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C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to The Solari Report. Tonight is our quarterly discussion with the Saker, The Emerging Multipolar World, and we are going to be talking about: Will There be War in Iran?

As you all know, the Saker has an extraordinary and very deep experience and background as a military analyst. There is nobody better to discuss this then with him.

Before we start, I would like to say a few words about his website, Vineyard of the Saker. I touch base there at least once a week to see what is going on. In preparing for this interview I’ve been looking back and re-reading a lot of the materials that I read weekly. I cannot recommend it to you enough.

In particular, for those who like to read, the Saker has two books, *The Essential Saker #1* and *The Essential Saker #2*. If you dive in and try to understand the emerging multipolar world, you will discover that it’s a big planet and there are many different cultures.
It’s rich, complex, and his books give one of the best and certainly the most fascinating description of that world.

He dives in to many different places. On the first one, I couldn’t stop laughing as I was reading his book. I was very depressed when it was over because I didn’t know what was going to get me laughing during mealtimes because I was reading it during lunch and dinner.

So, check out the Vineyard of the Saker. If you love to read, these books will give you remarkable insight into what is going on in our world at a much richer, deeper level than we are used to seeing.

With that, Saker, welcome to The Solari Report.

**The Saker:** Thank you so much for having me, and thank you for your very kind introduction.

**Fitts:** One of the great things about your website is, not just the people you publish and the commentary, but the comments. You are getting rich, insightful comments from all over the world. Your website has the best comments discussions that I have ever read. Of course, you have some pretty serious moderators, too.

**Saker:** I think it is entirely to their credit and, yes, it is heavily moderated. I also often get criticized for that. I actually think that it is the correct policy because if there is no moderation or if there is weak moderation, it is instantly hijacked by all sorts of characters ranging from ‘paid trolls to nut cases’ or whatever you want. So, it really is to the credit of the moderators doing a superb job.
Fitts: You get a very, very rich discussion.

I told you that we are here to talk about: Will there be a war in Iran, and if so, what does that mean? Before I dive in and go direct to that, I want to provide a lot of background. I want to start with something called FASAB 56 which we talked about before and I will be sending it to you soon. I just published *The Real Game of Missing Money*. It is a definitive collection of all the information on the missing money.

But, of course, the last big action occurred in October. When everybody was paying attention to Kavanaugh’s teenage sex life, FASAB 56 was promulgated. My description of it is, “Oh, an infinite amount of secret money for secret armies!”

My big concern is that it gives the Administration, as long as we are the reserve currency, to essentially funnel as much money as they need to people like the Israelis and the mercenaries. But immediately after it happened, we saw Mattis and Kelly use their credible gravitas to persuade Congress and the political system to provide unprecedented increases in defense appropriations. As soon as FASAB 56 passed, Mattis is out, Kelly is out, and Kelly is replaced by the man who engineered FASAB 56, who I would describe as a Bush person. We basically see Trump make a deal with the Bush people and Barco and DOJ, and the Iran-Contra team is back.

I believe this change in the freedom of the funding mechanism means that the neocons in the White House now have incredible secret resources at their command.
Saker: I would very much agree with that. The thing is that having a lot of money does not translate to having a more effective foreign policy – be it in a military or diplomatic or economic level.

I agree with you that the neocons are doing what they are doing that they are good at, which is corruption and big money and blind support for Israel and things like that, but I think that the most striking development is to what degree this does not correlate with an effective toolkit for foreign policy issues.

It is absolutely amazing for me to see how weak the empire is. It’s weaker than I thought, and I thought it was rather weak.

Fitts: I would say that this gives them the ability to make much more spectacular messes.

Saker: That is exactly it, and that is all they are going to achieve.

Fitts: One of the things that Kelly said – and he just did his first big interview since he left the Administration – is that Ivanka needs to go home. I don’t know if you saw that.

‘Ivanka’ is the nickname for Jared Kushner and his wife Ivanka Trump.

I don’t know if you saw Trump signing the deal that basically allowed Netanyahu to move in on the territories freely, and Trump looked furious and very angry and tense. Jared Kushner and Netanyahu were almost dancing.
You wanted to say to Netanyahu and Kushner, “Look, don’t dance. It’s really bad politics to make this look like what it is. You’re behaving like psychopaths who don’t appreciate that the audience is watching.”

**Saker:** Actually, I think that they are right because the audience is watching, but the audience doesn’t do anything about it. So essentially, they don’t ‘give a damn’ about the audience anymore. That is one of the things that is so impressive to me if we compare the Obama years to the Trump years.

Obama was just as bad as Trump, if not worse, but it was all, what I call, ‘democracy with a human face’. The man was nice and he had the charm of a car salesman, which is very effective in its own way. The current Administration works exactly the same, and it’s true for Netanyahu and the Israelis: They don’t ‘give a damn’ about public opinion anymore. They know they are hated, they know they are despised, and they don’t care because they are so superior and they can corrupt anybody. So, they assume they can get away with that, and I think they are mistaken.

