

Richard Wolff: Iran Exposed America's Biggest Weakness

Richard Wolff joins us to discuss the changing balance of power in the Middle East, the limits of American military dominance, the future of the petrodollar system, and the rise of artificial intelligence in the workplace. Support Independent media to remain bold: <https://patreon.com/IndiaGlobalLeft> Link for donation: <https://paypal.me/sankymudiar> In this interview we discuss:

- How the United States became deeply entangled in the Middle East
- Whether Washington overestimated its military power and underestimated Iran
- The strategic vulnerabilities of modern supply chains and economic warfare
- Why Gulf states are diversifying their alliances
- The future of the petrodollar system and American financial power
- How AI is reshaping class relations and labor organizing
- What strategies workers need in the age of automation

Richard Wolff is Professor Emeritus of Economics and host of Economic Update. He is one of the world's most influential Marxist economists and a leading analyst of capitalism, class struggle, and global political economy. Follow us on Substack: <https://substack.com/@indiagloballeft> Twitter: <https://twitter.com/Indiagloballeft> Instagram <https://www.instagram.com/indiagloballeft/> Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61559411353392> Spotify: <https://open.spotify.com/show/69Y9iCWUv8ha3ATsPWtWk0?si=ee1f0de3de094f17> Telegram: <https://t.me/+WNIqoiv1Rhg5NjEx> #RichardWolff #Iran #MiddleEast #Petrodollar #AI #ClassWar #Economy #Capitalism #Geopolitics #USForeignPolicy

#Mudiar

Hello and welcome to another episode of India and Global Left. If you are new to the show, please hit that subscribe button. Also, consider becoming a YouTube member, a patron, or donating a small amount using the link in the description box. Without further ado, let me welcome our guest tonight, Professor Richard Wolff. Professor Wolff is a renowned American economist. Professor Wolff, welcome back to India and Global Left.

#Richard

Glad to be here.

#Mudiar

I wanted to hear your thoughts about what we are seeing between Iran and the United States. Of course, the talks, the meeting in Geneva, have been canceled or paused for now because the Iranian side is saying that Israel has been violating the deal by massacring people in Lebanon. How do you describe the situation in which the U.S. has found itself in West Asia?

#Richard

It is almost a classical dead end. I expect that the greater poets of India and China and Europe will, in the months and years to come, rewrite the story of what has gone on these last few months as a kind of epic changing phenomenon. It certainly looks that way from where I sit in New York City in the United States at this time. The United States made a colossal blunder. It misunderstood the politics of Iran. It misunderstood the domestic situation—let's call it ideological, emotional, whatever words you want to use. It misunderstood the military capability of Iran. And finally, it misunderstood the very long-distance supply chains that the last 40 years of globalization have created and that carried in them not just profitability, which is why they were created, but also vulnerability.

And it's because you don't have in your mind the sort of Hegelian, Marxian idea that everything comes together with its opposite. So you better make sense of where the opposite is, because if you imagine to yourself that there is no opposite, you're just going to miss it, and it's going to come and surprise you when it shows up. And that's what I have the feeling is happening to us now. We are witnessing something that I've discussed with you and with Professor Padnaik and so on, which is the decline of the American empire, the relentless decline. It doesn't happen all in a straight line. It doesn't take the same form from one period to another.

But in terms of the longer view, it is a relentless decline. And here is another example. This is a defeat for the United States. It misunderstood, and it is now paying the price of misunderstanding. But because it doesn't understand, the price it is willing to pay may get larger and larger and take down other countries and involve other mistakes. There really is no end to all of this. And by the way, the decline of the empire is also bringing down American capitalism here at home. And it is also bringing down the career of Mr. Trump, which at this point is looking grimmer domestically than it has at any point in his first or second presidency.

#Mudiar

Talking about the misunderstanding, the U.S. administration also misunderstood its own military capabilities, and that is tied to your comment about the misunderstanding of the vulnerabilities that the global supply chain has brought along. So if you could tell us a little bit more about this, because I'm also curious if you think — and this is something I guess we do often on the left — drawing a distinction between the population at large and the state. Do you think that going forward there will be more and more people within the United States who would raise questions about not just the irrationality of politics, the military machine, or the military empire, but also its efficacy, also its efficiency? Because all this while it was said how great the U.S. military machine was, but Iran, probably ranked 24th or 25th within the global GDP, gave a bloody nose and scored a strategic victory over the United States. How did it all happen, and what is the implication of it going forward?

