the idea to, you know, get rid of Iran as a BRICS member and replace it with a government friendly to the United States, you know, to isolate Russia, to break up Russia and China, and to keep India more on the side of the West than on the side of the East.

Trump has been working really hard over time to kill BRICS. And I have to say, before the Iran war, he was doing a pretty good job. He was doing a pretty good job. He was making it complicated for BRICS to grow and mature the way that many of the world leaders who were part of BRICS had envisioned. But today, BRICS is an extremely viable thing. A key to it, of course, is the continued survival of Iran. And I think that what you're seeing in these meetings is the BRICS nations coming together to view Iran as a pathway toward their collective relevance. Whether or not they're going to be able to resolve the dollar issue, I'm not a smart enough economist to answer that question.

I just will point out some basic things that I focus on. Again, Michael Hudson out there and all the smart people out there might say, well, Scott, you're not focused on the right thing. I accept that. My résumé does not say world-renowned economist. But I am a world-renowned guy who owns dollars. What I know about the dollar is that when we linked it to the petrodollar, we pumped more dollars out there than anybody else in the world. In fact, our entire system, the way the global economy works, is premised on the petrodollar. People keep saying they want to replace the petrodollar with gold. With gold.

With what? What nation's out there willing to sacrifice all of the rational economic stability that they've imparted through structures and discipline and say, let's do it? We're just going to start printing yuan or rupees or rubles. Just print them, because that's how you have a petrodollar — you just print dollars. The Chinese aren't ready for that. No one's ready for that. There is no currency in the world that can do that. Now, you can have localized relations where you trade currencies, and we see that right now. Iran is doing that with Russia and all that. But there's a limit.

There's a cap because there's only a finite amount of those currencies available, and those nations aren't in the business of just running printing presses anymore, or they never have been. So I think one of the things that Russia and China are looking for is to bring stability back into the global economic system, which means that the dollar will be retained for the moment as the global reserve

currency. Now, other nations can offset that with baskets of currencies and things of that nature. But I don't think anybody is ready to have an absolute replacement for the dollar. And until you're ready to replace the dollar, you have to learn to deal with the dollar.

And this is, again, why I think the meetings with Xi — you know, the interesting thing now is there's actually talk about a meeting between Putin and Trump before the year's over, that there's whispers of this kind of thing happening. I think we're seeing the United States, because of the loss in Iran, having to readjust its global ambitions. First of all, we need the petrodollar to survive. Our economy is absolutely — we can't survive without it. It would lead to total collapse of the dollar. And nobody in the world wants that. As much as people hate the United States, you need to understand, we are the largest economy in the world. I mean, the world will not function without our economy. That doesn't mean that we're the driver.

#Nima

The regime of sanctions is destroying that as we speak.

#Scott

Sanctions are horrible. It's stupid. It's suicidal. It's dumb. It's crazy. I agree. I'm not defending the regime of sanctions. I'm saying that the world isn't seeking to destroy the American economy. The Trump presidency is seeking to destroy the American economy through tariffs and sanctions. I think you're going to see a normalization of that because of this, because we need stability right now. Trump can't back up the arrogant posture that, you know, the national security strategy was putting forward, and Scott Ritter has been trying to project economically. We can't do that. We're going to have to learn to get along with nations. We're agreement-incapable because, you know, I would never trust the United States at this point in time. Don't ever let your guard down.

But the point is, you know, reality dictates solutions. And the current reality is that the American vision of continued hegemony is dashed. We don't have the military ability to sustain that, the economic prowess to sustain that. And we no longer have the ability to leverage threats of American physical violence or economic violence into achieving outcomes that we dictate. We're going to have to work with the world. As imperfect as it is to work with America, that's just the reality. This Chinese trip — all eyes should be on it, because this is the first test of whether or not Donald Trump is capable of adjusting to new realities. I mean, if he comes out of China and has achieved nothing, that's a signal that the United States is incapable of not just reaching an agreement, but even conceiving an agreement.

That conceptually, Trump is unable to adjust his narcissistic worldview to reality. So it'll be interesting to see. The meeting in India right now, I think, is again—remember, as much as America is trying to adjust to these realities, the world's adjusting to this new reality too. It's a brave new world out there. This time, three months ago, no one was talking about, you know, America being

powerless. I mean, everybody's talking about Taiwan, you know, they were saying, yeah, well, American carrier battle group, the Americans think they're going to do this and the other thing. But there's always a little question in people's minds: could America pull it off? I mean, you know, today, there's just no debate. We don't have the capacity to pull it off. Europe is no longer talking about American air power being dominant.