For the short term, they are actually doing the right thing: They are ignoring us.

**Fitts:** Among other things, we see Jeff Gundlach, who I would consider the top bond manager in the United States, out and about, constantly pointing out the fact that we are in a debt spiral up, and the Federal finances are starting to hit the wall that we have all known. I’m assuming that is part of why Trump is doing what he is doing on the trade war.
What that means is that it is very clear that foreigners are not financing our game anymore, and that puts America in a real squeeze.

One of the questions that I have is: Why in the world is Mike Pompeo behaving the way that he is behaving? First and foremost, he gave a speech to the oil people, which was made public. You had it on your website and published a great article about the speech. Maybe you could talk a little about it?

Saker: Which article are you referring to?

Fitts: I’m sure that it was on your site or I found it through your site. Pompeo gave a speech to the oil people, and he talked about how they were going to shut down sales by Syria, Iran, and Venezuela and drive the price up.

Saker: Do they really want to do that when the beneficiaries of that price increase would be Russia?

Fitts: I would say, in certain cases, “Yes”. If you look at the debt markets and the derivative markets and how dependent they are on the oil companies and fracking and how important the export of oil is to the United States, I think yes. I think that they will let Russia make a little money if they can get that oil price up.

I agree with you. That is one of the reasons in the 1980’s that they drove the price down. But right now, I would argue that they need the price up.
Saker: I know that they are importing Russian oil in the US right now. It’s on the increase to substitute for the Venezuelan oil. So, there are all sorts of weird things happening that don’t seem to make sense. Frankly, I am not convinced that there is a foreign policy that is centralized by either an individual or a group of people.

This already began with Obama. You basically had individual actors or agencies having their own foreign policy, and they are all pursuing whatever it is that they are interested in. What we see is the result in vector, which appears to be schizophrenic – because it is.

Fitts: Different factions are lobbying for their piece of the pie.

Then we have Pompeo give a speech where he openly admits that he has been trained to lie.

Saker: I saw that and we posted it.

Fitts: You cannot fathom a Jim Baker doing that. In other words, why would they do that?

I’m going to say something a bit ‘off color’. When I was in the Bush Administration, I saw a politician for the first time get his own plane – because his status was Secretary of the State or something like that – and he would get ‘sex slave’ privileges, and the next thing I knew, he was acting like he had lost his mind. It was as if he was power drunk.

I watch Pompeo, and his behavior reminds me of that. I’m not saying that that is what it is, but his behavior doesn’t make any sense; it’s not logical.
We know that he is a smart person. He graduated first in his class at West Point. He is not a stupid man, but why is he behaving like this?

Saker: Does he have any other option? Can that system produce a different kind of Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense or National Security Advisor? It seems to me that the problem is that we are beyond individuals now; it’s really systemic, and it produces a specific type of individual.

By the way, the very same Pompeo who makes lots of roaring statements, but once he got to Russia, was actually on his best behavior. That tells you again that it’s situational morality or ethics. It depends on what he’s doing or who he is speaking to.

The odd thing is the Trump Administration actually thinks that somebody would want to negotiate with them when they’ve proven beyond any reasonable doubt they cannot negotiate, and if they do, they will break their terms of the deal.

If you take away negotiations and if you take away diplomacy, what is left in your foreign policy?: Only threats and war. But that shouldn’t be a foreign policy; that should be a last resort.

In the war part, what is interesting is I really contend that the US military as an instrument of foreign policy, is useless. It can destroy many things. It’s not that it can’t do anything, but it’s that it can’t do anything useful to the foreign policy. That is what is so important to understand: War is a continuation of politics by other means.
If your instrument of war is unable to deliver anything, that basically turns into a gigantically expensive, obscenely expensive, but useless item.

**Fitts:** Let’s turn to Venezuela. One thing we saw in Venezuela is that for the third time a CIA-engineered coup failed.

Once upon a time people were afraid of the neocons because their coups would succeed. Now we are talking about three strikes and you’re out. So, Venezuela is a spectacular example of the strategy not working.

Tell us what happened in Venezuela.

**Saker:** In Venezuela, it ‘blew my mind’! I never thought it would get so ridiculous.

If we take the country that basically openly resisted the empire – Russia, China, Iran, Syria, Venezuela, Cuba – Venezuela is really the weakest link in that chain. Venezuela is in a terrible situation internally and a terrible situation geographically. It is surrounded, more or less, by different degrees of hostility, and it is right in the US backyard.

You would think that it would be a no-brainer, but they completely failed. First of all, it was a dismal failure analysis. How could they believe Guaidó? They seemed to have believed what exiles told them. I can’t imagine any other explanation for that, and they completely failed and embarrassed themselves. You are right: It was the third time.

