

Scott Ritter: Iran DESTROYS Hanger Base, US Troops LOST as Trump PANICS

Scott Ritter discusses Iran's new ballistic missile and the massive destruction of Patriot batteries, air defenses, radars, and billions in military hardware as the blown open cover up of US troops casualties sends Trump scrambling toward all out war. <https://scottritter.substack.com/> PATREON.COM/DANNYHAIPHONG Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhai...> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> Follow me on Telegram: <https://t.me/dannyhaiphong> #iran #iranwar #trump

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. As you can see, Scott Ritter is joining me to break down the latest developments in geopolitics, where we begin with the 10th straight night of U.S. strikes on Iran and Iranian retaliation. Iran has maintained a very steady and very impactful retaliation to U.S. strikes along its southern coast. It has hit an Amazon data hub, according to the IRGC. It has taken out several Patriot batteries in a Patriot missile defense system, as well as in Jordan, at the Muwaffaq Air Base in Azraq. It has taken what they say is an F-15 fighter jet and another radar system as well. A big report is that, according to CBS, anonymous U.S. officials are saying that now nearly 100 U.S. service members stationed on these military bases have been injured this month, but more importantly, since July 7th.

All of this has come later, in less than two weeks' time. And Donald Trump, regardless of the consequences of this war, is saying that he is preparing to strike Pickaxe Mountain, as he received questions from the media that Iran may be hiding its subterfuges there for its nuclear program. And he says these refueling tankers that we see, Scott, amassing around Israel and Jordan could be used for these purposes. Scott, I want to kick it to you. What do you make of these developments? Trump is also blaming Jordan for the air defense mishaps that have occurred, which took the lives, unfortunately, of three U.S. service members, as well as all of this hardware. What are your eyes on in the latest developments in this war?

#Scott Ritter

Well, I mean, I think you have to learn to read between the lines here. First of all, let's just be honest. The amount of American casualties is also tragic for America — those who have died, their families. And for those who are injured, some of these injuries are very serious. I understand. It's actually an extremely low rate of casualties given the nature of the war that we're fighting — a high-profile, high-stakes conflict. These are as negligible casualties as they are, so I don't lose any sleep

over it. It's not as though this is a bloodbath for the American military. It's not, which points to a couple of things.

One, the Iranians are not seeking to kill Americans. The Iranians are going after capabilities as opposed to going after people. And this is where the real harm is being done, because Iran is degrading our air defense, making the sustainability of this conflict impossible from the American perspective. We're going to run out of ammunition and run out of the ability to defend ourselves long before the Iranians run out of missiles. You know, we need to also reflect on the fact that a significant proportion of the weapons being used to strike Iran today are ground-based weapons — the HIMARS firing the standard HIMARS rocket or firing the ATACMS missile.

I think there's some indication they might be firing an advanced long-range missile as well from the system. But, you know, this just underscores the reality that American strike power has to be augmented by ground-launched — American air-launched strike capacity has to be augmented by ground launch because we don't have enough weapons. And I believe the reports coming out from sources in the Pentagon, etc., that say we're running out of ammunition, both in terms of our ability to strike Iran and defend, which again reinforces the point that the Iranians are not losing here.

Um, the fact that the Iranians continue to be able to launch ballistic missiles in quantities, and the fact that they're hitting the targets they're aiming at, just again reinforces the point that Iran has not seen its capabilities degraded. The United States, on the other hand, is seeing its capabilities degraded. And even if Donald Trump chooses to escalate, all that will do is deplete the American arsenal even quicker. So then we compound all this with the fact that, you know, what this war is really about — oil — just became a major factor. Iran has not only shut down the Strait of Hormuz, but now the Houthis in Yemen have blockaded Saudi Arabia, in effect closing the Bab al-Mandab Strait.

And Saudi Arabia had deflected 70 percent of its oil production away from the Strait of Hormuz to the port of Yanbu and through the Bab al-Mandab Strait. Now Saudi Arabia is 100 percent locked off. They might be able to reroute some tankers through the Suez Canal, but that makes the sustainability of that routing questionable because it's just too expensive. So we are seeing major developments in this war, and the one thing that's clear is that Iran is not losing and the United States is not winning. And if you project that trajectory on both lines, it signals a strategic American defeat.

