

Scott Ritter: Trump Readies Tactical NUKES, US Carrier in CRISIS

Scott Ritter discusses the desperation mounting for the Trump administration as it pursues a potential nuclear option for Russia and China following its massive defeat in Iran. Meanwhile the USS Lincoln is reportedly in crisis, further complicating the war designs of the American empire. Scott Ritter is a former UN Weapons Inspector and US Marine Corps Intelligence Officer now widely renowned for his searing critiques of US foreign policy and pursuit of peace. <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, I am joined by friend of the show Scott Ritter, and we're talking about the latest developments in news. First, an issue very dear to Scott's heart: nuclear disarmament and arms control. The Pentagon has reportedly begun drawing up a new nuclear weapons strategy for war with Russia and China. And in this, the strategy overseen by Elbridge Colby would place a greater emphasis on short-range tactical nuclear weapons in the event of a regional war.

Now, it's interesting that Russia and China and nuclear war is becoming a subject, Scott, as we see that Donald Trump and Pete Hegseth clashed recently at Camp David over the Iran missile depletion issue, where he demanded in a very angry manner of Pete Hegseth, "Why are extreme munitions shortages occurring now?" And today, Donald Trump lashed out, saying that the U.S. has massive amounts of munitions. Additionally, large amounts are being manufactured and shipped to the U.S. as needed, and that the leakers of these treasonous statements are being hunted down and will go to jail. There's other issues, Scott, including reports that sailors on the USS Lincoln, who have been deployed to the Middle East since January of this year, are exhausted and suffering from poor morale on the ship.

So a crisis is brewing on this aircraft carrier, where the ship's doctor and therapist have said that they need to hit port soon or people are going to start, you know, losing their minds, said one step-parent of someone on the carrier. They noted morale issues and issues of moldy showers, inadequate facilities, even holes being seen emerging on the ship as it wears down out at sea. Scott, help us understand what's going on here. First, maybe to the nuclear war issue. It's such a curious thing that the United States is facing shortages on the front of air defenses and long-range missiles, and now is looking at nuclear war. How do you explain this?

#Scott Ritter

Well, first of all, we have to take a look at the history of the Nuclear Posture Review in the United States. Nuclear Posture Review is something that's ordered by a president, usually right when he comes in, but it can be ordered at any time it needs to be done. It's how the community examines what the posture of the United States will be regarding nuclear weapons. It used to be the United States, you know, maintained nuclear weapons in a purely deterrence mode, meaning, you know, we had weapons, we're ready to use them, but we're only going to use them if we're attacked with nuclear weapons. And then later on, this sort of got modified into, we could potentially preempt your attack if we found out about it.

But still, it's about nuclear weapons. Then it became weapons of mass destruction, especially after Iraq. And then we threw in cyber, said if you attack us with cyber that threatens our national infrastructure, we could respond with nuclear weapons. So we're expanding the scope and scale. And most recently, the nuclear posture was we can use nuclear weapons anytime we want to, for any justification. We don't have to tell you. But still, the concept was that these are the big nukes, the boomers, the ones that we focused on when it came to arms control. Tactical nuclear weapons, first of all, they've never really factored into arms control negotiations, and they never really factored into nuclear posture.

They were just there in case we ever had to—if we ever went to nuclear war, it gave us some options. But I don't think people thought that we would be starting nuclear war from the bottom up. I think most people thought that when nuclear war comes, it would be an exchange of the big ones. And then at some point in time, whatever surviving ground forces could use tactical nukes in the final spasm of death. This is why we reduced our tactical nuclear arsenal, because it really just didn't make any sense to have these weapons, especially when you're spending hundreds of billions of dollars a year on, you know, seeking to maintain and sustain a conventional military superiority, or in some cases, supremacy.

This is why we spend all that money on those high-tech weapons. You know, and part of that, our plan was to, you know, we sought to intimidate people. I mean, when you park an aircraft carrier off the shore of a potentially hostile nation, what you're saying is, we can strike you anywhere we want using our aircraft, and our aircraft can avoid your air defenses by using standoff weapons. And if you fire anything at us, we'll shoot them down with our superior missile interception capabilities. The notion is that we had this technological supremacy, and so most nations would be intimidated into doing nothing.

And if nations did choose to stand up to us, we would come in with a massive spasm of violence, you know, hitting them with all this high-tech stuff, shock and awe, and they would just crumble and go away. And this was the goal. And, you know, this is, frankly speaking, let's look at Europe. There was a time when, you know, remember early on when the Europeans, the United States

manufactured the lie that Russia was getting ready to use a tactical nuclear weapon against Ukraine. The response from Europe wasn't going to be nuclear weapons. What they told the Russians is, "We will hit you with precision long-range standoff strike weapons."

It'll go into the depth of you, and we're going to knock you out like you've never been knocked out before. It'll be purely conventional, but we're going to hit you so hard you're going to regret ever using a nuclear weapon against Kyiv. So don't do it. And that's sort of been our strategy with China too. You go after the Taiwanese, we're going to hit you with everything. Our long-range standoff weapons are going to take you out across the depth of China. You'll never know what hit you. And if you dare shoot at us, we got all these missile defense things that will shoot you down because we're the best.

We're better than the rest. That's the posture that has been taken. What's happened? Iran proved all that to be a lie. Not only do we not knock you out with long-range standoff strike weapons, we run out of them very quickly. And when we run out of them, we have no more options. And not only do our missile interceptors not shoot down your missiles, but when we run out of them, it gives you free rein to attack everything. We exhausted the weaponry allocated to the Iran conflict. This is the truth. We exhausted it. Now, you threw up some things about numbers and all that. And Hegseth has been quibbling to the president because what Hegseth says is we still have sufficient long-range strike weapons and high-quality interceptors to continue this conflict against Iran.

He's not lying, except he's not putting in the bad news. In order to do this, we have to strip Europe and the Pacific bare, literally bare, of their remaining capability. We've already taken them down. I mean, we withdrew THAAD batteries and Patriot batteries from South Korea and Japan, for God's sakes. But now we're taking down the reserves, the things that are in Guam and all those little ammunition depots in Guam, and then secondary ones in Hawaii. You know, the reserve. This is where we store the munitions that we need in case of war. And those are being drawn down—the same thing in Europe—being drawn down to the point that if we had a shooting war with Russia and China, we couldn't sustain it.

