

Scott Ritter: Iran's Missiles SMASH US Base in Jordan, Saudi Airport STRUCK

Scott Ritter, Former UN Weapons Inspector and Marine Corps Intel Officer, discusses the massive escalation in the Iran war as Yemen enters into renewed conflict with a US-backed Saudi incursion, and Iran strikes back hard after Trump declared war following day 3 of CENTCOM strikes.

<https://scottritter.substack.com/> LIKE the video and Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis

Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong>

SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong>

Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong>

Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong>

Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo:

@dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritho> #iranwar #iran #trump

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. As you can see, I'm joined by Scott Ritter to break down the latest news. We begin in Jordan, where five ballistic missiles ended up hitting their target. These missiles were fired by Iran overnight in retaliation for what the United States ordered, called a five-hour bombing campaign along the southern coast of Iran, around the Strait of Hormuz. Iran also targeted U.S. bases and military hardware across the region in Bahrain, in Kuwait, and also in the Strait of Hormuz, where two UAE supertankers were struck by Iranian forces, which claimed that they were being deceived by the United States to transit the Strait with their transponders off.

Now, also, Yemen has entered the war after Saudi Arabia, with Trump's blessing, bombed Sana'a International Airport. And Yemen has responded with what they call a full aerial blockade and hit, I believe, an international airport in Saudi Arabia as well. So with these latest updates, Scott, I wanted to kick it to you. Since the last time we spoke, there's been a flare-up, a major flare-up of war. What do you make of the U.S. strikes in particular and how Iran has responded thus far, and where we are right now?

#Scott Ritter

Well, one of the interesting things is we don't really know what the U.S. is bombing. You know, the United States isn't providing a daily breakdown of, you know, we're hitting this missile base, this missile base, this missile base. We just hear that, you know, targets are struck in the Bandar Abbas region and the Chabahar region, etc. And from the Iranians, it appears they're not too flustered by these attacks, which tells me that the U.S. has exhausted its target deck. I mean, we don't know, you know, why they're bombing. What is the goal? What is the objective of the bombing campaign?

Is it to suppress Iran's ballistic missile capability? Well, I mean, you just saw that the Iranians are launching and striking targets at will.

So... again, incomplete data, and we have to accept this. It's always difficult to do perfect analysis under any circumstances, but with incomplete data, this seems to be more about a charade in bluff and bluster by the United States. Why would I say this? Well, we know that the 39-day campaign exhausted pretty much America's supply of long-range strike weapons and also, you know, advanced ballistic missile interceptors capable of, you know, having the possibility of intercepting incoming Iranian missiles. Now, the U.S. took advantage of the pause since April 8th, I believe, to not only restock their oil, which J.D. Vance openly acknowledged — that the MOU is just a lie, that we signed it because we were running out of oil.

We needed to get more oil. But we'd also run out of ammunition. People, you know, have to ask the question, why did we stop the war when we stopped it? Because leading up to the ceasefire, you know, Donald Trump was saying, we're going to bomb them forever, we're going to blow them up, the end of the Iranian civilization, everything's done, da da da. And all of a sudden it's like, nope, we're signing an MOU. Now, he said it's because—I mean, Trump, he amazingly sometimes is very honest—he said that we signed, he had no choice but to sign the MOU because we were out of oil. We had to do this. That sort of means that we lost. I mean, got to keep that in mind. But the other reason is we ran out of ammunition.

We didn't have the ability to sustain this fight. So when you look at this now, Donald Trump's talking about we're going to have three weeks. I think three weeks is about the maximum we have for ammunition, you know, 21 days, and then we're out of ammo again. We're right back to where we started. Not only that, now we see pressure being put on the oil markets by the Iranians shutting down the Strait of Hormuz and maybe the Bab al-Mandeb. Notice I said that right—I'm learning—being shut down by the Houthis. They're apparently holding that in reserve. They're not playing all their cards at once. But the fact is, the dynamic that led to Donald Trump pleading for a ceasefire in April exists today. Nothing has changed.

I don't know what he thinks he's going to accomplish by reengaging in—was it Einstein, I believe, who said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different outcome? Well, here we are doing the same thing, even less so. I mean, we're not even coming in as hard as we came in the first time, expecting a different outcome. The only change here—and again, it's always difficult to assess anything that Donald Trump's doing because, as the Russians have said, he's emotionally unstable. As other people have said, he's just straight-up batshit crazy. It's hard to have predictability in a personality and a mind that's unpredictable.

But it was fascinating to see him say the Iranians aren't allowed to charge anything going through the Strait of Hormuz. But now I'm taking over the Strait of Hormuz. He's not. He can't. He doesn't have the ability. And when I do, even though we know he can't because he doesn't have the ability, I'm going to charge, what is it, a 20% surcharge for every ship going through. So he just instantly,

instantaneously legitimized the Iranian business model—the model that he had rejected before. There will be no payments. He just legitimized that. Now, again, crazy like a fox. I think that he did that on purpose because now what I think he's looking for—this is his political out—is an eventual resolution that gives America a buy-in.

I mean, 20% is, you know, I mean, he's just a New York realtor coming in with a ridiculous quote, and then it'll be negotiated down. At least that's his plan. But I think what he's looking for is to get Oman back in with Iran to—I'll use a big word that I'm probably using wrong—bifurcate the control of the Strait, even though Iran will impose the totality of its will. There will be two paths like there were. Remember, Oman had the southern passage and Iran had the other one. And there will be a joint toll collection, and Trump will take a percentage of the Omani cut and then declare victory. Because that's the only thing that makes sense here. Because there's no other out. There literally is no other out.

He can drop bombs, and he will drop bombs on Iranian nuclear sites, just to put that marker down. But there's no other out for him. He needs a political out. Because here's the problem: we lost the war, and we're not going to win the war. But war is an extension of politics by other means. So if you get to spin things in a way that creates perception—because perception creates its own reality—then even though we know America lost the war, that the Iranians have the strategic advantage, if Donald Trump can make things happen that allow him to spin that in a way that alters the perception of the American public, which is the only public that counts come November because they vote, then Donald Trump has achieved some sort of great victory here.

That's it. So that's the only thing that makes sense here, because otherwise this is not a war-winning strategy. I mean, you can get as many people as you want—you can get Wesley Clark and you can get General McKenzie, the former Marine commander—to come out and talk all they want about seizing the Strait and taking Karg Island. If we could have seized the Strait, we would have done so back in April. We didn't because we can't, and nothing's happened that makes it so that we can. If we could have taken Karg Island, we would have.