#Richard

Well, I would like to use a metaphor to explain my answer to your question. And the metaphor works like this. After World War II, for the first generation, 1945–1975, U.S. capitalism simply swept the world. All the other capitalists, having enjoyed—if that's the right word—several centuries of capitalist colonialism in places like India, but all over, culminated in the mutual destruction of all these colonial empires. The British, the French, the German, the Dutch, the Russian, the Japanese—it didn't really matter. They destroyed each other, with one exception: the U.S., between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and between the fact that air travel had not yet become the military mode par excellence.

It was too far away, and so the United States... I mean, I love to give my students the example that in World War II, it is estimated that something in the neighborhood of 25 or 26 million Russians died. Likewise, in World War II, 8 million Germans died. In World War II, the number of American dead was 400,000. In other words, there's no comparison in terms of the damage—physical, moral, emotional, structural, infrastructural—it doesn't matter. This is enormous, and this is tiny. And so the United States really went crazy and took over. The dollar replaced all other currencies as the global currency.

The IMF, the World Bank, all created mostly by Americans, or at least with a veto by the Americans. The gold standard with \$35 an ounce for gold, all the rest. And why is this important? Because the capitalists in all of the now secondary nations—Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and so on—slowly learned over those 30 years, '45 to '75, that if they were going to have any chance to survive in this new world order dominated by American capitalism, they would have to produce what the Americans produced, either at a better quality or at a lower price, or both. If they didn't do that, they would have no chance—the domination of the United States financially, militarily, left them no chance.

The only avenue was to exploit the capitalism of the United States under its rules and to defeat it. By the 1970s, they were beginning to do that. I can tell you, here in the United States, we stopped driving automobiles that said Ford or Chevrolet or Plymouth, and we started buying Volkswagen and Toyota and Nissan and all of that. It was a real wow. And today, we barely have an automobile industry left. Asian populations are producing the automobiles and buying them in a way that puts the United States in a very secondary position, even in the lives of these companies—Ford, General Motors, and so on—who are more active in Asia, for example, than they are in the United States.

We would have had to face this earlier, but two crucial developments postponed what the French would call a denouement at the end of these 30 years. The first one was the invention, if you like, of massive—and I mean massive—consumer credit. You reorganize the behavior of, first, the American working class and then, step by step, other working classes to become comfortable with bank loans at ridiculously high interest rates. I mean, for example, if you're a corporation, you can borrow money today in the United States at 4, 5, 6 percent. If you use a credit card, you are paying 17, 18, 19 percent. Not even close.

It's a tremendous bonanza covered by laws of all kinds allowing bankruptcy to be pursued or not pursued. For example, students who now borrow more money as a group than users of credit cards are not allowed to declare bankruptcy. They do not have the protection of the court if they can't pay their debts. It's extraordinary. The second thing was the petrodollar—the arrangement that everything in the world had to be paid, every transaction for oil had to be paid in dollars—accumulating them in a few places, which then lent that money to the United States, which could borrow wild amounts of money, leading to the present situation where the United States is the biggest debtor country the world has ever seen. Okay, why is that important?

Because here in the United States, there is a dawning awareness that this is a house of cards, that this is not working out well. And Iran is a wonderful, almost poetic metaphor. You have the greatest army in the world; this little country can defeat you. It found a vulnerability—the Strait of Hormuz. It found that its poor, mountainous, partly desert terrain is ideal for hiding missile silos and drone locations for production. And it's made an arrangement through the BRICS with Russia on the other side of the Caspian Sea, and then the Chinese manufacturing capability through Russia. So, I mean, the United States faces, therefore, an enemy which BRICS has organized into a network. So you're not just fighting Iran, you're fighting Russia and China, and that's an altogether different arrangement.

You know, I think there's a discovery that along with domination comes a determination on the part of other countries—smaller ones, weaker ones, poorer ones—to figure out how do you defeat the giant. You know, the Bible, other great books of human history, are full of little stories where that kind of thing has happened. David defeats Goliath. Goliath is huge. Goliath is powerful. David figures out that there's one little slingshot device. The Iranians figured out the vulnerability of the oil market and their position there, and they could, you know... And look, I think it's a parable because it works, once you look at it closely, even better. Here's the parallel. This is a country that is neglected, if you like, by the world, that's on the road, you know, from China in the east to Europe in the west. It's a little place along the road there.