I mean, that big strike that everybody's threatening Russia with couldn't happen today because we don't have the weapons. Even if we did, if we did it, it wouldn't work because now we know that the targeting is flawed and the weapons don't do what they're supposed to do and all that kind of stuff. It's all been a bluff. But we can't even bluff anymore. So now the question is, what do you do? We're weak. How do we keep the Chinese and the Russians from exploiting this weakness? Because, as you know, the propaganda has been saying that China is ready to attack Taiwan, some estimates by the end of this year, you know, and then, you know, Russia, of course. So once they win in Ukraine, although they're losing, remember, Russia's losing.

But once they win in Ukraine, they're going to move on the Baltics, and we have to be prepared for a war there. In the Baltics, we have to be able to fulfill Chris Donahue's wet dream of taking out Kaliningrad. But we can't because we don't have that. So now what they're doing is they're saying,

what do we have? Well, we don't want to go to the boomers right off the bat because that's bad. We'll all die. Why don't we? Why don't we just open up with nukes? You know, it's sort of the Karaganov philosophy that we've been talking about, where the Russians are saying, let's hit Europe with some nukes early on to send the terror into them. And now the United States is formally because Vladimir Putin wisely said no to the Karaganov doctrine.

Oh, hell no, we're not doing that. That's crazy. Well, now we know where crazy resides in Washington, D.C., because we are actively looking at using tactical nuclear weapons early on in any potential conflict to set the scene, to set the stage, to let them know. Let them know what? Because every war game that has ever been played out in the Pentagon is—the moment you use one nuclear weapon, it's inevitable that there will be a general nuclear exchange, usually very quickly, and we all die. So this is literally the definition of insanity. The last time we talked about nuclear posture is when the Trump administration—well, actually, it was the Biden administration—had to deal with the reality that China was, because of the posture of the United States towards Taiwan, and the threat said, "Hey, if there's a war, we can take out your pathetic little nuclear arsenal, China."

So don't mess with us. And China went, "Oh, okay, we're just going to modernize and build the DF-41 long-range solid rocket with 10 to 12 warheads on it. We're going to put it in silos. We're building hundreds of silos out west, and we'll just shuffle them around. You have no idea which one. So if you want to take out our missiles preemptively, you're going to have to hit them with 300 to 400 warheads, right off the bat, sucking dry everything you got. And we'll still have some left to strike and destroy all your cities." So we're reestablishing deterrence. And the United States is going, "Wait a minute. China's just upped the target deck. If we're ever considering a preemptive strike against China, which we were, well, now we don't have sufficient nuclear weapons to do that, because if we use all the weapons to take out China, Russia with all their nukes..."

We got to have some left over for Russia, and Russia's, you know, expanded their target deck too. So we redid the fuzing, and we redid some other things about the nuclear weapons, so we didn't have to allocate, you know, two weapons per silo. We were saying, we're going to hit it with one weapon, fancy stuff. So we redid the nuclear strike plan based upon, you know, new contingencies. But the good news was, even while this was happening, we still had arms control in place. I mean, what was the complicating factor? New START Treaty and the caps that New START Treaty placed on the number of deployed nuclear weapons the United States could have.

And there was the potential that we could have extended it if we continued to talk, to help lower, you know, the risk of unintended consequences. In February of this year, New START went away. There is no more arms control, none whatsoever. There's nobody talking about it. In the United States, you're not even allowed to use the term. The Chinese are like, ah. The Russians are like, hell no. And nobody's talking about it. And now the United States is embarking on the single most dangerous nuclear posture development imaginable, one that says, let's use small nuclear weapons early to set the stage. Set the stage for what? I mean, I wrote a book about it called Highway to Hell. Read it, and you'll see exactly where we're heading: on a highway to hell.

#Danny

Hmm. Yeah, great points, Scott. I think that's so important. Well, one question to follow up on this then is: do countries like Russia and China, and even Iran, let's say—it wasn't mentioned in this particular report—but if the U.S. is considering using tactical nuclear weapons, I guess we can't rule out any theater here. But again, again.

#Scott Ritter

So Vladimir Putin, whom everybody should pay attention to when we speak of Russia's nuclear doctrine, has made it clear that if a single nuclear weapon is used against the soil of Mother Russia, then everybody dies. Automatically. We won't be the first to use nuclear weapons, he said, but we won't be the second either. Meaning that even if you launch one, even before it hits, everything's being launched for retaliation because they just assume that this is the beginning of the thing and they're not going to waste time. And that's the Russians. The Chinese are very reticent on this, but they haven't done too much public discussion about what their nuclear posture is or what their warfighting plans are.

It's always been they will absorb a strike and then retaliate. And they always make sure they have enough to retaliate in a way that they cripple you and destroy you. But how they envision it today, because they've been modernizing, I don't know. What I do know is that the Russians have envisioned the possibility of using nuclear weapons against a non-American target. They came up with a doctrine: trading Poznan for Boston isn't going to be something an American president wants to do. And then, you know, it's still uncertain what Russia and China would do if the United States used tactical nuclear weapons against a non-

#Scott Ritter

And so I do believe that there's a place for tactical nuclear weapons here. You know, again, it's hard to see what would happen if, for instance, the United States struck Belarus with nuclear weapons. You know, would Russia's response be to treat it as part of Russia? I think the Union State suggests yes, in which case you'll get the total deployment. I think that, you know, Russia has a legacy nuclear arsenal that dates back to the Cold War, and the Cold War did envision, for instance, tactical nuclear weapons being used in a significant manner for that big push to the Rhine and then on to the Channel that Russia came up with in the late 1970s, early to mid-1980s, six days to the Rhine. I think there were nuclear weapons factored into that plan.

And the United States, of course, planned on using nuclear weapons to disrupt that. So there was a period of time when both sides envisioned the possibility of a limited nuclear war using tactical weapons on the European landscape. That always ended up with a general exchange anyway, but at least they started off pretending that we all weren't going to die. Russia inherited this, you know,

legacy system. I don't think this legacy system actually conforms to Russia's nuclear posture today. You know, but the Russians are loath to give away capability free of charge. These tactical nukes that they have, they have a superiority in terms of numbers. The United States is talking about potentially deploying more B61 bombs to Europe.

And at some point in time, if there's ever arms control, how do you get those B61s out of Europe? Maybe put the tactical nukes on the table, link them to the French and British nuclear programs, something. So the Russians have things right now that I don't think there's a viable military plan to use. They're there because once you start using nukes, I think it goes straight to the boomers up top. The Chinese, I don't know. I don't know what the Chinese strategy is. Will China, you know, use nuclear weapons against Taiwan? I mean, here's the thing. You know, Russia's not going to use nuclear weapons against Ukraine because Ukraine is an extension of, you know, it's a Slavic country. Taiwan is a Chinese territory. Why would they nuke themselves? So, you know, it's hard to see what the Chinese would do.