We can't. We don't have the resources available to seize and hold. That's the important thing. Sure, we can throw enough Marines at the problem. Marines are very good at wading through chest-high water, getting mowed down by machine guns, and keep coming because that's just what we do. All right, so we can stack the bodies, build another memorial. You know, instead of the Iwo Jima Memorial, we'll build the Karg Island Memorial of Marines raising the flag, except this time we'll have to take the flag down and leave. Because the best analogy isn't the Iwo Jima analogy, which Lindsey Graham was fond of quoting, but the Koh Tang Island analogy.

Koh Tang Island being that small island off the coast of Cambodia. In May of 1975, a Marine battalion landing team was sent to seize the island because we believed that U.S. sailors from the Mayaguez, an American merchant vessel, were being held there. They weren't. They were held somewhere else. But the Marines got on there. Eight out of the 11 helicopters in the first wave were

either shot down straight up or suffered so much damage they had to flee back and couldn't be flown again. Scores of Marines were killed. Dozens of Marines were in the water swimming for their lives. And we had the Marines split up on the island, 300 to 500 Khmer Rouge launching counterattacks, threatening to overrun.

We had to scramble in a desperate move in a nighttime evacuation. We left under fire, abandoning three Marines — a three-man M60 crew on the flank was left, and they were captured and executed by the Khmer Rouge. It was a day of dishonor for the Marine Corps, even though there was heroism there. I know many of the Marines who fought there; they fought heroically. But we lost. It was dishonorable because we had to flee, and we abandoned Marines, we abandoned bodies. That's not what we do. And yet that's what will happen at Karg Island if we go in, and everybody knows it.

So Trump is out there just spouting nonsense and things that aren't going to happen, betting on the fact that the Iranians, in accepting the MOU, made a similar gamble that Trump did. And the Iranians admitted it. I mean, Professor Mirandi, who I respect greatly, said, "We sold a whole bunch of oil." Yeah, you sold 60 million barrels worth of oil. And that brought money in, and you were able to establish economic links and create some sort of domestic stability, which is all very important during this time, knowing the United States would eventually renege on the MOU because that's what we do. As Sergei Lavrov has said, the foreign minister of Russia, we are agreement-incapable.

And so, you know, I think both sides know that the MOU is just a piece of paper, but they're going to keep it in place because sooner or later I'm going to publish this article on hybrid diplomacy, because what's happened is this is not traditional diplomacy, this is hybrid diplomacy, where it's diplomacy in name only. We know each side's going to cheat, but we keep it in place because we've built in the cheating as being the norm. We cheat until we need more oil or more munitions. We accept their cheating while we get more oil, more munitions. And then we both say the MOU's not in effect, but we don't rip it up — hybrid diplomacy. We hold it in place until we need a pause again. And now we have, instead of renegotiating something new, we fall back on something that exists.

We see this with Russia and the United States. We see this with Iran and the United States. You know, neither Russia nor Iran believes the United States is capable of honorably negotiating. But they both keep the potential of diplomacy open because sometimes, especially when you're dealing with an emotionally unstable president who, you know, moves the needle, at some point in time the needle is going to be pointing in a direction where diplomacy is conducive, and you keep the window open so you can rapidly close in and get whatever temporary arrangements are necessary to up whatever you need to be up. So we're in a period of hybrid diplomacy right now. Right now, we're doing more of the hybrid and less of the diplomacy.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah, certainly. That's the case. Well, let me pull up this then, Scott, because as you were talking about Trump's 20% toll legitimizing this, saying the blockade is back on against Iran for

everything Iranian-based that's going to be coming out of the Persian Gulf, he said that they will have to charge 20% in order for the United States to be able to cost-effectively do this. Then today—so this was all within the last day—he comes out saying, I have decided to replace the 20% U.S. reimbursement fee with trade and investment deals with various Gulf states that they'll be making into the United States. And this is him talking about it. And then, of course, today, what is it?

Tuesday, uh, talking about how oil is flowing out of the Strait of Hormuz. It's not, but that's what he always says—oil is flowing, everything is good. Um, Scott, uh, the regional situation is getting worse. I brought up the Yemen situation, Saudi Arabia. Trump gave a blessing to this, according to media reports. This is playing with fire, isn't it? Because Iran certainly is showing the initiative to be able to hit whatever it wants in the Gulf, maybe Israel in the future. The United States, as you said, we don't know what they're hitting. This could go on for a while. Why then give the blessing to Saudi Arabia to conduct this aggression against Yemen at such a sensitive time, especially economically?

#Scott Ritter

Well, again, Danny, you're putting me on the spot because we are dealing with one of the most chaotic situations imaginable. You know, a long time ago, I had several conversations with Anatoly Antonov, the former Russian ambassador to the United States. And, you know, I was talking at the time about the election and saying, you know, well, who does Russia want? Remember the eternal question, who do the Russians want to win? And he said, we don't really care. I was like, really? You don't care? He said, you don't understand. It's not personality-driven. It's not even policy-driven. What we want more than anything is predictability. And every Russian diplomat I've ever talked to has seconded this, yes.

See, the Russians can build a policy for any given situation. And the key thing, though, is that that policy is predictable, because then you get to do long-term planning. You get to do budgeting of resources, allocation of priorities, et cetera, based upon something predictable. Now, they would prefer that the predictability was attached to something good and beneficial to Russia, but it doesn't matter. They just want predictability. They can deal with that. And, you know, they said, look, we know Biden is not the man we want, but there's an element of predictability with Biden. I mean, we know how to craft policy to deal with Biden.

Everybody jumps and says, oh, because Trump's talking good about Russia, that we would want this. But we know that Trump says things and does things differently, and therefore he's unpredictable. And it's impossible to have sustainable policy with something of that nature. So Trump's unpredictability is problematic for the Russians. It's the same for the Chinese. They operate under the same predictability model. They're businessmen, and businessmen, you know, business isn't done—you don't succeed in business in an unstable environment unless you're a hedge fund and you guess right, or you're somebody who gets insider information about Donald Trump's next social media posting and you make the appropriate investments.