#Danny

Yeah, great point, Scott. Now, here is exactly what you're talking about. There is a Washington Post report — this is from the Times of Israel citing it — saying that while the U.S. is making plans for a potential expansion of military operations, it is limited by low munitions stockpiles. The U.S. is planning for a wider war, but according to this, it will be hamstrung by its insufficient stockpiles of air defense and long-range missiles, also limited in its ability to bring more troops to the fight

because of battle damage incurred by Iran. That's a pretty big report. And now I wanted to show you, Scott, this report by CBS. I found it to be fascinating in terms of the reaction to what has happened in Jordan. Here we go.

#Speaker 1

The loss of the first U.S. soldiers to die in combat in months here in Jordan has raised serious questions, starting with why Jordan? Why now? And how did it happen? Analysts point to a few different factors. First of all, Jordan doesn't have the kind of robust air defenses that you would see in more established U.S. military bases, like where the Fifth Fleet is based in Bahrain or in Kuwait. And those countries also have robust air defenses. Jordan doesn't have anything near that. Secondly, Jordan really doesn't have the kind of military to launch any kind of retaliatory strikes against Iran. In fact, the last thing they want to do is try to face Iran in their own conflict.

Thirdly, yes, U.S. forces are dispersed throughout here. And although we've talked about the loss of the U.S. soldiers who have been killed in missile strikes, dozens more have been wounded in multiple strikes over the course of the past few days. So while Jordan has largely managed to avoid bearing the full brunt of Iranian attacks, that all changed a few days ago. Something has happened to either cripple America's early warning system to show when missiles are coming in or to find some way to stop these missiles, projectiles, or drones from actually doing any damage. The Iranians have seen that Achilles' heel, and they're exploiting it.

#Danny

Scott, what is that something that has happened? I found that very interesting. Something has happened that has made it difficult for Jordan to use its U.S. hardware to stop these missiles and drones. What is that something?

#Scott Ritter

First of all, we just have to point out the absurdity of the report. I'm not denigrating the conclusions, but the fact base is just flawed. The United States has deployed some of its most advanced anti-air, anti-missile defense capabilities to Jordan. The THAAD missile batteries, the Patriot PAC-3 — these are the premier anti-missile units, and the United States has deployed them into Jordan. So I just don't know what he's talking about to imply that Jordan is defenseless. But the reality is this makes this report even more damning to the United States because even though we have deployed the best resources possible to defend American forces that are operating out of Jordanian soil.

Um, we're not able to, you know, successfully defend. Our weapon systems are not shooting down the missiles — the best weapon systems we have, by the way. You know, Donald Trump may be talking about the failure of a Jordanian unit, but that's just part of an integrated air defense system, similar to what we do with Israel, where you tie in host nation air defense. And maybe the Iranians

exploited that gap. But what's happening here is the Iranians have better weapons than we do, and the Iranians also have a better approach to conflict than we do. They've done a thorough assessment of how we fight, what makes our systems work.

And, you know, they've been, you know, sending missiles at United States bases in the region now for some time. And they've effectively destroyed much of the early warning capacity of the United States. So we're not getting the initial launch notifications, the accuracy, and it gives us reduced time to react. But at the end of the day, that's just making excuses for the sad truth, if you're an American. Our weapons aren't capable of stopping the Iranian weapons. You know, that's what happened. The Iranian weapons are superior to American weapons, and the United States has no defense against the weapon systems that Iran has brought to bear.

That doesn't mean Iran's not doing damage. Of course they're doing damage. But the point is, you know, the report seems to imply that if we were able to reconstitute the systems that have been systematically destroyed by Iran, we would somehow magically be able to assert our dominance on the battlefield — the furthest thing from the truth. We lack the technological capacity to handle the Iranian ballistic missile threat, period, full stop. And they're going to continue to dissect American defenses and bombard American facilities. And the potential for additional American casualties — a great number of American casualties — is quite real.

#Danny

Yeah. Yeah. Well, Scott, now I wanted to ask you about the, you know, there's been a lot made of Parchin Mountains in recent days. And I'll just play what Donald Trump said very briefly about this. He's been asked about this several times — about this location, the nuclear program of Iran, subterfuge, et cetera, having been moved here. Here's that question and answer.

#Speaker 2

Thank you for the question. Do you believe that Iran has moved nuclear centrifuges into Parchin Mountain? When you say, "we're not done yet," what is left to finish?

#Donald Trump

Well, I think that they may have. We don't have it on record. All we do is read the fake news. You know, we see the news is so wrong so many times. So, you know, maybe this one they have right, but it's okay. It doesn't mean anything unless they have the material. You're talking about the centrifuges. It doesn't mean anything unless they have the material. They don't have it. We follow the material. That's where the action is. And we'll be hitting that area probably pretty soon. And there's not a thing they can do about it.