It is not interesting to the West until oil. I mean, I'm exaggerating, but to give you the idea—oil. The minute oil—well, now it becomes part of the colonial project. When they make an effort, after already a long time, in 1953 with Mossadegh, to try to make a little election, put into office somebody who claims that he's going to use the oil to help the country of Iran rather than the oil companies of Britain, they overthrow him and do it crudely so that the whole country knows the CIA got rid of him. And they install a dictatorship that lasts for another generation. Okay, the way I read it, they began the minute the Shah was overthrown back in the 1970s. So, 50 years ago—half a century—they went to work to do what the capitalists did after World War II around the world. They looked at the United States.

They understood who their enemy was. The United States was against them from the day the Ayatollahs and the Mullahs made their revolution in Iran. They understood: how are we going to defeat a country with that air force, that navy, that army, that money, that... What have we, little

Iran, got? And they found it. And the message to the United States and to everyone watching is that what the Iranians did, everybody else is trying to figure out how to do, each in their own way, with their own traditions, their own religions, their own histories. They're trying to figure out how.

The poor United States doesn't understand still that it has gone from being the top dog to being the top target. And that they should have understood that those two things go together. That's Hegel's genius. That's why when Marx, in Volume 3 of Capital, teaches us that there's a tendency for the rate of profit to fall—something which Adam Smith and Ricardo had also—they called it the stationary state, when the economy stops growing. But Marx was different because, being the student of Hegel, in those three chapters in Volume 3, he talks about the tendency, then he talks about the counter-tendencies, and then he talks about the contradictions within the tendency. That's Hegel. That's teaching us: be careful.

Yes, there's something that goes that way. But that produces a reaction, and that is full of its own contradictions, shaped by its own context. Wow. This way of thinking would have, could have, saved the United States from what is happening now, which is that it's having to learn bitterly and slowly and painfully what it refused to think about. Partly the destruction inside the United States, which I hope people in the former colonial world are aware of, that alongside the United States' domination after World War II was the systematic destruction of the Marxist-Hegelian left in this country—deported, imprisoned, terrified of going in that direction. My professors—and I went to all the elite schools here.

My professors were terrified when I raised my hand and asked about Marxism. They weren't terrified about the substance. They were terrified that if they answered my question and seemed to be knowledgeable about Marxism, they would get a reputation that would destroy their career. So they would say to me, "Come to my office hours and we can talk about this, but don't ask me questions." And one of my teachers at Harvard, where I went to school in the 1970s—I went there in the 1960s—but who was teaching there? Henry Kissinger. And I had my class with him, and he explained to me how to do foreign affairs. I should have paid more attention. I would have understood it better, sooner.

#Mudiar

Right. You mentioned the falling rate of profit in the 1970s. And among the resolutions, you mentioned, too, in particular, the leverage—the debt being used instead of letting wages rise—being used as a trick to drive up consumption. The other was a global driver, where the U.S. created a global chain to suck in more consumer goods, but also global finance. And the strength of the petrodollar rests on West Asia. I mean, it was happening even before that solidified, because a lot of surplus in West Asia was plugged back into the U.S. through Europe, through the transatlantic financial system. And part of that was creating this police state—selling security, if you like, to the Gulf states—in exchange for their investment being plugged into the United States, which allowed the United States to drive down interest rates.

And that was very, very central to the explosion of credit. I mean, it couldn't have made that if interest rates were higher. So given this war has exposed the vulnerability of this gigantic empire, military empire—I mean, what was sold as an asset for the U.S. empire, both financial and military, this bloated empire—military outposts and bases in West Asia were marshaled to solidify its financial empire. Given that has been completely shaken up, given many countries, most countries, not just Saudi Arabia but even countries like the UAE, are now rethinking the viability of hosting these bases, it seems to me that the future of the U.S. financial system empire is very, very bad.