But for the normal people, the normal businessman, you know, planning out, you want stability. You don't like this kind of market flow. You like something predictable. And the Chinese are that way, too. So you say, what does all this have to do with what we're talking about? What Donald Trump is doing, I believe, is deliberate. I believe that Donald Trump—and this is an assessment that's in motion because, again, we're dealing with a lot of incomplete data here—but if you take a look at what the priorities are for Donald Trump, he sort of acknowledged this. He said that, you know, I had to do the MOU because of energy security issues. Oil markets were dropping, price of fuel was going up.

But also Scott Bessent, you know, during this crisis was making decisions about, you know, releasing, you know, giving the Russians the ability to sell oil on the market, avoid sanctions, letting the Iranians sell oil. Now they're tightening the market. Scott Bessent's talking about squeezing Russian oil exports to hurt the Russian economy, about tightening oil availability to China to hurt their economy. There's an energy component to everything. I think the whole strategy behind Venezuela was denying China access to—I forget what percentage they were taking out of there at the time, 8 to 13, I don't know—but to deny them access.

Then to say if they wanted to renew those contracts, they have to go through the United States, which now has control over China's fuel supply. I think this was the strategic objective here. We had Venezuela in the bag, and we were looking to put Iran in the bag. But Iran in the bag doesn't necessarily mean that we have to control it. It just means that nobody controls it. And that in itself is disruptive. Remember, the United States is the largest oil producer in the world. And we are, you know, although we are prisoners to the spot market, the global market, we're not going to run out of oil in America. We've got the oil. And so we're in sort of a safe place where we can create chaos.

So when you say, wow, this is a lot of chaos in the Middle East, I think it's chaotic by design. I think it's done on purpose by the United States to be extraordinarily disruptive of global energy markets. And then we take advantage of that. And when we're dealing with Iran, it's not just about denying Iran the ability to generate income on a sustainable, predictable basis. Of course it is. But we also know that Iran has workarounds. This naval blockade does nothing for the proven overland routes that Iran has established with Pakistan, Turkmenistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. Iran will get oil to the market in sufficient quantities.

But the problem is those sufficient quantities, while they may prop up the Iranian economy or at least prevent it from collapsing, are not sufficient to sustain China's energy needs. China needs the fire hose to be fully charged. They don't need, you know, the hydrant just to be cracked and a little bit of water dripping out. They need everything. And without that, you know, China's economy will have a hiccup. And I think that's what Trump is betting on. He's betting on the pressure that China and Russia will put on Iran to resolve the Strait of Hormuz issue. That's what he's betting on. Whether it's a successful bet, I don't know.

But, you know, let's take a look at Russia because a lot of people attack me immediately when I say that. I haven't looked at your comments. I'm trying to avoid looking at comments. I'm in a good mood today, so I won't let the comments spoil my mood. Vladimir Putin gave away something very important. It was actually one of the more important speeches he's ever made at the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum. Because in that speech, even though there were a lot of reasons for him to talk about the Ukrainian conflict, and indeed many people, including myself, were expecting him to talk about the necessity of striking Europe, he didn't. He didn't mention it at all. Why?

Because his speech basically put the marker down that his number one priority isn't the war in Ukraine. His number one priority is the economic growth of Russia as a nation into the future. He talked about stability and the need to create a safe investment environment. And he was, you know, he exuded enough confidence that the Russians got \$84 billion worth of direct investments made at the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum. But the lesson that came from that is, to attract investors, you need a stable economic environment. Again, I got schooled on this because I went into the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum, you know, blowing smoke. I was like, I was fire coming out of my ears and nose. And I gave a little presentation where I said, shoot the dog.

I mean, the dog was Europe—out of control, has to be shot. And everybody loved it, except the people who think for a living. Sometimes I have to learn to think. I think one of the big lessons out of St. Petersburg is, when I want to speak, it might be best to take a deep breath, sit back, and listen. Because you learn so much more by listening. When you're speaking, you're not hearing what the other people are saying. And what the people around me were saying, especially at the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum, is stability is the key. Stability is the most important thing, which is something everybody needs to factor in when they talk about what Russia is going to do next in Ukraine. The question you have to ask first is, does this increase the stability for Russia or destabilize Russia?

And if it's destabilizing, maybe Russia's not going to do it because that's not the trajectory that they're on. Energy, you know, people are going, well, Scott, Russia's making more money right now than they've ever made. Yes, high oil prices are great for Russian oil companies. But how many people have done the actual research to find out what percentage of Russia's GDP is energy-derived? Twenty percent. That means 80%, the vast majority of the Russian economy, has nothing to do with energy. It has to do with growth, traditional economic values, investments. So now, if you're going to sacrifice everything because 20% of your economy is going to get a temporary boost in income coming in because of high oil prices—but remember, what the high oil prices do is just give Russia the ability to discount their oil more, to make it more competitive on the market.

Russia rarely buys oil at the maximum or sells oil at the maximum price because of sanctions and everything. They're always offering a discount, steep discounts oftentimes just to secure market value and to generate income. So it's a false argument that Russia is making money and therefore Russia wants high energy prices. High energy prices are a brake on investments. When there are

high energy prices, people aren't investing because their cost of doing business is out of control. So for Russia, the most important thing is stable energy prices because stable energy prices allow economies to develop in a normative fashion, which means that people who are in a position to invest in Russia can invest in Russia.

And this is Vladimir Putin's long-term goal. So the chaos that Trump is causing in the Middle East right now is extraordinarily disruptive for Russia's long-term planning because it injects unpredictability. And for China, which needs predictable, sustainable energy supplies, it's also problematic. And so I believe that—again, this is a belief, faith-based analysis, because I don't know. Because who the hell knows? This is all guesswork. When you have a country like the United States prosecuting foreign policy through social media posts, just think about it. How do we find out about the 20%? Was there a statement from Scott Ritter? Did Marco Rubio come out?

Was there a meeting of the national security? No, Donald Trump put out a social media post, and we all went, ah, that's how we learn things. And then how did I learn from you? There wasn't a press conference where the White House spokesperson or the State Department spokesperson articulated policy that had been built through the interagency process. No, the President of the United States just makes stuff up and puts it out on a post. That's how America's run—unpredictable, crazy, chaotic. And I think it drives the Russians and the Chinese crazy. And I think the Iranians, we know where they are. You want a war? You got a war. You want to go max? We can go max.

But the Iranians are also, you know, they're in the middle of making one of the biggest strategic pivots in their history because they are pivoting decisively away from the West. Yeah. You know, everybody says, well, Scott, they've been paving the way for me. No. Talk, read. Even this president, Pezeshkian—I'm sure I butchered that name—but I'm not the greatest speaker of foreign languages the world has ever seen. But the current Iranian president told me in person when I met with him in September of last year that they would like to do business with the West. That's before all this nonsense began. He's part of a moderate wing of Iranian society—political society, economic society—that continues to believe that the West is the direction for Iran to go because they have a long history with the West.