#Danny

So, Scott, hitting that area very soon — what does that even mean? Maybe you can help the audience understand Parchin Mountain. And there are B-1 bombers, I know, mobilizing around the Israel-Jordan area. What are your thoughts on this?

#Scott Ritter

Well, Parchin Mountain is an underground facility that is dug deep into the heart of a granite mountain, and I can't remember exactly how much granite is on the top, you know. But there's not a weapon in the United States arsenal that can defeat Parchin Mountain in the conventional arsenal. There's no realistic nuclear weapon that can defeat it as well. If we were to employ one of the heavier warheads from the Minuteman system or the Trident system, maybe we could partially collapse part of the Parchin system, but then that would be thermonuclear war using strategic systems and inherently destabilizing. The B-1 is not a nuclear-capable bomber.

And so, you know, the B-1 could be dropping, you know, uh, the GBU-57 Massive Ordnance Bomb. Um, but that doesn't work. We know that we dropped that on facilities during the first Iran war in June. And then later on, when this conflict began in February, the Iranians actually dug out a few of these bombs that didn't blow up, and they're aware of the totality of the capacity of this weapon. And I'm sure they've taken appropriate precautions. But this is just, again, par for the course for a president who, frankly speaking, doesn't know anything about military art, doesn't know anything about the weapon systems. He receives superficial briefings, and therefore he presents superficial argumentation to a superficial American public.

#Danny

Scott, what have you made of the—there's been a kind of diplomatic, well, you know, there's a complete rupture between the U.S. and Iran, but the mediators—Qatar, Pakistan—they've been rushing in recent days, actually in the last 24 hours, 24, 36 or so, to try to get some kind of 10-day ceasefire. Both sides, the U.S. and Iran, have rejected this. Uh, what do you make of this rush, and what's compelling it? And, uh, why is it that the United States appears to be, uh, digging in and doubling down despite all of the consequences that it's having, and consequences that you said earlier could very well build up if this thing continues and pile up?

#Scott Ritter

Yeah. I mean, uh, you know, to be able to answer this question with, um, you know, a modicum of, uh, certainty, um, I'd have to be speaking to American policymakers to get the true answer to the question.

#Scott Ritter

Danny, you're going to have to do me a favor because it's late here, and my brain just literally cleared. I have the answer in my head, but I need the question rephrased.

#Danny

Sure, everyone should know that it's after midnight where Scott is, and so everyone should appreciate his effort by giving a like here. Well, uh, so the question was, Scott, the diplomatic rush that's occurred from the mediators—Pakistan, Qatar—there's even said other Gulf countries have participated in this as well to try to gain some kind of 10-day ceasefire leading to maybe a 90-day ceasefire, and Iran has rejected it. And so it's over to you now. Yeah, well, I mean, first of all, the credibility and the viability of the mediation efforts are at risk.

#Scott Ritter

And so, you know, they're trying to reestablish, um, you know, a forum that could lead to a negotiated settlement. They thought they had one through the memorandum of understanding and the negotiations that were used to achieve that. Um, but this appears to be more of an initiative by the negotiators as opposed to either Iran or the United States asking these people to do things. Uh, Iran has the upper hand—that's what they believe. And Trump believes that he has yet to begin to fight, that there are more capabilities he can bring to bear. Um, and so this rush of diplomacy, you know, isn't something that I believe is going to generate any real diplomatic outcome.

Uh, it's not until, uh, Iran, the United States, or both, um, you know, feel, um, significant pain. It's pain that brought the United States to the negotiating table last time. Donald Trump has admitted the United States was running out of oil. J.D. Vance acknowledges that the MOU was just a fraud, that it was only there to buy time so we could get more oil. And the one thing they didn't talk about is that we could generate additional weapons to replenish our stockpiles, to strip the Pacific bare, to strip Europe bare, to basically hamstring any effort to provide ballistic missile support to Ukraine. All of this was diverted to the region to deal with an Iranian missile threat, but it hasn't been able to deal with the Iranian missile threat.

This is the reality. So we're not going to have a negotiated settlement just because the former mediators want one. It's going to require either the United States or Iran, or both nations, to reach a conclusion that they are not going to achieve what they want on the battlefield. And that, for damage control or whatever, the only option, the only venue available to them, is a diplomatic outcome. So in a way, it's good that these diplomats are flexing their diplomatic muscles so that they don't atrophy. But the race isn't going to be run now. The diplomatic race will be run when either Russia, the United States, or Iran, or both, decide that the need for peace is greater than the imperative for war.