#Richard

Yes, it's bad on so many levels one doesn't know where to start. You're absolutely right. The Gulf states have discovered that the American military base that they welcomed as protection for them has had exactly the opposite effect. It has become a target. Iran understands that it can give a powerful response to every attack of the United States. And given the collapse of the conversations in Switzerland that happened already, you know, the resumption of military action could happen any day or any hour, for that matter, because the United States has no options anymore. So they understand that they are now targets, and they don't want to be targets, because the rocket can go a few miles either direction, and then it isn't a military base—it's the little bit of culture and development that they've achieved.

Okay. But there are other dimensions. Let me add them so you see how serious it is. The United States, more than you might imagine, is aware that it lost the war in Vietnam. It's aware that it lost the war in Afghanistan. And it's aware that it lost the war in Iraq. In each case, what it dreamed of—the regime changes, the reorientation—none of that has happened. You know, the enemy in Vietnam was the Communist Party of North Vietnam, and effectively, that's who runs the country now and ever since. And likewise, the Taliban was the enemy in Afghanistan. They run Afghanistan. I mean, there's no question you lost. And out of it came the notion that fighting a war in Asia on land with troops is a losing proposition. You can't do that. You can't do it. Okay, so what is your alternative?

High-tech air power. All right. Iran suggests, and this is causing unspeakable turmoil in Washington right now, Iran suggests that it may actually be even easier for little countries like Vietnam, poor countries like Afghanistan or Iraq, to defeat an air-based or techno-based attack than it was for Afghanistan and Vietnam to defeat America. You know, hundreds of thousands of military and army people coming into their country. And if they don't have high-tech air and they can't afford a land army, then, as the French say, *le tigre est en papier*. It's a paper tiger. It's the old joke of the Chinese. It looks like a tiger, but it's just a balloon. It's a kite. It's a piece of paper. It's not going to bite you. It can't bite you. It's just the image. Now, yes, the United States is still dangerous.

Yes, the United States threatens to cause real damage to get what it wants. And I'm not at all questioning that it will continue to try to do that. But it has taken an incredible blow having been

defeated here. Look, after the attack by Israel and the United States on Iran in June of last year, 2025—remember, it's now called the Twelve Day War—because it didn't last, because the Iranians were already then able to hit back in ways that the Americans and the Israelis had not understood. And Israel has an army of spies in these countries. That's why they're able to kill their leaders. That's how they could assassinate the Ayatollah and all the rest. They still didn't understand. It shows you, you can have the greatest spy apparatus, but if you don't understand what's going on, you're going to make one blunder after another.

The real question now will be whether this blunder can be learned from, or whether you will have—and I'm afraid it's more likely we will have—another effort, likely this time run by the Democrats, but basically to do the same thing and to end up in the same dilemma, just a different country. It won't be Iran, it'll be something else. Right now, there's interest in the new government in Israel under Mr. Bennett, if he wins, seems to have decided to leave Iran alone. They can't defeat Iran, but they're going to attack Turkey. So the next phase—and the Americans will, I don't know, go along—that issue is being fought out domestically. It is really important, and I say this as a Marxist, very important not to lose sight of the fact that the domestic struggle is the more... The international is very important.

Great power conflict is its own thing. It has what Louis Althusser used to call relative autonomy. It has to be understood. You know, people like John Mearsheimer are right. There is a global great power struggle. But it is anchored in, it is deeply dependent on, the class struggle at home. And the interaction is what you have to understand. After you say that they're both dependent, then you have to talk about what that dependency is. Otherwise, you're going to lapse into stressing one at the neglect of the other, or vice versa. The class struggle is heating up in the United States. It is going through stages of development. It went to the right first. That's why we have Trump. But he isn't solving anything.

And therefore, the question for which I don't have the answer, but the question for the working class is, where do you go now? You don't want to go back to the conventional Republican-Democrat. The alienation from that is spectacular. I want to remind people, I'm sitting here in New York City. We just elected a Muslim socialist for mayor. Unthinkable in the history of this city for the last two centuries. A young man who proudly says that if Benjamin Netanyahu visits New York, he will have him arrested. A lot of Jewish people live in New York City. They voted for the Muslim socialist, too. The alienation. And I want to take a moment for Mr. Mamdani. He's very creative, very thoughtful, good leader. Best New York could hope for.