They trust the West. But they don't trust the West anymore. And so they are making a decisive pivot to the East, which means they have to solidify relationships with Russia, China, India, elsewhere. Solidify relationships, and also get embedded in forums such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, BRICS, the Eurasian Economic Union. In order to do that, they need to be stable. Remember that whole concept of how do you invest, how do you get involved? Stability. And so I think the belief is that Iran—I think bluffing is the wrong word—but Iran might be open to the right set of circumstances that allows it to get something less than maximal outcomes, as long as they don't impact sovereignty and national security.

But Iran might be able to play some political games that allow Donald Trump to have a face-saving mechanism out of this. Right now, I know Dr. Morandi says that's the last thing Iran cares about.

Yeah, but when the phone starts ringing and it's Pakistan calling, saying the Chinese are pissed off, maybe Iran's going to listen. And remember, Iran can't afford to lose China and Russia right now. They need that support. China and Russia are sovereign states unwilling to commit suicide on behalf of any other state. So this is my thinking about where Donald Trump is going on this. Am I right? Don't know. There's only one way to find out, and that's the passage of time.

#Danny

Well, the passage of time is working against the Trump administration in many ways, because the longer this goes on, the more the oil markets are heating up. As you say, as you said, this is correct, one hundred percent. When oil markets heat up, it does lead to the possibility of a worldwide economic crash, which indeed neither Russia nor especially China wants. You know, China has been called recession-proof domestically because it can maintain economic growth even during the '08 crisis. But as you said, investment to be able to expand growth, to be able to move growth even outside of China, is hard when the entire world is in a major slowdown or a crash. I mean, that's been kind of the story since COVID—China's growth is fine, I mean, 5% is considered fine—but it's lower because the world is so slow, and China has to conform to world conditions.

It can't out-invest the world. It can only do as much as other countries are willing and able to cooperate and do as well. So, indeed, a globally stable economic environment is certainly within the interests of China, of Russia, and really everybody. The United States, though, is in a very tough position, Scott, because it has made the Strait of Hormuz the battle. And Iran is only going to keep on doubling and tripling down on this as part of, as you said, a matter of sovereignty. It seems like eventually the U.S. is going to have to be the one to back down like it did with the MOU. But this seems like it's going to be a very long process. Your thoughts on this? It doesn't seem like we're anywhere close to a solution, especially on the side of the U.S. essentially needing to do what reality is telling it to do.

#Scott Ritter

I don't think there's going to be a solution at all as long as Donald Trump's president, which means that we're talking about two years of managed chaos. That's the direction I think this is going. This is going to be managed chaos because politically there can't be a solution, because if there's a solution, Donald Trump has to acknowledge he got beat, and he's not going to acknowledge he got beat. He may have some political latitude following the midterm elections if he can pull a rabbit out of the hat, and he may be extremely constrained if he can't pull a rabbit out of the hat. I mean, the midterm elections are going to dictate, you know, the pace and priorities of the next two years from a foreign policy standpoint.

If the House falls to the Democrats, we know that Donald Trump is going to be impeached consistently, nonstop. That's a guarantee. He knows it. And if enough Democrats win in the Senate and they lose control of the Senate, there's enough dissatisfaction in the Republican Party. You

know, depending on how successfully the articles of impeachment are pursued at trial, he could be convicted by the Senate. That would be the end of the Trump presidency. So, you know, this is a very serious game being played. I think Donald Trump is, I mean, you know, I think there is a method to his madness. I don't say I agree with it. I just, uh, I don't believe that everything he's done is just knee-jerk, totally irrational.

It may look like it to us, and maybe some of the things he does are knee-jerk, irrational. But I believe Donald Trump knows where he wants to go. I think he has a strategic vision, and he has an idea of how he wants to get there. And I think chaos is the key here. I mean, he's engendering chaos in the domestic American political system — you know, what's going on at the state level, national level in terms of gerrymandering and redistricting and all this kind of stuff — you know, whether there's going to be voter ID, things like that, laws being passed, executive decisions being made.

It's all designed to create an electoral environment that is advantageous to Trump, from his belief, because, you know, if you can't win the votes, at least manipulate the votes. And I think he's going to be trying to manipulate the votes as much as possible so that he doesn't lose control of the House and he doesn't lose the Senate. But in order to do that, you have to be able to explain certain things to the American public. And it's easier not to explain things if there's chaos, and you just basically can blame everything on Iran and blame everything — you know, the Iranians are the ones that can't negotiate, the Iranians refuse to do a deal. So I think that's where we're at right now.

I think we're into a... you know, it's a permanent state of fluctuating chaos over the course of the next two years. I don't think there's any intent on the part of the Trump administration to actually bring an end to this, because they can't. They can't admit that they lost. They can't admit that they failed. And I also believe that Iran — the assessment is that Iran isn't going to go to the mats, so to speak — that Iran is also willing to do what I talked about early on, hybrid diplomacy. Basically, this game, this diplomatic game where we're not talking, but we're going to talk, all based upon your momentary advantage.

#Danny

Two years, Scott. That's a long time. The situation just feels incredibly unstable in terms of what even the next several months, especially in terms of the global economic situation, are going to bring. Now, as we speak, Scott, the U.S. is conducting strikes on Iran. They're hitting, of course, again, all along the Persian Gulf, the southern coast. Kish Island has actually been reported to have infrastructure damage to its water and electrical systems, causing power outages. And right now there are 30-plus missiles going off over Bahrain. This was some of the imagery taken from that.

And this is said to be the biggest single response by Iran so far in this recent flare-up. So, yeah, two years, Scott. These kinds of escalations have already brought oil prices up above \$80 a barrel. The Bab al-Mandeb Strait — this is what Yemen, the Yemenis, the Ansar Allah are saying — that if Bab al-

Mandeb closes, it could go back up to that harrowing \$200 a barrel mark. What do you think the likelihood of that is? Because it seems like the chaos has, as you said, a lot of unpredictability to it. Part of that unpredictability is things getting out of hand. What are your thoughts on this?