#Danny

Now, there is a troubling development that's been emerging, and of course it resides a lot within the mainstream media, that there's a narrative going around about the U.S. war on Iran as it is currently constituted being increasingly a forever war. And this is a retired general who—let me actually just pull up his name here—Rob Calding. I'm not familiar with him, but he had this comment to say about the low munitions and the issues with that, and whether he thinks this will be a problem for continuing the war in the immediate and long-term future.

#Speaker 3

How much longer do you expect this to go on? And do you think munitions should be a limitation at this point? What are you hearing?

#Speaker 4

No, I don't think, you know, the Pentagon has done a great job of restocking the munitions. I don't think that's an issue at all. But I do expect that we're going to be there a long time. You know, Operation Northern and Southern Watch went on for almost 20 years, I think. So I think this is going to be something similar. We're going to have to stay there. Those guys aren't going to change their behavior. We have to adapt. And I think, you know, we're going to have to get the Gulf states and those who rely on the oil coming from the Gulf states to help pay for this.

#Danny

So that's the narrative going around, that this is going to go on for a long time. Stockpiles are not an issue. And ultimately, it's similar to the Iraq situation. I think it's very different. But your thoughts on this?

#Scott Ritter

Stockpiles are an issue. I mean, intellectually, you cannot support what he said based upon realities. Look, let's just deal with, you know, just baseline math. You know, we have weapons, we fire weapons, and if we run out of weapons, we can't fire weapons. And so while we're firing the weapons, we need to find new weapons to replace the weapons we're firing. Ideally, at a minimum, you want to replace them on a one-for-one basis. But because this is war and you can anticipate potential, you know, increases in rates of fire, et cetera, you want to produce more weapons than you expend. That's always a good thing, especially when you've taken the weapons out of other theaters of operation.

It takes over two years to produce a single Patriot missile. People need to understand that. Over two years, you know, we're expending. I think there was video that showed Bahrain firing eight Patriots to intercept one target. But the bottom line is, you know, the replacement rate for Patriots is a little bit more than one missile a day. We're expending dozens of missiles a day. Do people understand

what I'm saying? I'm saying that we have an expenditure rate, when compared to a replacement rate, which is totally skewed against replenishment of stockpiles, that we are going to rapidly run out of ammunition and we're going to have no capacity to replace those munitions.

And so we'll have empty stockpiles. There's nothing the general can say that can change this outcome. Even if we, as you know, we've done, you know, the United States has had Lockheed Martin and Raytheon let new contracts for the accelerated production of the Patriot. But even if the contracts are initiated today, you're not getting a Patriot missile until two or three years down the road. This war is probably not going to be around in two or three years.

And, whatever, if there is a war, you know, the Ukrainians won't have any air defense to protect themselves. So I think the general is 100% wrong on that. I think the military math alone precludes this from being a long war. The United States will run out of ammunition, and that's a fact. The Iranians, on the other hand, appear to have their capabilities underground. They're showing no pressure to limit their strikes. In fact, the talk is that Iran is going to accelerate the missile strikes in order to drive home psychologically the inevitability of an American defeat. So I think the general is just wrong across the board. I don't think anything he said is right.

I don't think this war will last long because you can't have a war if you don't have the capacity to fight this war. Donald Trump early on was talking about a three-week war, and it's probably because in the back of his brain, he remembers a briefing where someone said, we run out of ammunition in three weeks and we need to accomplish everything during this time or, you know, we're going to fail. And so, you know, this is what we're looking at — you know, three weeks. The Iranians aren't going to run out of ammunition in three weeks, and we're not going to do fatal harm to Iran in three weeks. I think this is just going to further deplete, you know, America's military prowess.

Um, an uncausable war that we haven't been able to articulate why it is we're fighting. We're trying to make up this notion that it's to save America and the world from an Iranian nuclear bomb, but it's a nuclear bomb Iran wasn't producing, wasn't trying to produce, didn't want to produce. And the American side knows all this because they've seen the evidence. They're aware of the evidence. And, you know, so this is... this is a case where the United States is manufacturing consent for a war against Iran that we cannot win. And it's a war that will stop sooner rather than later because, you know, our strategic position will be so weakened, so fragile, so exposed that we will have no choice but to sue for peace.