But he wasn't elected because of him, or because of his socialism, or because of his Islam. None of it. He was elected because a socialist Muslim is clearly different from what we have had. It is a massive vote of rejection and alienation. And by the way, in the last couple of days, it may be that the next mayor of Washington, D.C., our capital, is a Black woman socialist. You know, it's again the same phenomenon of Blackness. Will that sweep the country? I don't know. I'm not claiming. It certainly hasn't done it yet. Will it? It might. And the very fact that I can say it might tells you what

changes have happened here right below the surface, but they are rooted in a working class whose conditions are being squeezed out.

Decade after decade, they have lost the idea that the future will bring change, that they need only wait, work a little harder, save a little more money. And particularly the younger people. The polling among people under age 35... the majority now want socialism. They don't even know—let me be blunt and honest—they don't even know what it is. They couldn't know because it hasn't been taught in the schools. It hasn't been explained. The generation that knows it from the past is dying out. You know, it's a serious problem. When I give speeches and people raise their hand and they say, I want to talk about socialism, I say, sure. And then I used to expect an interesting question. No, often the question is, what is it? These are adults. They're working adults, smart people, educated people.

#Ayushman

They have no idea what it is.

#Richard

Or they think they know, and what it is, is the Soviet Union. Or what it is, is the People's Republic of China. Well, what do you know about that? Nothing. But I don't want to leave people in a... I'm very optimistic. I am having an opportunity as a Marxist to function in this society in ways I never imagined in my lifetime that I would live to see.

#Mudiar

One of the places I wanted to ask you a question on, and this relates to your comments about the importance of class struggle, is the importance that AI has gathered and how class war has been intensified through all resources being funneled into or wrapped around AI. And by AI, I need to be clear, I'm not particularly talking about the chatbots that give a solution. I'm talking about enormous money—from space technology that maps our agricultural fields, to military technology, to spy agencies—all wrapped up into data centers, the financial market, all of which has been poured into that. I mean, more money. Bloomberg is excited because it says that the drought in the stock market is over.

Now money is coming out of private equities into the public. And the talks are, of course, like SpaceX going public, because apparently even the debt is not enough—they need even more money. And all of this is at a time when the returns are not coming. Even the CEO of Anthropic is saying that while the valuations are going through the roof, and I'm optimistic, I'm not sure when the returns will come and how long that will take. And if you are reasonable about it, you see this as an intensification of class war, because it's not just one person becoming a trillionaire. It has tilted the balance in favor of the concentration of wealth increasingly, I mean, in ways that I can't explain.

I mean, we often talk about the last 20 years, how extreme that has been. Piketty and others have been telling us, giving us comparative figures with a few delays and so on and so forth. But I'm not sure where it is going with these trillion-dollar companies popping up just in a day. So... you are right. Yes. And we have been discussing the growing strength of the class struggle within the United States. But I wanted to ask you also about the strength of the class war and how the trillionaire class and the billionaire class—how strong they have become. And as a working-class politics, how do we tackle it? Because it is not that old-fashioned factory-style mobilization or, you know, what is the strategy going forward?

#Richard

Well, I think, let me respond on a couple of levels. Across the United States, and particularly among younger people as they come out of high school, as they come out of college, I am not exaggerating. There is a very deep depression. There's a deep understanding that the jobs and the lives they had been led to expect at the end of their education, when they become adults in the working world, that they were misled, that they were deprived of something that they hadn't had but that they were told was coming for them. And it's not there. And it's not like dying, because then you're not there. They're still there, but the promised life isn't there. And it takes the following interesting form.

We are right now at the end of the season of graduation, when every college has a little ceremony for the people finishing this year and going on. And so we have a graduation ceremony, and typically a famous person that the university wants to cultivate is invited to come and give a talk. These talks are usually as interesting as stale bread. "You should do well, and welcome to you." Just empty exercises. Their main function is the hope of the university that the person you invite will give a donation to your university to endow a chair in biology or something. Many of them this year, many, involved inviting one of these tech billionaires, somebody from Google or Apple or Anthropic or any of them.

And they would give a speech about the wonders of AI, and the students would boo them off the stage. It became a phenomenon. The New York Times had to write stories: "What's happening to our young people?" Very easy to tell you. For them, for many of them who pay attention, they know enough to know that AI is somehow involved—they couldn't tell you how—in the absence of good jobs for middle managers, for all kinds of things they had hoped to get as a job. Meanwhile, the working-class people have no work at all. They are being told there are no factory jobs; you know, you can go and be a retail clerk somewhere. I mean, I just wrote a story: we have here in New York City 76,000 food delivery drivers.