I would think that if... I don't know. I don't know the Chinese thinking. This is why I'd like to talk to the Chinese and get a better idea of what they're thinking. But, you know, are they really going to talk to me? But we just don't know what the Chinese... The Chinese, you know, there are some scenarios they've talked about. I think it's a DF-21. They call it a carrier killer. So the idea is that it can either be precision-guided into a carrier and sink it with a direct hit from a conventional warhead, or it can use a nuclear weapon and take out the whole carrier battle group. And, you know, that might be something that China could consider. But I don't know. I just think it's really dangerous to be talking about using nuclear weapons because you're never going to contain it. Once it's used, it's all going to be used.

#Danny

Yeah, great points. And all we know about China's policy is no first use. That's been the policy since they tested their first nuclear weapon all the way back in 1964. So, Scott, now to the story on the USS Lincoln, because I wanted your thoughts on how this affects the broader war effort. We know that there are talks right now on the Strait of Hormuz between Iran and Oman, and many are saying the deal is set and Israeli and U.S. vessels are going to be excluded from being able to cross the strait. At least that's the reports.

But then there's this factor that I don't think anyone considers, which is, you have the USS Lincoln and these aircraft carriers out there. The USS Lincoln has been out there since January, and now there's all these horrible reports about the personnel out there are worn out by working seven days a week, some of them barely any food that's worth eating, lack of soap, toothpaste, and other amenities. Plus, holes are showing up in the ship due to wear and tear. What do you make of how this affects something like this war on Iran that now apparently is going even further south with these talks on the Strait of Hormuz, at least for the United States?

#Scott Ritter

Yeah, I mean, you see that right there? Marines. You're not going to get too much sympathy from me about bad conditions on a ship. You're at war, dude. That's the problem, though. We're not at war. There's no declared war. This is very much a peacetime military. When these sailors went on the cruise, they're expecting a six-month pop, be home. Family planning is done in regards to this. You know, maybe the wife and the kids relocated to where the parents are to help, and the kids get put into a school district, but then they're going to be pulled out of the school district based upon the anticipated return time. Vacations are planned. These guys don't make a lot of money, but they're planning vacations in advance.

So the wife's bought tickets and hotel rooms, and all of a sudden you're extended, and you're going to, you know, you got to do the refund, the exchange. It's 300 bucks because you went cheap. You didn't buy the insurance. You lose that money, and now you can't go on. It's a morale shot. The wife leaves. The guy's getting a Dear John letter in the middle of a deployment that's going on forever. And, you know, they weren't really briefed on what they're doing. It's just another show of force. You're going to launch things. Things are happening. You're not really aware of the totality of the plan. Nobody is. You know, that plan changed five times in 10 days early on. What plan are we in? What war are we fighting? Why are we fighting? Wait, there's a ceasefire. We're supposed to go home. No, we're staying. MOU violated.

Why are we violating? I thought it was a ceasefire. And this kind of stuff's going on. Instead of just being straight up with the sailors, you're at war. Grow up. You know, so sad, too bad, wouldn't want to be. You shouldn't have raised your hand. But we're at war, and you're going to do your damn job. And stop complaining. I want you up in the morning doing your job. I want you at night getting your rest. Eat the food when we give it to you. You say you love the food. Thank you, Uncle Sam, for the food. And get back to service. But you only do that when there's an actual war. Instead, we have this peacetime military. I mean, the same thing with the Army. The Marines, less so. The Marines are pretty hardcore. But even now, the Marine Corps have family. They have the same problems. How do you deploy when you deploy?

What happens to the families, family support, but things that nobody thought about in World War II? To be honest, you just sent the boys away, and when the war ended, the boys came home. Now we send people out. The sustainment package for a carrier is, again, based on peacetime modalities. The budgeting, we acquire sustainment packages. They're shipped out to the ship, but now the ship's coming in. We haven't budgeted for an extension. If we did, we're robbing it from the next aircraft carrier. This is the problem with going to war with a peacetime force. I mean, this is why Congress has to step up and do its job. Declare war. If you want to go to war against Iran, declare war.

But this president comes out and he just makes stuff up, and then we are at war. We're not at war. I mean, what are we at? We don't know. And that leads to confusion. The confusion leads to morale

issues. I think if you were very straight with these sailors: we're at war, and this is why we're fighting. You know, one of the things that was important—you remember the guy that did the movie *It's a Wonderful Life*, Frank, not Capra, famous director. But he got brought into the military. He was old, but he got brought in. And they said, your job is to make a series of movies. It's called *Why We Fight*. You know what the importance of that movie was? When the soldiers went through basic training, they saw the movie *Why We Fight*.

They sat there, and if somebody asked them the question, "Why are you fighting?" they could answer it. They saw a propaganda movie that said, "This is why we're fighting. This is who the enemy is. This is what our cause is. This is what we're doing. This is why you're being asked to make the ultimate sacrifice." *Why We Fight*. Who's taking the time to do this with the modern sailors? Has anybody sat down? Because, you know, most of the time your leadership is going to be, you know, either going to be some gung-ho guy, you know, and the last thing the sailors want to see is some bald-headed, you know, huge-necked freak up there: "You're going to do this! You're going to do this! You're going to do this!"

And they're like, screw you. You know, I want to hear it from the boss of bosses. I don't want to hear it from you, you know, testosterone-laden steroid freak. But the boss of bosses is being silent. The president—this is his job as a leader—to sit down and say, "This is why we're fighting. This is what it's about. This is what I expect of you. And this is what I expect of the American people. The American people have your back. It's going to be hard, long hours. You're at war. I need you to keep the airplanes flying. I need you to keep the bombs being loaded. I need you to keep doing this. And it's going to be tough. We may not get a resupply out to you." They abandoned 1st Marine Division on Guadalcanal.

The U.S. Navy ran away. And the Marines were sitting there going, "Wait, where are you going? We need food. We need ammunition." "You're on your own." Did they surrender? No. Did they bitch and moan? Of course, they're Marines. But they turned around and they fought. They continued to fight until the Navy reestablished lines of supply. That's called war. War is an extreme thing. We have just done a horrible job of preparing the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who are engaged in whatever we're calling this. I think President Trump says it's a military operation, which is funny, just for all the people out there who—again, just a little anecdote. I attended a conference, a video conference, with a group of people who were talking about different issues. And I was talking about Russia's intervention in Ukraine.