#Danny

All right. I guess the question will be, how will that be spun exactly? Well, I wanted your thoughts, Scott, more on the Yemen blockade, the reaction to Saudi Arabia's aggression — what ended up being actually a bit of a short-lived aggression — strikes on Iran. Sana'a Airport now leading to Yemen, Ansar Allah, the Houthis, as they're called in Western media, to engage in a full-scale blockade of Saudi Arabia. Now, today, that has borne fruit, with six ships total in a single day being

turned back based on Ansar Allah's warnings. Here's Donald Trump's comments on how he feels about Yemen's blockade of Saudi Arabia.

#Donald Trump

But we take care of things. If something like that happens, we take care of it. You know, we've done that with the Houthis before, and we haven't heard from them in a while since we did what we did originally. It was about 45 days of very powerful action we took against the Houthis. And we've had no problem with the Houthis. They've had no problem with us for a long period of time, including during this conflict. I think that if there is something like that, we'll just have to take care of it. Okay.

#Danny

We'll have to take care of it, Trump says, Scott. But what do you think will be the impact, or is already the impact, of this blockade as it goes on and on? Because while it does single out Saudi Arabia only, Saudi Arabia is a big part of the energy equation in the region, obviously.

#Scott Ritter

Yeah, I mean, it's smart to signal it's Saudi Arabia. Remember that the causal relationship to this is the Saudi decision to effectively blockade the Houthis of Yemen by shutting down the airfield, attacking the airfield, bombing the airfield — the international airfield at Sana'a. And so now, you know, Iran is retaliating, and they're retaliating in a way that appears to be capable of doing significant harm to, you know, Saudi Arabia's economy. Saudi Arabia, after the end of the 39-day war — which I think the first week of April is when the ceasefire began — has reworked its oil delivery capabilities so that now somewhere around 70% of the oil or refined product that's produced is shipped through the western city of Yanbu directly on the Red Sea.

By closing this down, 100% of Saudi Arabia's energy output is now impacted by, you know, this move by the Houthis and by continued fighting against the Houthis and, I mean, against Iran. I'm sorry, you know, shutting down the Strait of Hormuz, not shutting down Iran. But, you know, the fighting between Saudi Arabia and Yemen is what kicked this off. You know, the Houthis didn't come out of nowhere. This is a retaliatory strike for, you know, Saudi Arabia attempting to impose an air, you know, air blockade of Yemen. This is unsustainable. I mean, the fact is, you know, we have dropped to, I think today or yesterday, we're down to 43 days on our strategic oil. Um, ladies and gentlemen, that means that we run out.

We can't, uh, there will be empty gas stations. There will be no diesel. Uh, people will be driving around and having to pull their car over because there's no gasoline to go on. It changes life as we know it. Um, you know, and this is the direction we're heading. And, uh, you know, this is why what the Houthi did is so important. Uh, we also need to realize that Donald Trump, uh, has talked big about the Houthi before, uh, bombing them. Um, and it had no meaningful impact on the Houthi,

even though they killed the Yemeni regime, so to speak, and killed many senior members. This only caused the Houthi to rally even more closely around their leadership. Around their leadership — I can't say elected leadership.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah, no, it certainly does seem that, and I think it's in both instances, the more that the U.S. attacks, the stronger, at least in terms of their legitimacy, Ansar Allah as well as Iran's government becomes. Now, I wanted to—this is, you know, as we're talking, Donald Trump posted this. Because of all the flak around the Iran strikes that have taken U.S. service members' lives, he decided to lash out and essentially list all of these wars that the U.S. has participated in and how fewer deaths have occurred during four months of the military conflict against Iran. In four months, just 18 dead, according to him, zero dead in the Venezuela war. And, you know, listing off the numbers—2,000 dead in 20 years in Afghanistan, 4,600 in Iraq over nine years, et cetera, et cetera. What do you make of this, Scott? This is, you know, on the one hand, I guess facts are facts, but on the other, this may belie some other factors and issues that maybe Trump does not want to confront.

#Scott Ritter

Well, I think that's the case. You know, as I said earlier, the casualty levels that we're actually suffering in this conflict are quite low if you're looking at the lives of American service members. But what Iran is doing is destroying our capacity to fight. I mean, if we have personnel deployed in the Middle East, but they don't have the command and control, they don't have the communications, they don't have the actual weaponry to fight because Iran has destroyed them, or destroyed their ability to marry up with this equipment, you know, this is going to ultimately end in a strategic Iranian victory. And, you know, this victory could include territorial acquisition and bringing large swaths of territory under the control of Iran.