#Scott Ritter

My thoughts are, don't answer this question and get off your podcast, because it's too unstable of an environment to make any rational prediction. But I'm not going to do that, because half the fun is just sitting here, you know, brainstorming. And that's what we're doing — we're publicly brainstorming. Donald Trump has made a lot of money off of this crisis. I mean, I think there are estimates that he's made over \$2 billion. He does this by manipulating the market. He openly admits that this is what he's doing, and he's making money for his friends. So anybody out there that thinks Donald Trump cares about you and cares about your income and cares about your well-being — he doesn't at all.

He only cares about himself and his close circle. And this chaos we're speaking of has been extraordinarily profitable for him. Now, he also understands that this profitability comes to an end if he loses control of the political dynamic. And so, you know, I think Donald Trump's going to continue to manipulate the market. He has to, you know, you can ride a cycle out — you know, the cycle he had going of, you know, a crisis on Friday, solution by Monday, crisis by Friday. But you saw that the margins were shrinking. So he has to reset. And by resetting, you have to have a major crisis. And that's where we're at right now. He's got the curve here.

The potential for oil to go up is here, and where you want it is down here, and you can bounce that for as long as you are able to sustain it. And I think that's what's going to happen. I think you're going to see, at some point in time, because he can't allow this to go on, because that's economically devastating, he's going to have to play the bounce game, make money for himself and make money for his allies. Donald Trump is driven by greed and greed alone. He's not driven by legitimate national security interests. There's a whole different dynamic at play here when we evaluate Donald Trump. Personal greed factors into this. The need for his loyalists to make money is manifest.

Um, you know, if he was out for success, he wouldn't appoint, uh, you know, Jared Kushner and, uh, gosh, who's that other, Witkoff, as his personal envoys. They're as incompetent as the day is long and incapable of solving any problem, but their job isn't to solve problems. Their job is to engage in hybrid diplomacy, going through the motions of diplomacy until decisions need to be made. But I think we're just basically in a market manipulation mode, a permanent market manipulation mode. This is what is going to drive Donald Trump. It's going to destroy large segments of American society. It's going to be harmful to the global economy. But Donald Trump and his hedge fund managers are going to make a whole bunch of money.

#Danny

Yeah, well, back to market manipulation, we know that there's a principal figure in this, in the media, that has been playing this game, and that is Barak Ravid of Walla! 200, now Axios reporter, quote-unquote. Today, he reported that Trump is telling Netanyahu to move forces out of Syria and Lebanon. Again, especially the latter. That's a key provision in the MOU. Now, Scott, I have many people all across platforms, from YouTube to Patreon, Substack, etc., sending me messages saying, why isn't Iran attacking Israel at this point?

Especially since the U.S. has had to move quite a lot of military hardware to Ben Gurion Airport in particular. I think even Netanyahu has noted that this is getting kind of costly for the tiny, tiny economy that they are. Talk about your—I want to pose that question to you and your response to this. I mean, I see Barak Ravid as simply a market manipulator at this point, but given his articles are always so tied to bringing the prices of oil up or down, up or down, and they're hardly ever true. But your thoughts.

#Scott Ritter

Well, I mean, you hit an important thing, my thoughts. Have we heard this from anywhere else? I mean, the magic phone call in the middle of the night. Are other reporters reporting this? Is this something that, you know, other people have, or is this just his own little special source? And as you said, sometimes his special sources turn out to be wrong. But in this case, I would say that it makes sense. Again, controlled chaos is an important concept here. That means that the United States alone has the ability to engender stability or engender chaos. Netanyahu is a wild card here because when Donald Trump wants stability—because remember, his goal here is to manage this curve properly to make the maximum profit margin.

And if you want the curve to go up and Netanyahu does something that drops it down, or you want the curve to go down and he does something to bring it up at the wrong time, somebody else now is in control, and that's not controlled chaos. That's just chaos when other people are dictating outcomes. I believe that Donald Trump wants to take the Israeli factor out of this controlled chaos. In order to do that, he has to be responsive to the Iranian demands that the Israeli forces leave Lebanon and leave Syria. Why doesn't Iran strike Israel? Well, I mean, Iran did strike Israel, and I think they struck them just recently because of what was going on in Lebanon.

But I think also the Iranians understand that Donald Trump is serious about this, that this isn't just a game, that Donald Trump is serious about getting Netanyahu removed from the chaos generation machine. And so... hybrid diplomacy, guys. I'm telling you, it makes no sense except when you realize that it's just fake diplomacy. The Iranians are standing by and letting things happen, seeing if the United States can put pressure. Look, Israel's not winning. It's not like Iran's losing anything here. I mean, you know, it's, you know, again, I'm sure we'll talk about Russia later on, but, you

know, Putin needs to bomb Germany. Why? Why? Because they're providing drones. Okay. And? Those drones are hitting oil refineries. Yeah. And? They're doing damage. And? They're shutting down supplies. And?

#Danny

It looks bad. It's embarrassing.

#Scott Ritter

And because nothing you just said changes the trajectory that Russia's on. The one thing that could change the trajectory that Russia's on is hitting Europe, hitting Germany. You know, right now, Merz is like history. The Germans—Pistorius is out there writing. He can write all the white papers he wants and everything about building the German army and doing all this. It ain't happening. It ain't going to happen. There will be no Patriots built in Ukraine because the trajectory that Europe is on is in the wrong direction. But if Russia actually attacked Europe, regardless of the justification, the potential is you could get Europe to unify. You could create additional opportunities for sustainability for Merz, the last person you want as chancellor.

So Putin doesn't do it. Now, with Iran, why would Iran strike Israel? Is it going to help Hezbollah kill more Israeli soldiers? No. Hezbollah's doing a good enough job already. Is it going to destabilize the Israeli economy more? You already mentioned the Israeli economy is extraordinarily fragile right now, and sustaining American tankers is putting a lot of pressure on them. Israel's not doing well, ladies and gentlemen. Israel's doing quite badly. And sometimes the best policy is just to let things go the direction they're going. There's no reason to intervene if the trajectory is going the way you want it to go anyway. And I think right now, from the Iranian perspective, you have political discord between the United States and Israel over Lebanon.

Let it play out. If you bomb Israel, you change that dynamic. Suddenly, Donald Trump, instead of being irritated with Netanyahu, is going to be sympathetic to Netanyahu. So sometimes the best policy is actually to do nothing. And I think right now this is what Iran is doing with Israel, because strategically, people have to think outside of the box here. As much as pleasing as it would be—and believe me, I would join those people who would be happy to see Iranian missiles rain down on Israel—but as visually pleasing as it is, is it changing strategically the trajectory that is happening right now? And the answer is no. And could it reverse the trajectory? The answer is yes. So I think the Iranians are doing the right thing.