I called it a special military operation. And somebody intervened and said, "How dare you use your Putinism? You're speaking the language of Putin. You're speaking the language of an occupier." I said, "But it's called a special military operation for a reason. It's not a war." You know, and I had to explain it to people. But, you know, the reaction—I'd say, "No, they're at war. Russia illegally invaded." Well, Donald Trump just came out: "No, it's a military operation." Donnie, do us a favor. Just put "special." You know, this is where we're at right now. We're not being honest with the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines. And as a result, there's going to be deficiency. And here's the

thing: all it takes is one person on the team to screw up. An aircraft carrier is a— that's my dog saying, "That's right."

One person on the team, a team member, screwed up. Now he's got the other team member in, and it becomes a cascading effect of dogs barking, interrupting the podcast. But the point is, when you're a team, especially something like an aircraft carrier, where you're launching and recovering aircraft, you're moving munitions around, you're moving fuel around, everything is carefully choreographed. And you need discipline. You need to be focused. You need to be locked in. The last thing you need is some guy crying about a Dear John letter or complaining because I didn't get to eat all the beans and bacon I wanted to eat last night, or the ice cream machine was off, or the toilet smells like it's been used about one month longer than it was programmed to be used.

And next thing you know, a mistake is made, we get an aircraft crash, a pilot dies. Munitions mishandled, which we saw in Vietnam, blows up, the ship sinks. These guys got to be locked in. They got to be focused. And they can't be if they don't understand the mission. They don't believe in the mission. And they can't understand the mission if it hasn't been adequately briefed to them. And I think this is the problem, including the families. The fact that families are communicating and talking back implies there's confusion amongst everybody. The totality of the team is confused. And you just defined this war problem in a nutshell: confusion, no teamwork. Hell, the president and the secretary of defense can't even get on the same page when it comes to why we don't have enough munitions.

#Danny

Yeah, which, to that end, Scott, I'll just pull this up again because I think it's worth reviewing. This is Trump's response to the Washington Post article about the—or not the Washington Post article, but all of the reports that have come out about munitions shortages: "The leakers of these treasonous statements are being hunted down. Long-term jail sentences will be sought." And these are the shortages that he's commenting on: 80% of THAAD interceptors, half of Patriot interceptors gone. This is just, Scott, this is just since February 28th.

#Scott Ritter

You understand the small print. You got to read the small print. It says the top two variants. Okay, that's the PAC-3, and that's the PAC-2, whatever GEM-T you want to put on it. Now, why don't we be honest, Mr. President? How many PAC-3s remain? Because that's the only one capable of shooting down a ballistic missile. The GEM-T can't shoot down anything the Russians bring to bear. So he says, you know, we got 1,100 left, but that's the two most modernized variants left. I would say that 80% of that number are the PAC-2 modernized variant that can't shoot down a missile, not a modern missile. So there's probably 150 PAC-3s remaining of that number, maybe 200. This is

why, when Ukraine said, "Mr. President, give us 300 PAC-3s," the president said, "No, we don't have any. We don't have any." This is the proof positive. We literally don't have any. And look at the number of THAADs. We're down to, you know, 90 left. That's crazy.

#Danny

And they're blind because all those radars have been destroyed in all the U.S. bases, at least in the theater of the Iran war.

#Scott Ritter

The good news is those radars, they're not expensive and they're not unique items. We can mass produce them rapidly because they're not some of the most complicated technology available in the United States. I'm lying. They're some of the most complicated technology available in the United States. We can't produce them rapidly. And when you lose a THAAD system, you lose a THAAD system. It's not as though we go, "Hey, bring me up another one, buddy." Nope. They ain't on the shelf.

#Danny

They're not talking about it either, that's for sure. They're not commenting. There's no comments coming from Trump or anyone else about that. But this is his direct response today, as we were speaking, to the Washington Post piece about him and Pete Hegseth clashing heads at Camp David recently about these munition shortages. He said, "The fake news, as usual, is spreading false and completely unfounded rumors. I'm extremely happy with the job Pete Hegseth is doing. Everything has been extraordinary, including our attack on Venezuela, where the result was accomplished in less than one day, allowing us to bring the worst criminals anywhere in the world, Nicolás Maduro, to justice."

Likewise, Iran, where the country has been decimated for the purpose of not allowing it to have a nuclear weapon, is going very well." Pete is highly respected within the military and has made tremendous improvements, including getting rid of DEI and increasing recruitment to historic levels. The rumor was started by the Washington Compost, one of the worst media outlets in the business. Despite our telling, their story is completely false. False. In actuality, I believe their fake reporting is treasonous. So there seems to be a big pattern, Scott. Bad reports come out in the media, and Trump reacts almost exactly like this: treasonous, put the reporters in jail, everything is going well. What do you make of it?

#Scott Ritter

Well, let's just remind people for a second of this thing called the Constitution. And the Constitution, you know, guarantees freedom of speech and free press. The 1972, I think it was, New York Times

versus the United States, the Pentagon Papers case, you know, when—gosh, I can't remember. I just had his name on the tip of my tongue. The guy who did the Pentagon Papers, Ellsberg. A friend of mine, by the way. I mean, up until the time he passed away, and we were in communication up until the day of. I mean, give his family—so sorry, Dan. Forgive me. I didn't forget about you. I'm talking about you right now.

But that case, people should go and read the, you know, the opinion written by the Supreme Court justice, why we need a free press. And one of the key things about it was that the government can't hide behind a wall of secrets. It can't hide, you know, failures. It can't hide lies. That's the important one. They can't hide lies. That it's a duty of a free press to uncover these lies. And the government can't, you know, hide the lies through secrecy. That—especially in the specifics of language, I might be getting off—but especially when we're talking about sending American boys overseas to die in foreign lands. Well, hell, that's exactly what's going on right now.

American boys and girls are going off to die in foreign lands. And the justification for this is based on lies, straight-up lies. And so now the press is doing its constitutional duty. I mean, this is why we have a free press. And the Supreme Court has put down in writing the importance of exposing the lies and breaking through the wall of secrecy. So the president is smoking dope. You know, Richard Nixon tried to do this. It didn't work. And every president since then has tried to do this thing: shut down a free press. Look, I'm a former intelligence officer. I know more than anybody the danger of, you know, irresponsible leaking of information.