So this is the direction we're heading. I think Donald Trump is being disingenuous. His fact set that he put up there is meaningless. You know, you can't compare the historic struggles of the constitutional republic called America—the Revolution, the Civil War, et cetera. You can't compare these struggles with what we're doing today. But you should focus on what is happening here. Remember, the United States is the one who initiated this conflict, which means we have clearly established political objectives that are not being fulfilled—the elimination of the Iranian regime, the collapse of the Iranian military's capability of sustaining this fight.

You know, these are goals and objectives set out by the United States, and we haven't accomplished them. This is the thing that we have to understand. We've already dropped a lot of bombs—a lot of bombs. The idea that we're going to be able to continue this conflict and achieve a new, surprising outcome is absurd in the extreme. So, you know, this is just Donald Trump saying—I can't sit here and say that he's deliberately misleading the American people—but if he truly believes what he wrote on that post, it underscores the fact that Donald Trump is extraordinarily far removed from

reality. And that's a very dangerous place for American service members, for the American people, in a time of war.

#Danny

And before we get to a bit on Russia and Ukraine, your last comment on this. You know, Kuwait has been complaining about Iran now striking desalination plants, power plants, and has accused Iran of war crimes. Trump has said that Iran kills children like candy. And I'm wondering your reaction to this, especially regarding the targeting of desalination plants and power plants now by Iran. What do you make of this and this accusation of Iran committing war crimes?

#Scott Ritter

Well, I think we need to point out that Iran has, you know, didn't initiate this fight, that it was American missiles operating from Kuwait and Bahrain which struck Iranian desalination plants and Iranian power generation plants, putting thousands of people—their ability to sustain life—at risk. And so what Iran is doing is retaliation, and it's one that makes sense. By striking Kuwait's desalination plants, you eliminate Kuwait's ability to provide drinking water, or water of any sort, to its people. You can't sustain modern industrial life and a high quality of life without water. So, you know, there's that. Then power generation—you know, it's the summertime, it's very hot. To be livable in the desert, you either need to be in a tent not moving during the daytime, in a traditional Bedouin style, or you need to be in a building that has air conditioning and considerable electric draw.

Kuwait has the power generation capacity to make life comfortable in Kuwait, but what Iran is doing is destroying this power generation capacity so that Kuwait can't provide energy to light up apartment rooms, to air condition, to, you know, do cold storage for food and all this stuff. Basically, Iran is killing Kuwait, and it's something I've said all along—that is the ultimate Iranian weapon. And I think what they're doing now is sending a clear signal that, you know, Kuwait as a nation-state is literally on the verge of dying, unable to drink, unable to feed its population.

You're going to see the mass migration of the citizens of Kuwait. And that opens up some interesting possibilities because there are many in Iran who understand that Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, calling it the 16th province of Iraq. And there's a good chance that if Kuwait is unable to provide for its people, if its people start to flee and there's a precipitous drop in population, Iraq may in fact make a move to protect its southern flank by absorbing Kuwait. So it's early on in the process, but this is a very interesting and dangerous development for Kuwait.

#Danny

Yeah, there have even been rumors—I know you addressed this on Judge's show—of the possibility of an Iranian ground attack into Kuwait and the bases there, leading to a potential disaster for the

United States. One that, while Iran may take some hits, there are obviously people within Iran that have been talking about this. And so I see it as a major warning to the U.S. in many ways. Scott, now, as I know you are staying up late, let's finish off on Ukraine. This is the latest out of the Atlantic Council, our favorite propaganda arm of NATO. This is the narrative we're seeing everywhere now, Scott.

Ukraine is winning. And, of course, there are a lot of recommendations on how to, so-called, quote-unquote, finish the job. Now, what this, you know, NATO mouthpiece is saying is that what they need are Patriot interceptors—that's the big thing, Patriot interceptors. That is how Ukraine finishes the job. But, Scott, how is Ukraine winning exactly? Of course, the citations here, the evidence of this, all lie in the fact that Ukraine is sending drones at Russian territory and bringing the war to Russia. But I'm not sure how that equates to victory. Help me understand—help the audience understand.

#Scott Ritter

Well, I mean, the first thing we need to understand is that Ukraine is not winning this war. There's not a single aspect of this conflict in which Ukraine has the upper hand. On the ground, Russia is advancing everywhere, slowly but surely—in some cases, not so slowly. Russia is inflicting horrific harm on the Ukrainian armed forces. The casualties that Ukraine loses daily from dead and wounded, or, frankly speaking, the percentage of soldiers who say, "To hell with this, I don't want to do this anymore. I've watched too many of my buddies die."