We recognize that there are limitations to American air power, especially when we expend all of our long-range standoff munitions. So Europe is now talking about how to go it alone. What's going to happen to AUKUS? What's going to happen to the Quad? What's going to happen to the tripartite agreement with South Korea, Japan, and the United States now that we've stripped all of the air defense systems out of there? We just told the Japanese, you know, one of their big things was the ability to guarantee to strike back if they were struck by North Korea, to have their own capability to strike back. This was premised on 400 Tomahawk missiles that they were buying from the United States.

And we just told them, no, you ain't getting them. And the entire Japanese strategy was built around that. Now they have to reconsider it. The world has to adjust. America's ostensible friends and allies have to adjust. But the people in opposition to the United States have to adjust. And I think what's going on in India right now is the great adjustment. But, you know, you seem more optimistic about India than I am. I am not optimistic about India because I don't think India... India hasn't made a strategic decision yet. Remember, India was in Israel making common cause with the Israelis right before this war started. That doesn't sit well. And India is problematic when it comes to China and Pakistan.

I mean, Pakistan... I think Pakistan is one of the great superstars of this crisis. The leadership that Pakistan has shown, the maturity that Pakistan has shown, the ability of Pakistan to work with the United States, with China, with Russia, with Iran, and others to create the potential for a diplomatic solution. If ever there was an entity that deserved the Nobel Peace Prize, if this conflict can be brought to an end, I think the Pakistani leadership deserves collectively the Nobel Peace Prize for the role they played in making peace possible. Because it's amazing what they've done. Superb diplomacy. But, you know, India is problematic. I mean, India is a problem child. It's big, it's powerful, but they don't know where they want to be in the world.

And as long as India is indecisive like that, now maybe this meeting will be the beginning of India's, you know, transition to being serious about BRICS. But right now India is not serious about BRICS. Not serious at all. India is more serious about, you know, G20 viability and, you know, hoping against hope to get an invitation into the G7, which will never happen. You know, India also continues to lobby for relevance at the Security Council, and they feel they need the United States' support to get that. So India is putting far too much weight on a relationship with the United States that's no longer globally relevant. I mean, the bottom line is India's future must be with repairing relations with China and turning BRICS into a formidable, viable international economic forum.

#Nima

Thank you so much, Scott, for being with us today. Just let me bring up your... Here it is. If you want to follow Scott, you can go on scottritter.com.

#Scott

Chapter 5. It took me forever to publish Chapter 5, but I got it out there.

#Nima

Yeah. There's something like a donation. You can go there and donate and help Scott because he's doing a tremendous job. He's doing everything. He's informing all of us.

#Scott

Let me just make a pitch on that because I have a trip coming up soon. People will find out later why I'm not committing to the day. Let me just put it this way: the Ukrainians have tried to kill me three times, and I don't want to help them on the fourth. So I'm a little... I'm not as detail-oriented as maybe I should be, but there's a trip coming up, you know. The trip seeks to comprehensively reset my database when it comes to Russia. You know, I've traveled to Russia a lot recently, but it's primarily Moscow and St. Petersburg doing interviews. But it hasn't been the deep dive into Russia that I actually did in 2023, 2024. So I'm operating off of perceptions and insights that were developed two years ago, more than two years ago. And as an analyst, I have a duty and responsibility to update that.

So I have a trip coming up that's designed to do just that. But I go as an independent journalist. I'm not sponsored by anybody. Nobody pays my airfare. Nobody pays for my hotels. They don't pay for my food. They don't pay for anything. If I interview somebody, I book the studio. I pay for the videographer, the whole thing. And it ain't cheap. But if you think what I'm doing is important—and I feel, look, I just had, my daughter just gave birth to a grand... I got a granddaughter now. And, you know, whereas in the past, what I did was more out of, I mean, there was a sense of moral responsibility as a global citizen, but it was also based upon, you know, just intellectual curiosity, meaning that I do this because it interests me.