These are people on bicycles who take the food from a restaurant and deliver it to somebody's home. 76,000 of them. They were earning, up until two or three years ago, \$7 an hour here in New York City. I mean, you cannot, you cannot. You go into a coffee shop and you ask for a coffee, it'll cost you \$5. So that's what \$7 gets you. And you are taxed on top of it. The socialists in the city

council got the minimum wage raised to \$21 from seven—triple. Okay? We now have 76,000 riders. Why? Because everybody has to accommodate. They were basically free laborers. Now you have to pay them—not much. You can't live on it either, but it's better. What I'm telling you is we have only jobs at the bottom, jobs with no security, no benefits, no pension, no medical, health care, nothing.

Very low. We have an army of people, and the army is growing larger, slowly, steadily, and the working class is slowly, steadily understanding with bitterness that there is nothing for them. They don't yet trust the left in America. So to answer your question about strategy, I don't know how we go about organizing these people. But I do tell you that this is a system—and this is important—that this is a system that is savagely exploiting them. To understand Elon Musk becoming our first trillionaire, it is important that the American people do grasp that the way this system works is to make the man who was already the richest in the world, with several hundred billion dollars, much richer.

That's when you may be in difficulty. You may be having problems. But there are other people who are... Now, part of the working class will be, because it always has been, excited. They will actually imagine that if he can do it, so can I. Or if he can do it, so can my son Peter or my daughter Mary or whatever. But a growing number understand you can work until you're blue in the face. That's not there for you. And then, then, if there's enough of us, and we're growing as a group in this country, explaining—just think for a moment what the extra three, four, five hundred billion dollars now flowing into the pocket of Mr. Musk could have done for the people of the world. And now think with me, what kind of monster must this Musk be to collect? He can't spend it.

I explain to people, if you lend to the United States government a trillion dollars, which he can do, your interest would be 50 billion a year. That's a billion dollars a week. How many mansions will you buy? How many yachts? How many airplanes? What are you going to do? Jump from one airplane to another? All it does, then I say, and that's how he got to be the richest man. He didn't do anything; it's just the compounding of the interest. That's the way this is, and that's a crazy system. To give this extra money to the man who needs it least deprives the people who need it most. Do you agree? And they don't. And even if you do it in this moral language, it allows their personal feeling, their personal desire for a secure life, to get an expression through moral language that there's something terribly wrong here.

Look, one other way to put it: if the people of New York could vote for a Muslim socialist for mayor, they can certainly vote for socialists of all kinds, for all kinds of positions. The soil is fertile. Do we have the right kind of seeds to put in that? And the answer is, I don't know. We do not have an obvious candidate. We have people who might emerge doing that, but for the moment, no. For the moment, it's a population that is very hostile to the leaders. Mr. Trump has very little support. And at this point, his own MAGA, Make America Great Again, base is split badly along three or four lines, and it'll be very difficult for them. They'll try, but it'll be very difficult for them to come together again.

There's a good chance at this moment that they will be defeated massively in the November election, so massively that they might make the decision, which I think would be terribly in error, but I could be wrong. But is it possible that they will decide to prevent the election because they know the outcome? Yes, that is possible. I wouldn't have said that a year ago. Now I will say it. The people to do that are there. They have no capacity to adjust. They have no capacity to see any of this. For them, it is an evil struggle of the Democratic Party. And so they will smash that party if they can in order to rule without. And all that will do is make this class struggle more intense and speed up. That they can't stop, but they're not trying to because they don't see it. For them, it's not there.

#Mudiar

We'll leave it there, Professor Wolff. This was a fascinating conversation, and thank you so much. Appreciate it.

#Richard

My pleasure, and I hope we can repeat it in the near future.

#Ayushman

Hi, my name is Ayushman. I, along with Jyotishman, have started this platform. Over the last two years, we have tried to build content for the left and progressive forces. We have interviewed economists, historians, political commentators, and activists so far. If you have liked our content so far and want us to build an archive for the left, I have two requests for you. Please do consider donating for the cause. The link is in the description below. Also, if you are not able to do so, don't feel sad. You can always like our videos and share our videos with your comrades. Finally, don't forget to hit the subscribe button.