Um, so, you know, Russia has the advantage across the, uh, you know, across every aspect of this battlefield. But war isn't just about the battlefield. Um, you know, the economy—Russia's economy is stable. There was just the St. Petersburg International Forum that was convened last month. I had the honor and privilege of speaking on a panel there on diplomacy. But Russia is not allowing this conflict to define it. The St. Petersburg International Forum had 20,000 people from 130-plus nations visit, and the participants there signed \$84 billion worth of contracts with Russia. Now, I'm not an investor, but I can guarantee you that investors don't invest in unstable or losing or unpredictable causes.

And so the people that put their money into Russia are people who are confident that Russia is on the right track. And economically, Russia is thriving compared to Ukraine. We can go to just society. It's not demonstrators in the streets of Moscow we're talking about; we're talking about demonstrators in the streets of Kiev. It wasn't Russia that fired its defense minister and its joint chiefs. That's like Putin firing Belousov and Gerasimov. No, it's the Ukrainians. And so you have to say one side appears to be unstable, the other side appears to be stable, and the side that's stable is Russia.

And so, again, there's just not a single aspect of this situation, of this conflict, where Ukraine is doing well, which then begs the question: why is everybody in the West shouting at the top of their

lungs that Ukraine is winning this war, that the drones are—because it's pure propaganda. This is literally an information operation designed to sow the seeds of doubt in the minds of what passes for a liberal elite inside Russia, and then to allow these seeds to germinate and infect, you know, the totality of Russia so that there is a Moscow-Maidan moment. The people of Russia rally into the streets and demand the overthrow of Vladimir Putin. That is the goal. That is the objective.

But it's failing. And, you know, people need to understand that it was always an information operation. It was always a propaganda exercise, what they're doing. It doesn't mean that the Ukrainian drones that are provided by the West aren't doing real harm. Of course they are. Vladimir Putin has come out and said the same thing. But you don't see the Russians panicking here because the Russians have identified the problem and they have the solution. And we see them implementing the solution on a daily basis. You know, 30 Iskander-M missiles hitting targets in Kiev that turned out to be 100% involved in drone manufacturing. You know, this is the reality of what's going on.

This is an information operation that's designed to convince people on the outside that Ukraine has a chance, that allows for continued investment, which Ukraine desperately needs. But I think more importantly, it creates an echo chamber that bounces this message back into Russia, where it's picked up by the Russian liberal elites in hopes that they can start to question Vladimir Putin's leadership and question his time in office, etc. Danny, remember when the bomb was dropped on Ali Khamenei's home and he died? You know, people in the West thought that would mean the collapse of the Iranian will to fight, etc. What people don't understand is these drone attacks—not only are they not strategically hurting Russia, they're having the exact opposite effect.

The Russian people are rallying behind their country, and it's going to be impossible, you know, to separate Putin from the people, which is what they wanted to do in the upcoming parliamentary elections on September 20th. That's the goal. That's the objective. It's a propaganda exercise. It's not working. Putin is stronger today than he has ever been. Engaging in this—this is what triggered the unrest that we see in Ukraine today. People are in the streets protesting the firing of Fedorov, a 35-year-old punk AI technologist, to convince Zelensky that he should pour billions of dollars into this drone operation, this drone campaign. The West supported it because the West is about, again, creating the perception of the inevitability of a Russian defeat that will never come. But Fedorov took all the resources.

Syrsky, the commander of the ground forces, didn't get the resources he needs to reconstitute his army. And so we have the Ukrainian army being defeated on the battlefield, withdrawing, in danger of losing the totality of the Donbass sooner rather than later. And it happened. And the Ukrainian people are now saying, well, wait a minute, we were promised a victory. We were promised that if we did these drone things, we would break the Russians' will to fight, that there would be a victory here. And I think they're waking up to the reality that they've been bamboozled the whole time.

#Danny

What bamboozles me, Scott, is why, if Ukraine is doing so well, Zelensky or the Ukrainian regime would get rid of their defense minister at this time, Alexander Syrsky. There were nationwide protests calling for his dismissal. I'm not sure why, Scott. Honestly, as you said, the propaganda has been so deep and incessant that it's hard to actually get good information coming out of what's happening in Ukraine now. Why do you think this happened?