Look, they've proven they can strike. And if the time comes when they make the calculation that it's necessary to strike, they will strike. But I think at this point in time, just let it play out. Don't complicate things. And let Trump and Israel have their fight over Lebanon. Because Trump definitely needs Netanyahu not to be able to push the chaos meter. Trump wants to be in control of that because, again, we come back to managing that fluctuation curve, because Trump is a greedy son of

a bitch and all he wants is to make money out of this. Nothing he's doing is for the benefit of Israel, the United States, the American people, or regional security. It's all about the benefit of the Trump empire. That's all he cares about.

#Danny

And how much do you find that Iran's calculations here are in coordination with the larger resistance? Because one thing that is, I think, argued often is that, okay, if Iran intervenes against Israel, starts striking it, then that will be to the benefit of the Lebanese resistance, Hezbollah. Right. So I'm curious about your thoughts on this, because it seems like there is actually quite a lot of coordination. There aren't usually a lot of direct requests made. This isn't really how these things tend to work.

But as you said, with Russia, the battlefield is looking very much in favor of Russia. And you can talk about this, especially in lieu of our friend Lindsey Graham's death. But when it comes to the regional situation in West Asia and what the U.S. is doing there, it seems like the Axis of Resistance is coordinating its attacks and its strike-backs and its counterattacks very much together in a lot of ways. Not always, but it seems like there's a lot of that going on. So I guess I'm curious about what you think about this and how it factors into Iranian decision-making.

#Scott Ritter

Well, first of all, I agree with you that there's coordination. I think the evidence is clear. You know, Iran has made it clear, and Professor Marandi is very articulate in this fashion, that as far as it's concerned, the fighting in Lebanon is one and the same with the fighting in the Persian Gulf. You can't divide the two. It's a singularity. And that implies then that there's close and continuous connectivity between the policymakers for Hezbollah and the Iranian policymakers, that they're on the same sheet of music. The Houthis are slightly different because the dynamic of their conflict is a little bit more different. But from a strategic standpoint, I think they're absolutely on the same page with one another and that there is active coordination going on.

So this isn't something that can be, you know—the important thing here for Iran is to understand that the United States specializes in divide-and-conquer tactics and strategies. And so if there is any disconnect between Yemen, the Houthis, and the Iranians, the United States will find that and seek to exploit it. The same thing with Hezbollah. The other thing is that there are critical, region-specific dynamics at play that go beyond the analysis that goes into U.S.-Iranian relations. Look at Lebanon. Do people understand what's going on right now, the internal discussion that's taking place in Lebanon, how the Christian President Aoun has disgraced himself and embarrassed Lebanon by creating a circumstance that legitimizes the continuing Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon?

I mean, it was a gambit imposed on him by the United States and Israel, but he went along with it, and he has totally weakened himself. So from the Hezbollah perspective, let this dynamic play out.

Let it play out. It weakens those people who have been lining up against Hezbollah. It makes Hezbollah more viable. And so, you know, let it play out. And what is the best way to let it play out? Don't change the trajectory. I saw a comment—I'm not supposed to read the comment—Ritter is saying that it's okay to bomb buildings and that's a good trajectory. Hey, fuck off, pal. Because guess what? There'd be more buildings bombed if Iran bombs Lebanon. That's just the way it goes. Be real here.

People need to put on their realistic hats. And the fact is, there's less violence going on right now in Lebanon today. I guess Israel is bombing, but they're not leveling Beirut right now, because there's a dynamic at play that can only be sustained if Israel isn't being bombarded by Iranian missiles. So, you know, it's a complicated dynamic. You have to get into the internal politics of Lebanon, and that's something that Iran sometimes will just put on the back burner. That doesn't mean that Iran is not showing interest. But let Lebanon be Lebanon and let Hezbollah manage this.

Because Hezbollah—there's a lot of sympathy in Lebanon for Hezbollah, because Hezbollah has been the one party that basically has fought for the territorial integrity of Lebanon. I mean, think about it. The president just gave up southern Lebanon. He said, yeah, it's yours, you can occupy it for all you want. We don't consider it to be an occupation. That's because that allows the United States and Israel to play word games and tell the Lebanese, well, Hezbollah says they're a legitimate resistance movement as long as Lebanese territory is illegally occupied by Israel. But the Lebanese government just legitimized the occupation, so it's not illegally occupied anymore. Therefore, Hezbollah has no right to exist.

Nobody in Hezbollah buys this argument. Even the Christians don't buy this argument. So let Lebanon be Lebanon. There is ancient history between the Houthis and Saudi Arabia. How many people understand that much of southern Saudi Arabia is actually Yemen, stolen land from Saudi Arabia, and that one of the biggest fears—I remember back in 1991 during the Gulf War, or actually in 1990 even, before, as we were building up our forces—we were telling the Saudis, you need to divert your resources from the Yemeni border regions up to take on the Iraqis. And they're like, we're not leaving the Yemeni border unguarded because those are bad mofos that can come across and reclaim the land we stole from them.

The Saudis have always been paranoid about Yemen, about the Houthis. So there's a dynamic there at play. And sometimes Iran needs to let that dynamic play out and not interfere. And I think that's what we're seeing right now. The Saudi Arabian decision to bomb Sana'a airfield isn't just about an air blockade, but it's also an extension of decades-long animosities between the Houthis and Saudi Arabia. Let Yemen develop the way it needs to develop. Iran may believe that it's better to block Bab al-Mandeb. But from the Houthi perspective, who understand this dynamic more, it might be better to actually threaten the territorial integrity of southern Saudi Arabia, to threaten to take over cities, to take over territory.

Because the Saudis will respond to that drastically. And so there's a local dynamic at play there that has to be allowed to play out, too. And so it's not total coordination like we're saying. I think it's a very mature coordination. We have to respect the fact that the Iranians have a long history with both Hezbollah and the Houthis. They know these. Everything I'm talking about here with you might be new to the people listening. It ain't new to the Iranians. It's not new to Hezbollah. It's not new to the Houthis. And the Iranians are very mature people. These are people who understand the region.