You know, so I would not support it. Give me an example. Back in the 1990s, the CIA had found out that Osama bin Laden was using a specific kind of satellite phone to communicate. This is pre-9/11. We were trying to kill him because we understood the risk that Al-Qaeda posed. And so I forget the company, Morton—no, yeah, they're based out of the L.A., San Diego area—but they built a satellite that was specifically geared to intercepting that satellite phone. And it cost over a billion dollars to build this thing. And we launched it. And Aviation Week and Space Technology published an article that said that onboard was a classified package believed to be capable of intercepting the communications of Osama bin Laden.

That satellite went silent. I mean, the phone went silent. So we had a satellite in space. It wasn't collecting anything because it was specifically geared to get that, so we could take that guy out. That was harmful to the national security of the United States of America. I'm not in support of leaks of that nature. Those people who gave that up, free press doesn't protect you. That is a criminal action. But if you're Daniel Ellsberg and you're sitting on the Pentagon Papers, which proves that everything the United States said about Vietnam was a lie, and that people are out there talking about Vietnam, saying things that are untrue to justify continued expenditures, continued deployments, continued death, loss of life.

He was 100% correct morally, ethically, legally, to see that this information got published. Now, he could have paid a high price. I mean, there are consequences to your actions. But the press can't be

silenced. And see, the president isn't talking about just bringing the leakers to justice. Look, we have a whistleblower system that's been abused. It doesn't work, but it's there. And if you're somebody who has information you believe needs to go to the press or needs to be made public, needs to be made aware to Congress, you need to go through the whistleblower process. Now, if you go through the process and you get stymied and you have no choice but to go to the press, then you have to be willing to pay the price.

Ellsberg was willing to pay the price, but because the government broke into his psychiatrist's office and stole medical information about the counseling sessions, the judges said, "Screw it. We're not going down this route. The whole thing's dismissed." But the president can't sit there and call the press treasonous. They're not treasonous. They could be irresponsible, but they're not treasonous. And especially when they're uncovering lies they're being told about a war where American service members are losing their lives.

#Danny

Yeah, and the fact that the mainstream media can be wrong. I mean, it often is wrong. It could be completely making all of this up. But the way that Donald Trump himself and his handlers—I guess, I'm guessing he's not writing this all himself, from what I've heard—but the response is not convincing. It comes off as not only defensive, but also, uh, it reeks of almost, uh, you know, uh, the boy who cried wolf. Like, your reaction is showing that actually it could be the truth. It's almost like when CENTCOM has, uh, throughout this whole war, every time Iran comes out with a report about what they did in retaliation to U.S. strikes, CENTCOM would come out as fact-check.

No, they didn't do that. But, you know, you do that enough without providing actual evidence that they didn't do that, people are going to start to think, well, maybe they actually did do that. And that's the thing with Trump, too, and Truth Social. So, you know, people are going to start to think that you saying the media is lying—people are going to look into it more and say, well, maybe they're telling the truth, because what you're saying isn't convincing at all. It just comes off as a lie.

#Scott Ritter

Temper tantrums, almost. Your thoughts? Look, Donald Trump has repeatedly, "We destroyed their entire Air Force." Then why did two F-5s penetrate the air defenses and bomb Kuwait, killing Americans? What about that Air Force? "We destroyed their navy." Then why are their ships laying mines in the Strait of Hormuz, blocking it down? And the navy isn't just ships on the sea. The Iranian navy has a whole bunch of anti-ship missiles that are shut down in the Strait of Hormuz. "We've destroyed their army," except we didn't even come close to destroying their army. And if they ever put a million guys on the border with Iraq, like they did during the Iran-Iraq War, they could come punching through and take Kuwait in a matter of days. And what do we do with the 5,000 to 8,000 American troops that are still there, who can't fight because they're not the combat troops?

If they were, they can't fight. I mean, CENTCOM's lied the entire time. The president's lied the entire time. We haven't told the truth about anything, because to tell the truth, to acknowledge that we were woefully ill-prepared for this—I mean, from top to bottom—someday somebody is going to write the definitive history of American targeting practices during this conflict. You know, there's a program called Maven. Palantir and company came up with it. It was, you know, NATO made extensive use of it coming up with its war plan against Kaliningrad and striking Russia. Its artificial intelligence supported targeting. Well, we used Maven to develop our expanded target list in Iran, and we ended up blowing up empty buildings. We ended up murdering 168 children.

We ended up hitting volleyball games in progress. We ended up just committing war crime after war crime after war crime because nothing we did worked. It didn't. When it comes down to it, you know, the president brags about doing this and the other thing. Why is Iran producing more missiles today than they were before the war? If we destroyed their missile production capacity, why is Iran doing anything today? If we destroyed everything, we killed everybody. There's no leadership, but there is leadership. They have a functioning leadership. They have a functioning government. We're going to find out that we knew nothing about Iran, which begs the question, you know, why didn't we know anything about Iran?

Where was the CIA? Where was the, you know, where's the special intelligence that comes in? You know, the man next to the Supreme Leader who we've been recruiting for 20 years, who's slipping us all the papers so we know everything the Supreme Leader is doing. Normally, it's just the kind of intelligence you want to have if you're going to go to war. And normally we'd have, you know, hell, when we were preparing to go to war against the Soviet Union back in the 1980s, you know, we had a core of foreign area officers, Soviet specialists, guys who, you know, would take three to four years to get trained up, get advanced degrees in Russian area studies, advanced language program, cultural immersion at a Russian city that was built in German territory.

Germany, then deployed to various duty tours. Some included the embassy in Russia, in Moscow. Others were at the Potsdam mission carrying out sort of James Bond-type espionage against the Soviet Group of Forces and other places. But we knew the enemy. We had people who actually knew the Russians and could talk about it intelligently. I worked with these guys. They were really, really good. Where's our Iran hands? No, we've populated the Iran hands with nothing but a bunch of former, you know, Shah types, people loyal to the son of the Shah who's in exile, people who are, you know, contaminated with the Mujahideen-e-Khalq. What we need are people who understand the Islamic Republic. What we need are people who understand the Shia faith.