#Scott Ritter

Because Ukraine's losing the war. This drone campaign was an act of desperation by the West. Again, the job is to create, to sow the seeds of doubt inside Russia. That's the only chance the West has of victory. The West will not defeat Russia. The West cannot defeat Russia. What the West is seeking to do is drag this war out for so long that the Russian people lose faith in their government, lose faith in this war, and demand an end to the conflict. And the Ukrainians bought into this pathway by believing Western analysts who said, if you just focus on strategic drone strikes at the medium and long-range level, you can strike Russian facilities. The Russians will have to shut them down, it will bring real harm to Russia, and people will start opposing Vladimir Putin.

And the goal is to drive his party, United Russia, out of the parliament. But the fact of the matter is, Putin's never been more popular today than at any time. We've seen, you know, a drop of four percentage points, but that's within the margin of error. You know, the Russians are winning, they're advancing, etc. Why this happened is because Zelensky was confronted with the hard fact that the Russians are winning on the battlefield, and Ukraine needs to have brigades capable of plugging the hole. And all the money that was supposed to go to building brigades went to this drone fantasy. And so now, as Zelensky sees the reality on the battlefield, he gets his commander, Syrsky, and says, what do you need? And he says, I need brigades, and you have to stop this drone nonsense.

And then Fedorov refused. He said, no, I have the winning formula. Everything's going good. So Zelensky had to relieve him. And now you have a propaganda victory for the Russians because Fedorov is gone. But then Fedorov led a campaign that was seen as threatening the viability of Zelensky. So Zelensky in turn relieved Syrsky and has replaced him. But this is complete turmoil. This shows the level of instability that exists inside Ukraine today. And it's all because of this deception operation, this information operation being run, you know, on behalf of Ukraine by the collective West, which is designed to make people believe that a Russian victory is unachievable, that a Russian defeat is inevitable, and that the Russian people need to rise up against Vladimir Putin.

#Danny

Well, Scott, I want to say to the audience that they should know, you know, when I was in China in April during the height of the 40-day-ish first round of the U.S.-Israeli war on Iran, you were kind enough to join my program at that time when I was streaming out at midnight time in Iran. You had come on where you were at midnight as well and spent so much time here breaking down these latest developments. So everyone should do a like storm for Scott, as well as check out ScottRitter.

com in the video description and support all of his work. Scott, any final words before we wrap up here?

#Scott Ritter

I mean, we're living in a historic time, but I would just say that people need to understand that what's happening here is not just about Ukraine or the collective West. We're looking at a world in transition away from American domination, American hegemony, to a multipolar world. And Ukraine is one of the critical battlefields in this transition. But while the Ukraine conflict might be resolved, the struggle between the American hegemon and the forces of multipolarity are going to continue to clash. And so, there are analysts saying this war will go on and on and on. I believe that the war in Ukraine is going to end sooner rather than later. I think the Russians have a winning formula, and I think that they're going to push this through to the bitter end. But the fact of the matter is, this conflict is much more than simply Ukraine. This conflict is the collective West against Russia, and it's going to be interesting to see how the collective West responds to defeat.

We already see political turmoil inside not just Ukraine, but in Europe itself. Marine Le Pen is positioning herself for a run at the presidency against Macron. The Alternative for Deutschland has a lead over all other political parties, including the party of Merz, and that lead is growing. There are elections next year, and there's a chance you'll see change there. We just saw another change of the guard in Great Britain. How long can this new prime minister hold on to? It's a fair question. But the fact is, we are seeing Europe in decline.

We're seeing the United States seek to step into this vacuum, but we're tied down through Cold War legacy ways of fighting war with Iran. We just live in interesting times. That's the thing I want to point out. And then I'll just conclude by saying that because we live in interesting times and people are thirsty for knowledge, supporting your independent podcasters, your independent journalists, is more important now than it ever has been. And I encourage your audience to support you to the full extent possible, Danny, because we need your voice and we need the service you're providing. So thanks for having me on.

#Danny

Of course, yeah. We'll head out together. Same goes to you, Scott. And everyone should know that hitting the like button gets more eyes on this. And then you can go to the video description after you do that and find ScottRitter.com, where you can support all of his work — his articles, his shows that he does tirelessly, even when he's in a completely different time zone. It's completely inconvenient to his viewers' well-being. I want to thank the chat, who says, "Scott, drink some hot lemon water instead of Coca-Cola." People looking out for you. But Scott, it was great to be with you. Everyone, of course, hit that like button. I'll be back tomorrow, 4 p.m. Eastern time, with our mutual friends Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson and Larry Johnson. Until then, July 22nd, everybody — we'll see you next time.

#Speaker 4

Bye.