When they select somebody to represent Iran in Yemen, it's not like the United States, where we give away the ambassadorship to the highest donor, and we send somebody to a country who doesn't know anything about the country. No, when the Iranians select a Quds Force commander to go into Yemen, it's because that Quds Force commander has been on the ground in Yemen for years, and he understands all the players. He knows them intimately. When they send somebody to Lebanon, it's because they've been to Lebanon. They've fought, they have experience. And I think the Iranians are doing close coordination, but a lot of it is influenced by the domestic political realities and regional realities that are unique to Hezbollah and unique to the Houthis.

#Danny

Scott, do you have a eulogy for Lindsey Graham? I'm curious — we've talked about him over the years. He's come up because he was such a champion, of course, not just of Israel, but of the Ukrainian cause, a.k.a. the U.S.-NATO cause, to strategically defeat Russia. Your words on Lindsey Graham.

#Scott Ritter

You know, back when the Soviet Union was having their troubles, there was a historian, a Russian historian, Roy Medvedev, I think his name was. And he wrote a book called *Let History Judge*. And basically, it was a condemnation of Stalinism. Now, I'm not saying that I agree with what Medvedev wrote. I'm just saying that the concept of letting history judge is an important concept here. You know, right now, you're just not going to get an accurate assessment of the legacy of Lindsey Graham because of the politicization of the moment. There are many people in power who support the warmongering policies of this man. There are many people who support the Israel-first leanings of this man. And so there are many people who are going to call him a great American. But the fact of the matter is, Lindsey Graham has been a United States Senator since 2003 — so 23 years. I believe in 1995, he became a congressional representative before that.

So he'd been in Congress since 1995. This man has had his finger on the pulse of one of the most tumultuous, transformative periods in American history. And I don't mean in a good way. I mean, we are literally watching the end of the American dream. Look, people can disagree with him all they want, and I respect that. But, you know, I'm somebody who believes that the United States was designed by its founders in the constitutional phase as a constitutional republic. I've read the, you

know, the... oh gosh, the, uh, what are they, the, uh, the letters, the arguments written by Madison and, uh, and Hamilton, the, uh—come on, help me out here, Danny, save me—the 50/50 or whatever it is, the, uh, oh my God, the—wow, this is like a civics course gone wrong—the, the...

#Danny

The Articles of the Federalist Papers. Federalist Papers, yes.

#Scott Ritter

Federalist Papers, there we go. So, the Federalist Papers. You know, I've read them, and sometimes I even remember them. And sometimes I even apply them. But the point is, I take the Constitution seriously, and I take what it stands for seriously. And, you know, I'm also somebody who is a student of history. And so I know, you know, with the Constitution and the Federalist Papers—I was desperately looking at the comments for some help here—but the Constitution, "We the people of the United States of America," that's important because it means that the responsibility for this country resides with the people, not with the government, because the Constitution is forming a government. "We the people of the United States of America, in order to form a more perfect union."

That means that we understand that we're not perfect, that we are a work in progress. And America has always been that. America is a nation of ideas. We're not Russia with history tied to the soil. We're not China with history tied to the land. We're not any of the European nations that have fought forever wars over their different national visions. We are a nation of an idea—an idea of libertarianism, imperfectly implemented. I'm not sitting here telling anybody that we're perfect. I'm not reading the comments, but I'm sure people are going, "Screw you, Ritter." Okay, but the point is, you know, I know we had slavery when the Constitution was written. How can we be perfect when we, you know, enshrined slavery?

There are a lot of problems with America, but the idea of America is that we will work together, we the people, to form a more perfect union to fix these problems. So we have a Constitution that can be amended, and it has been amended over the years. We are supposed to be a nation seeking self-improvement. And while we have committed many sins, we have been on a trajectory of improving many of the faults that existed when we were created. I've always said that what makes America, in my mind, the greatest country in the world isn't what it is, but what it has the potential to be. And Lindsey Graham presided over a period of time when we lost that potential. We surrendered that potential. You see, I always believed that we could do better.

I always knew we had a lot wrong. Just look at our history. But I always believed that we could do better. That's what gave me the optimism to sit there and say, okay, we're knocked down. We can pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, refocus on our priorities as set forth in the Constitution, and move forward in a positive light to be better, to do better—the promise of the potential to be better. Lindsey Graham and his ilk destroyed that promise by embracing warmongering, by surrendering the

American dream to an Israeli dream, by surrendering the imperative of improving our country by attaching it to another country. And when history is written—and you can't really write history in the immediacy of the moment—

You can capture it. It should be documented. But history has to be written by, you know, detached people who are not emotionally attached to the events. They can sit back and rationally assess what's going on. When the history of this era is written—2001, actually, because I think 9/11 is one of the defining moments where we totally screwed it up—we went in the wrong direction. We went in the emotional direction instead of the right direction. And here we are today, looking at the collapse of everything we stand for, because it's hard to say America stands for anything today. And it's hard to articulate in a rational manner that America has the potential to go forward in a better way, because in order to do that, you have to believe in the Constitution.

And the challenge I put out to everybody in your chat and everybody is, do you even know what the Constitution is? Because you can't sit here and say that you're willing to defend the Constitution with your life, as I am, if you don't know what the Constitution is. You can't defend that which you don't know. And the vast majority of the American people are ignorant as the day is long about the Constitution. Therefore, we no longer function as a constitutional republic. We function as something totally different. In this day and age, what I say is we function as a cult of personality because we've allowed the Constitution to be replaced with, you know, the ideas of a man, of a madman who says he doesn't believe in the Constitution. He doesn't even know the Constitution.

Somebody you and I know very closely was interviewed by this man to be a Supreme Court justice. And at the end, this man turned to him and said, "You don't know anything about the Constitution." And Trump said, "I don't need to. That's why I'm hiring you, hiring you, hiring you." That's his whole approach. Trump is so removed from what the reality of America should be. And unfortunately, he's taking Congress with him. Congress doesn't function in their normal effect, and he's perverted the third, you know, allegedly independent arm of government—the Justice Department, the judiciary. So Lindsey Graham will go down in history as one of the key players in the transformation of America away from a land where we had the potential to do good, the potential to be better. It took us firmly on the path of collapse.

Is this irreversible? History will judge. I am going to go down fighting in whatever time I have left on this earth to get us back to where we have the potential to do good. I'm going to continue to struggle for the Constitution. But I'm also a realist, and I understand I'm in a distinct minority, and I can't improve my position unless people read the Constitution. And I don't think people are in the mood to read the Constitution anymore. I think people have lost faith in the Constitution because our government no longer functions constitutionally. So, this is how I think—this is the eulogy of Lindsey Graham, the most un-American American that existed, a man who put Israel before America, a man who put war before peace, and a man who put corruption before the rule of law.