We need people who will be able to tell the president, "You don't want to assassinate the Supreme Leader in a land where, you know, martyrdom is sort of the highest honor. Mr. President, let me tell you the story of Ali, Hassan, Hussein. Let's talk about the Battle of Karbala. Let's talk about what that means with the people because, you know, when we in America talk about, you know, Bunker Hill or we talk about Lexington and Concord, we talk about Gettysburg or we talk about, you know, any one of these defining moments, you know, Americans are like, 'Yes, I identify with that. That's

what makes me who I am.' Well, Karbala is what makes the Shia what they are. And to be dismissive of it and the concepts of martyrdom that are attached to that is just stupid in the extreme. Who advised this president? Well, the Israelis did. Who told the president the Israelis are smoking dope?"

Where was the Iran specialist to stand up and say, "That ain't what's happening, Mr. President. That's not right. Let me tell you what's going on." They were long ago dismissed. If you ever dared stand up and say something about Iran that was realistic, you were accused of going native. Ritter went native. Got to get rid of Ritter. We got to get somebody who doesn't know a damn thing about Iran. That way we know he hasn't gone native. But, oh, Ritter's up there talking about Iran. He's gone native. I mean, they accused me of going native in Iraq. Well, shame on them, because I was the only one who got it right. Why? Because I didn't go native. I was just damn good at what I did. We need people who are damn good at what they do with Iran to advise the president, you know, in a wise and judicious manner about the reality of Iran.

You know, the key thing about an advisor is talking about these things. It's not about, you know, supporting policy. The policy is made by policymakers. It's about being able to set the stage accurately so that policy can be, you know, to make sure that the policy works, you know, is capable of impacting a realistic scenario. We went into Iran ignorant about the reality of Iran. We don't know anything about it, and we're shocked. The president says, "I'm shocked. I'm shocked that they could withstand this." Why, Mr. President? They're a constitutional republic. They've been a constitutional republic for 47 years. These institutions of government are hardened. They're there.

You can't just kill one person and make the institution go away. And these are institutions that the Iranian people respect. Don't listen to the Iranian expats in Los Angeles. That's the wrong crowd to listen to. You actually need to have people going into Iran. Oh, that's right. You stopped students from going to Iran a long time ago. You stopped business from going to Iran. You don't have anybody that goes to Iran. Do you have an embassy in Iran with a defense attaché? You closed that down too. So basically, you closed down every vector of gathering information that could be used to create a team of Iran experts, subject matter experts, who could advise you accurately.

Instead, you just get the anti-Khomeini, the anti-Ayatollah, the anti-Shia crowd, you know, heavily influenced by the Saudis. Don't go to the Saudis to learn about Iran. Don't do it, because the Saudis are a bunch of Wahhabist extremists who hate everything about the Shia faith, everything about the Iranians culturally. And they'll tell you any lie you want to hear. Don't go to the United Arab Emirates. They'll tell you the same lies. Don't go to the Gulf Arabs, period. Go to Iran. Go to the source. But we didn't do that. And here's the result.

#Danny

Yeah, you have to be willing to do that as well. In the last 15 minutes, I wanted to talk to you about Ukraine. The latest reports are from BBC that Russia's strikes between the 4th and 5th killed 21

people. That's Ukrainian reports. Ukraine is saying it needs more missile interceptors, which seems to be the theme. Now, in these strikes, Russia did fire off about two dozen Iskander missiles, half a dozen Zircons. So they were showing off those missiles, and none of them were intercepted. So that's showing exactly where Ukraine is. But again, the reports still are, Scott, that Ukraine is bringing the war back to Russia. The BBC, I can pull it up in a second, is reporting at the same time that, you know, Ukraine has been successfully bringing the war to Russia. So, yeah, give us your Ukraine update as to where things are right now. Well, it's the same place it's been for some time now. This Ukrainian offensive, the—

#Scott Ritter

You know, that just ended on August 4th, two days ago, began on June 25th when President Zelensky declared that he was initiating a 40-day drone-based influence campaign. Who is he trying to influence? The Russian people. The purpose of the drone-based campaign was to bring the war home to Russia, bring the reality of this conflict to the Russian people. He had softened the Russians up, you know, starting in April. You know, in May, there were extensive drone attacks. I was there in June. There were drones flying everywhere. And, of course, on June 25th, he announces his campaign. What he said is that the purpose of what Ukraine was doing prior to June 25th was to make the Russians believe that Moscow and St. Petersburg were at risk.

And the goal was to get Russia to divert air defense systems away from the rest of Russia to defend these high-priority targets in Moscow and St. Petersburg. And then Zelensky believed that he had successfully done this. So now his drones could go out and they could strike into the depths of Russia. They could strike, you know, places that had never been stricken before and just bring the pain to the Russian people. Look, the Russians are good, but they're not infallible. First of all, systems can go down. You can have 100 radars out there with interlocking sectors of coverage. And what's the radar failure rate? I don't know. Let's say 16%.

So that's 16 radars that go down at any given time. The average recovery period is six to 24 hours, depending on what's wrong with the radar. Normally speaking, you wouldn't know. I mean, if I mapped it out, if I fly my drone and it's collecting the electronic warfare, you know, I've got the things positioned, and then the Russians, of course, moving around every now and then just to change things up. But if I'm doing it constantly, if I have my satellites on board, I'll know when those 16 go down. And because I have signals intelligence, and the Russians may have made a mistake in broadcasting clear or used a mode of encryption that we can cover, we'll know how long they're going to be down.

So suddenly our intelligence picture can pick the gaps in the radar. And then we also look at the mobile groups. The Russians have mobile groups going on, and we can track where they are in near real time. And so what will happen is we will sit there and get this intelligence picture, and then we shoot it down to the people advising the Ukrainians who are right there with the drone operators. And they will sit there and program in a flight path that will take them in, shoot the gap. And what

you do is you flood that zone. You've got 550 drones flooding in, because what you're also doing is you're seeking to exhaust that sector. Because the Russians don't know in advance where you're coming.

So you flood this zone. You exhaust this sector. Basically, they're going to run through, you know, their Pantsir missiles, and they're going to run through, you know, their surface-to-air missiles. They're going to cycle through that. And the last package is going to get through, and then it will come in, and some will get shot down by the mobile groups that are recovering. But there's going to be a handful of these missiles that get through, and they're going to strike the target they're aiming at. Generally speaking, these are, you know, oil refineries. And so you get a pop, and you get some flame, and you get a lot of black smoke when you burn oil, and a lot of black smoke.

And then the Ukrainians have their agents who are driving around waiting for the attack, and they take their video and they download it. You see it on Telegram. You know, video provided by the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense. Well, how the hell did they get that video? Ask the FSB, because I think the people taking the video don't last too long after that. They get rounded up and go away. But the whole idea is to get that imagery out there to create the notion that the pain is coming to Russia. Then, on July 18th, I believe, there was a political crisis in Ukraine. Fedorov, the Minister of Defense, got canned.