Um, my moral compass has been reset, meaning that this is no longer just intellectual curiosity. The work I'm doing to try and promote peace and everything is now a personal crusade—not on my behalf. I'm old. But for my granddaughter. I got a couple of years of viability left, as long as these knees work and this brain works and the heart keeps ticking. I'm not going to go gently into that good night. I'm going to rage, rage against the dying of the light. That's sort of a takeoff of Dylan Thomas's poem. But the responsibility is on all of us now to work to make the world a better place. And I've spent a lot of time over the course of the past several years, you know, buying into the

notion of generational gaps. You know, I'm a boomer, and, you know, people make fun of us boomers.

Okay. And there's Zoomers, and then there's Gen X and Gen Z and all this other stuff. And with the birth of my granddaughter, I've come to the conclusion that's just all total bullshit—that there are no generational gaps. We are a collective of humans, and if we don't work together collectively, we'll die collectively. That's the fate of all of us if we don't learn how to figure this thing out. And so the idea that boomers need to step aside—I'm sorry, I ain't gonna step aside. I'll follow if somebody wants to take the lead, but if you're not gonna take the lead, the old Marine in me says, then take charge and move forward. And right now, there are very few people doing what we're doing. We have to lead by example.

And so I will continue to keep doing this work to lead by example and hopefully get people to say, hey, let's help them. And then they can take over. My knees give out, I can pass the baton off to them. But I'm not going to sit on the sidelines. I'm not going to sit back and take it easy. Even my wife is on my side now. I mean, the birth of this granddaughter—because she was one of these, "You've done enough, caused enough trouble in your life, maybe you want to sit back and we're just going to take the easy path into retirement." And now she understands the absolute urgency of what we're doing, what I'm doing, what you're doing, what everybody's doing. So that's a long way of saying, if you support this and you think the work that I'm doing contributes, you can go to [scottritter.com](https://www.scottritter.com). It takes you to my Substack page.

The subscription is free, so you can get access to about 90% of what's up there on the tabs for free. It doesn't cost you a thing. A paid subscription pays my salary. That means the lights, the computers, the roof over my head, food in my refrigerator—that's what pays my salary. The donations allow me to travel. The donations are purely to support taking independent journalism on the road. And right now there's a need. I mean, you always need a paycheck, but there's a bigger need for donations than there is for paid subscriptions, because I've got this trip coming up, and there are certain fiscal realities that manifest themselves. The ruble gets stronger—that makes it more difficult for me, because that means that what used to cost X amount of dollars costs X plus.

The price of aviation fuel has made plane tickets one-third more expensive. Everything gets more expensive. I'm going to take the trip. Things are going to happen, but any donations you provide are what I call trip enhancers, meaning the more resources you have, the more opportunities you have when you go on this trip. So if people wish to support, please go to the Donate button, click it, but also support Nima. Support everybody, but support Nima. I don't know what you do to get support—subscriptions, clicks, whatever—but whatever Nima does, do it. If you think this discussion was valuable, this guy's a rising superstar, or he's already entered. When we first talked, you just started this, right? It was almost like a hobby for you. I mean, it was like, you know, I'm bored in Brazil. What am I going to do?

I'll just do this little dialogue thing. But you've turned into an institution that, I mean, the whole world respects the work that you're doing. And what you're doing is important because I love the title, Dialogue Works. It does work. Dialogue works. Works for what? Works for peace. And so help Nima promote dialogue. Give him the opportunities to interview better people than me. There are people out there right now. I come back because he's a friend. He asked me. We do it. But at some point in time, I'm going to become irrelevant. But keep Nima viable so that more people come in and talk to him. Get the bigger names out there. Get the better analysts. Get this dialogue thing working. That can only work if you support him. It doesn't happen in a vacuum. And support everybody. I mean, we brought up other names.

We speak about Larry Johnson. We speak about Judge Napolitano. We speak about Garland Nixon. We speak about Danny Haiphong. You know, everybody. This is the tip of the spear when it comes to independent journalism. These are the people that create the opportunity, Glenn Diesen, to have dialogue outside of the controlled framework of mainstream media. Support independent journalism. You'll keep this kind of discussion going well beyond the time when my knees stop working, my brain goes. I mean, one of these days I'll be drooling into a cup. So, you know, it'll be what it'll be. But if we create institutions that survive the personalities, then the institution of independent journalism—non-corporate sponsored, non-government controlled—is an institution that needs to be sustained over time.