#Danny

Hmm. Yeah, well said, Scott. For things to get better, I think history shows that it's, as you said, go down fighting. That's what people are going to have to do to make things better and to make sure, you know, Lindsey Graham is certainly his own kind of horror and left a horrible trail of blood and destruction and chaos and misery for so many at home and abroad. But unfortunately, the political class is full of Lindsey Grahams, whether they're loud or quiet or somewhere in between. He was, of course, one of the loudest there was. But Scott, I have your website, scottroeder.com, in the video description below so people can support you after the show. I want to make sure everyone hits the like button. I want to make sure that the super chatter here, Red Sparrow, Free Palestine Support Iran, gets love for sending the super chat. All the moderators, of course, thank you so much for moderating. Hit the like button before you go. Scott, I'll leave it to you if you have any final words for the audience.

#Scott Ritter

Look, everything is a work in progress. The idea that we can rest on our laurels is an absurdity, especially in this day and age. Our colleague Max Blumenthal just was in Iran, came back, and had his electronics seized at the border. That's the price you pay for independent journalism. There are other people out there who are afraid to come back to the United States right now because of the price they'll pay for trying to tell the truth about, you know, events and places in the world that the United States doesn't want you to know the truth about. I have spent the better part of the summer in Russia learning the truth about the war, learning the truth about what's going on in Donbass, Zaporizhzhia, learning the truth about drone warfare. And now my job is to report back.

But I'm also preparing actively for the next phase of this independent journalism territory. I'm going back to Russia in September to engage in some very important work. It deals not just with the Donbas, but with security in the Arctic, security in the Baltic regions. I just had a very interesting meeting with Chinese diplomats, and it looks like I will be dipping my toes in Chinese waters on issues pertaining to arms control. So this isn't just going to be tourism. This is actually very exciting because right now arms control is dead between the United States and Russia. And one of the key things is China. And China has previously said, we're just not going to play this game. But the person I talked with said that they're very interested in pursuing this topic.

And so here's a chance to do that. I have an open invitation to Iran. It's tough to go to Iran while there's a war going on. And I have established a new relationship with Turkey that will get me not only to Turkey and be able to tap into that important part of the world, but that carries on into Central Asia. So there's just a lot of potential for work here. But that work doesn't happen without your support. The reason why I'm an independent journalist is that I have foregone any kind of sponsorships that have corrupted journalists in the past. You can't work for any of the mainstream people and be credible, and you can't take money from certain outlets without losing your credibility. And this work only happens through donations.

And there are a couple of reasons why I like coming on your show, Danny. One, I like you. You know that. Over the years, we've just developed a very good relationship. Two, even though we disagree on certain things, we're on the same sheet of music when it comes to the basic trajectory we want the world to go into. So it's always a joy and a pleasure to come on and share this with you. But three, you have a great support base. And every time I put out an appeal for help, your support base has responded. I know this because the cause-and-effect relationship between my donation page and showing up on your show, it's there. And I'm making the appeal again. This last summer has been a very expensive summer. To spend 22 days in Russia in a war zone and all that entails—security, et cetera—depletes the funds.

I hope people are going to my Substack page and seeing that I'm not just sitting on my laurels. I'm actually publishing articles that deal with this, and I'll be publishing more. I have two documentary films that are in the works—short films that are in the works—and more articles, you know. But this happened because of you, because of you, because of you, Danny, and because of your supporters, and because of all the supporters out there. And so I would just make the appeal again that if you think this kind of work is good, you know, I'm going to come on your show no matter what. You know, the show's free. It doesn't cost me. I know you have to pay your overhead and all that kind of stuff, which also brings me back to my point.

If you guys like this, support Danny Haiphong. Keep him in business. Keep him doing what he's doing. And Danny travels. Danny goes to China. Danny goes to other places. I'm going to try and get Danny to Russia. I really want to go. I got to go. We need to talk about that. You got to find a window of opportunity. We got to do it. But let's get Danny Haiphong to Russia. But this only happens with donations. And so that's my appeal. If you like what I'm doing, if you like what Danny's doing, support Danny in the way that he articulates. The best way to support me is to go to ScottRitter.com, take you to my Substack page, and go to that donation page. I just redid the donation page so you can read what I'm doing and see what you'd be donating to.

And if it appeals to you, donate. If it doesn't, I respect that. But that's it. Thank you very much for the support that you've provided, and I look forward to working with you and working with everybody else and having an exciting year. I mean, my mind is blown away by the potential that has opened up recently because, again, because of the work that we do together. People are saying, oh, this is credible. Oh, this is important. So doors are opening up in Russia. Doors are opening up in China. Doors are opening up in Iran. Doors are opening up in Turkey. Doors will open up elsewhere. If these are areas of the world that you're interested in, then help me get there and continue reporting.

#Danny

Yeah, definitely. Well, the pleasure is mine, Scott. And that's the silver lining with the United States under Trump. We had the same issues in a different form under Biden. The more aggressive the United States becomes, while horrific and damaging as that can be for humanity—and it is—there

are also opportunities for building more connections because there is far more of an impetus toward, as you said earlier in the show, stability. People want that stability. They don't just want stability because it's stability. They want it because it's better for people. It's better for development. It's better for peace.

It's better for all of these things that people who come and watch this show care about. And so it's really important to, yeah, definitely support those who are trying to do that work, both in, you know, making people-to-people ties, making connections in this way, as well as, you know, doing what both of us do every single day, which is try to help others understand what's going on without the establishment spin and the constant lies that we are fed by those like the deceased Lindsey Graham, and those like Pete Hegseth and all the other cast of characters who profit so much off of war and destruction. So, Scott, pleasure as always. Everybody, make sure you hit the like button.

That's a free way to make sure more people hear Scott, make sure more people see that we have been on today and are therefore more likely to support the program. That's a very free way to get more eyes on this show. Of course, in the video description, both Scott's website and his, you know, his Substack slash website, and also all the places for this channel are there too. Tomorrow I'll be back on at 4 p.m. Eastern time. Sorry, a little later show tomorrow with our mutual friend Larry Johnson and Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson. Without further ado, everybody, I'll see you then with the latest reports and analysis. Everyone say bye to Scott with a like. Go to the video description. See you tomorrow, 4 p.m. Bye-bye.