They brought in a new guy who was the commander of Group Alpha, the same people from the Security Service in Ukraine that did Operation Spiderweb, the trucks with the drones that went out and hit the aircraft. And he decided that it would be a good idea for Ukraine now to strike, to expand the strikes. He's got to bring the pain to the people. Wildberries. Wildberries is an online retailer. They've got warehouses out there. Small Russian businesses will send their goods to Wildberries, who will then distribute it, you know, for a fee. That's how they make money. Everybody's happy because it reduces overhead for the companies. It helps with distribution. It's all wonderful.

It's a very effective system. And they started hitting these places. They're not well defended. And they're not designed to take a, you know, a missile through the roof. You know, I'm sure they have a fire suppression system that happens if some guy throws a cigarette into the, you know, trash bin and it catches on fire. The heat sensor picks it up, fire suppression, and you lose that little sector of stuff, you know, water damage. But that's okay. But now something comes in, boom, you know, now you got a fire. It rages, big flame, black smoke, people taking photographs, videos, and you start getting this whole thing about how this is painful for Russia.

My God, it's embarrassing. It's humiliating for the Russians. I'm glad Putin's... You've got to count his days. The doctor was going to tell us just how bad it is. My God. Fire the entire general staff. Incompetence. Bad. Bad. Boom. Oh, Jesus Christ. And then they come in with more drones, and they go into the Sea of Azov. And you have this Magyar dude sitting there, you know, publishing

videos of Ukrainian drones hitting ships in the Sea of Azov. Every night, eight more ships, 12 more ships. Well, not that many, but they hit something. Then they go to the Caspian Sea, and they start interdicting Russian shipping to the Caspian Sea.

And they're bragging, "We own the Black Sea. We kicked the Russians out. Now we own the Sea of Azov. We own Kerch. We own the sea. We are destroying Russia. It's over. It's all over." And the Russian people are supposed to be, "Oh, my God, we hate Putin. We hate United Russia. We're going to vote against United Russia on September 20th in the Duma election." And Putin's going to collapse, and there'll be a Russian Maidan. And, oh my, that's great. Yeah. Over and over and over and over and over again, you hear this stuff. It's all a pack of bullshit. Yes, there are things happening.

Yes, Russia is being hit. You know, the other thing the Ukrainians are famous for doing is picking out a refinery, popping the refinery, knowing, for instance, it's run by Rosneft. And they know that now it's going to shut down for a period of time. And that's going to disrupt because the refinery is producing refined products for primarily local consumption, regional consumption. So if you take out a refinery, regional consumption is going to be impacted. And then what happens? Gas stations don't get their delivery, and people who go to that gas station go, "There's no fuel, and there's a line." And the Ukrainian asset comes by and films it.

And then it gets published. Look at the long line outside of Samara. The Russian people hate Putin because they found the one drunk Russian woman who's going to pick a fight with the one drunk Russian man. And they can say that's all of Russia because they're fighting. Hell, I can get a line anywhere in America now, and I can find two Americans who are willing to duke it out. Does it mean all of America is collapsing? No. But it gets echoed around in the social media chamber, and everybody goes, "The Russians are falling apart." What they don't see is that Russia has gigantic strategic gasoline reserves. And the Russian government goes, "Oh, Samara is short."

Hey, Lukoil. Yeah, those reserves you got over the excess capacity you have. Yeah, divert it over here to Rosneft. Rosneft, get it over to the people who need it. And three days later, the line's gone. But no one's talking about that. Somebody just drove from Ekaterinburg to Sochi, I believe, over 2,000 kilometers of road. They said along the entire way, no lines, you know, for gas, no rationing. One place, one gas station, limited you to 30 liters of gasoline because, you know, my God, Russia isn't perfect. They didn't have enough gas to go around to every gas station instantaneously. They're still working on redistributing their gas reserves.

So you can only sell 30 liters until the gas supply comes in. Then it goes away. This is the reality of Russia. Now, the closer you get to the front line, the more difficult it gets. Crimea, difficult situation. Kursk, difficult situation. But not end of world like Gilbert Doctorow tries to say. It's that the Russians have lost because my 80-year-old friend has two bad legs and he's standing on a hill in Feodosia and

he can't get a taxi driver to take him down to the train station. All right, Gil. Keep drinking your Kool-Aid. But it's insanity. The Russians aren't panicked. Why? Because what Russia's just done now is declare total war against Ukraine's supply.

So, yes, a handful of Wildberries places are hit. Wildberries is, you know, defending some, moving some, setting some places up in Kazakhstan to get out of the strike range. But the bottom line is, you know, they're saying \$1.3 billion worth of economic harm, but the head of Wildberries came out and said it's in tens of millions. It's significant, but it's not the end of the world. Meanwhile, Russia is destroying everything. And in Kyiv now, everybody, they've got a guy—I forget the name of the company—but he came to Zelensky: "Stop it, stop it. I just built this company. It's so great and it's wonderful. And now the Russians are blowing it all up. You shouldn't have bombed Wildberries."

You bomb Wildberries, you lose everything. And they're losing everything. And Russia, it's total war now against the Ukrainian civilian distribution network. It's over. The post system of Ukraine is gone. Gas stations are gone. Everything's gone. And it's just going to keep going until everything's destroyed. It's now total war. The Russians have shut down the Black Sea. You know, you went after Azov and Caspian. Guess what? Azov and Caspian Sea is still controlled by the Russians. But the Black Sea, Ukraine ain't getting a ship in and out of her ports. My dogs agree. Shut down the Black Sea. And that means that it's the end of the Ukrainian economy.

60% of the Ukrainian economy came in and out of the Black Sea ports. It's gone. Finished. Ukraine is dying. This is the reality. Ukraine is dying. They're dead. Nothing is going to happen. Nothing's going to grow. Nothing's going to get built. Harvest is in the field right now. Who's harvesting it right now? They don't have any diesel. Everybody's like, "Well, the Russians had to stop the exportation of diesel." Well, they did that last year and the year before, too. It's just a reality of war. But it doesn't mean they ran out of diesel. The Russians are smart enough to say, "We have to conserve enough diesel to make sure that our crops can be brought in and that goods can be transported."

There might be a temporary shortage for commercial users, non-critical commercial users, but that never happened. The diesel is there. The price of gas—there's a grade of gas, AI-95, I think it is. It's the most popular grade of gas for Russian drivers. The cost of AI-95 per liter today is cheaper than it was this time last year. So much for that damn crisis. This is all a giant lie. Ukraine is collapsing. There is no air defense, and there will be no air defense. They have no air defense, and they can't build an air defense. They have this system they're calling Freya, the Norse goddess of something—love, attraction, beauty.

That's why they paint their R&D missiles pink, I guess. But they're like, Freya's going to solve everything. You were just in Paris. You talked with 12 European defense companies, and some of them you're still continuing to have a discussion about shared R&D. Now, if you're in the discussion of shared R&D, it means you haven't even decided what the original missile is going to look like, and

you're years away from potential production. There will be no Freya missile. There will be no missiles. Without air defense, Ukraine dies, and that's where we're at right now. We're watching the agonizing death of Ukraine.

#Danny

Yeah, well said, Scott. And it appears, too, that we're watching that as the United States is claiming here—or this is from Politico, but it is coming from a U.S. congressman—U.S. intel sharing is now rebounding with Ukraine under Trump. Ukraine watchers saying it's helping drive new wins for Kyiv on the front lines. So, again, that's the narrative, Scott.

#Scott Ritter

I don't even know what U.S. intel is supposed to do here, but you're— Let's explain this just so people understand. The intel we're providing to Ukraine isn't the really, really good stuff. A lot of this is imagery-based because you need to know where you are when you launch a weapon. You need to know where the weapon's going, so there's GPS factored into this thing. So they use— There's a contract they signed with a commercial provider. It begins with an M, Maxar, something of that nature. And so Maxar then is a contractor of the Department of Defense that provides this imagery that's then used to provide targeting packages.

We don't call them targeting packages. We call them points of interest because we're not allowed to use the targeting word when we deal with Ukraine, to the Ukrainians. And so, yes, there's intelligence that is provided. When we shut off the intelligence last time, this imagery and all that, the Ukrainians came up with their own mechanism of gathering the information necessary to do targeting on this. And as you see, the Ukrainians have been hitting targets in the depths of Russia. They don't need this. So this is just a gesture.

People need to understand that turning on U.S. intelligence support doesn't solve any of the problems that Ukraine faces, because Ukraine had largely adapted to operating without U.S. intelligence. U.S. intelligence isn't the good stuff. It's not what we get when we go to war, although based upon our performance in Iran, maybe the good stuff's not good enough either. But just be careful about headlines, because these are headlines designed to create impressions. But when you dig into the details here, turning on U.S. intelligence support for Ukraine doesn't do a damn thing. Nothing. It doesn't help Ukraine do anything but die more efficiently.

#Danny

Well, Scott, it's been a great program. I want everybody to know that in the video description below, they can find your website, scottritter.com, support your work. Thanks to everyone who gave a super chat here. I feel like it would take only one guy to say, "Hey, guys, you basically are doing the same as killing the Pope, basically what you're doing," in reference to Iran, murderer-in-chief.

Thanks so much. That's a funny photo as well. So thanks so much to those Super Chats, Andrew Daniels and Farzana Deem. Thanks to everyone who moderated today's show. Always appreciate all of your work to make the chat a good place to be. Tomorrow I'll be back on—what is tomorrow, Friday?—Pepe Escobar, 12 noon Eastern Time, August 7th. Scott, any final words for the audience before we hit end stream here?

#Scott Ritter

I'd just like to point out, I've put out a couple posts on my Substack. I published an interview with the mayor of Gorlovka. You should watch it. It gives you valuable insight. And I'm putting out things about my trip in June, continuing the Trail of Tears, a series of articles. And soon we'll be hopefully publishing two trailers, one for a drone movie that I'm making, The Grayzone, another trailer for a movie about Chechnya, which is called The Chechen Miracle. Basically, you know, how Russia and Chechnya stopped fighting each other and came to peace. Explain that in more detail. This is a good model to be used.

But the reason why I bring that up is, you know, like Danny, I'm an independent journalist, and I only get to travel when you guys decide to get me to travel. Meaning that if you fund it, if you provide the donations, the donations you provided in the past enabled me to go there in June, go to Russia in June, and carry out these interviews and these visits. I wrote an article about drone warfare. You're not going to see that anywhere else but on my Substack. My Substack is free to go to. If you want to have a paid subscription, great, thank you. That pays my salary. It allows me to put a roof over my head, but trips that I make only come through donations.

And right now I published an article on my Substack about, you know, Baltic and Arctic security. These are the next things. You know, we're sitting here talking about Ukraine, but when the war in Ukraine ends, there will be a crisis in the Baltics and there will be a crisis in the Arctic. And these are crises that could lead to war. And as we saw, we have nuclear war planners saying rapid use of tactical nuclear weapons. We don't want a war in the Baltics or the Arctic. It's therefore imperative that we, the people, become engaged in holding our elected officials accountable for what they do in our name. And right now, you know, we should be telling people that there's no need to have a security crisis in the Baltics.

There's no need in the Arctic, but you have to be empowered with knowledge and information. I've been given a unique opportunity to travel to Russia this fall, where I can have unique access, unprecedented access to people and places that will allow me to further develop the issue of security when it comes to the Baltics and the Arctic. If people think this is a valuable thing and want to support this trip, please go to the website, skywriter.com. Go to the Substack page and, on the donation side, donate. Trip can't happen, won't happen unless I can pay for it, and I can only pay for it if you pay for it. So I thank you in advance for what you've done in the past, and I'm hopeful that people will continue to support the work.

And it's not just my work; it's Danny's work and all the other people who do independent journalism out there. You know, Andy does the work that I do. I believe it's very important. We're the counter to what they call the mainstream media. I don't call them mainstream media anymore. I call them corporate media. And I don't call us alternative media. We're the mainstream. We're the mainstream because we actually have larger viewership. We have greater impact than corporate media. But that only happens, again, because our corporation is you, the people. You're the ones who make all this happen. And I want to thank you again for allowing me to do this work.

#Danny

Well, everyone, thanks, Scott. By hitting the like button before you go, more people can see this show. And then, of course, check out ScottRitter.com, where you can find all of his Substack publications, all of his work, and, of course, the means to support him. Without further ado, everyone, also in the video description is where to support this channel: Patreon, Substack, and much more. I'll see you tomorrow, August 7th, 12 noon Eastern Time, with Pepe Escobar. Until then, everyone, take care and see you next time.