That basically means that anybody can laugh at Uncle Sam. If the Venezuelans get to, who doesn’t? Maybe they can reinvent Grenada.
The first time, they had a very, very hard time invading Grenada – which is usually hidden from public knowledge. However, Grenada was a disaster militarily speaking. They didn’t lose because they couldn’t lose, but they came as close as possible.

That just proves again that the US is punching way above its weight.

**Fitts:** I also want to turn to Cuba. I recently had a friend return from Cuba, and she was working with the doctors there. She said that the doctors are trying to operate on a diet well below what they need to maintain health. So, Cuba is also really struggling with sanctions from the US and the US breaking its deal there.

**Saker:** Yes, but Cuba is well-known to have an established and effective military intelligence community and that is a tough one. The US has tried to defeat Cuba for decades and never came close. So, I would think that if you start with the easy one, first you go for Venezuela, and then eventually – as Pompeo said – Nicaragua and Cuba would be next. But how can he make such threats if he can’t even deal with Venezuela?

**Fitts:** The theory has always been that if we have the reserve currency, then we just erode the other guy. It’s an endurance game.

We can throw a lot of money, and we can make a big mess. Ultimately, we can drive everybody into the ground – whether it’s Russia or Venezuela or Cuba or Iran. That is the whole idea of the financial sanctions, but I would say that it is not working as planned.
Saker: There is one thing that is absolutely crucial: There are really two worlds out there – two realities. There is the reality you can see in the US media, and that reality is that the US is a superpower. As they like to say, they have ‘the best military in history’ and all this nonsense about, “We will bomb you into submission.”

All of this ‘huffing and puffing’ looks tremendously credible, and everybody is shaking in their boots of abject terror. Then there is the real world out there where people are scoffing, laughing, dismissing, and openly daring to defy the US, and that other reality is never openly discussed because it is based on a number of assumptions, which I think are still crucially accepted by most people in this country.

For instance, one assumption is that the military is such an effective and formidable military. You can even see that in people who oppose war. They still have the ‘ready sentence’ that the US has the ‘strongest military in history’. It’s nonsense; it is absolutely false; it is counterfactual, but it doesn’t matter.

Fitts: No matter how many wars we lose, we continue to say it.

I go back to the statement attributed to Karl Rove that was in Paul O’Neill’s book saying, “We are an empire now. We make our own reality. You fellows are in the objective reality-based world, and we don’t have to obey that world anymore.”

If you go on the Silk Road (I just got back from Thailand), the majority of the world and the majority of the world’s economy is in the objective-based reality.
It has to be. If you’re not in an objective-based reality, the planes fall from the sky and the bridges fall down.

Everyone else is trying to make money and pay their rent in the objective-based reality. It is interesting that wherever you go in the old Bretton Woods systems – in the last two years, I’ve been in Thailand, and Australia and Hong Kong and New Zealand – all of them don’t want the US to fail. They are under that national security umbrella, and they are rightly afraid of China.

What is interesting is that this year they are all saying, “We don’t have that choice. America is failing.”

They talk about the failure as if it’s a fait accompli, and now they are making other plans.

**Saker:** They have no other option. I think we have seen that brilliants illustrated by the South Koreans who used to be very much an occupied country with a comprador regime, but the US was in control. Look what they did when Trump threatened to form an armada. They suddenly opened bilateral negotiations on their own with the North and actually got a number of agreements, including the Olympics, etc.

I think that a similar thing is happening in Europe right now where, even people who would not necessarily share our political beliefs about war or peace or empire, are basically saying that the US just can’t deliver anymore, and we need to function.
**Fitts:** They have to function in the objective-based reality. They have to do whatever they have to do.

One thing that is interesting when you go on the Silk Road is the Israelis are there trying to do IT/cybersecurity deals and get into everybody’s systems everywhere. It’s somewhat intriguing because they figured out a way to come out on top whether the US fails or not.

**Saker:** Yes, but they are pursuing completely different goals. The Israeli goals are understandable – the IT slice of the bigger pie – whereas the US, first of all, doesn’t have a clear strategy of what they want to do with the Silk Road, but I think that it is pretty clear that they either want to be part of it, or they want to sabotage it.

The interest of the entire Eurasian land mass is exactly the opposite. There is no way that they are going to prevail.

I don’t understand how a country with 300 million people can actually enter a trade war with a country whose internal market is 1.3 billion people.

**Fitts:** We have to rebalance our trade with China and we know that. At the heart of this trade war is the fear that if you look at our global control, much of it is dependent on the IT systems.

I don’t know if you’ve seen the documentary called *Zero Days* about the Stuxnet virus. It’s a great description of that dynamic. At the heart of the fight over 5G is whose platform it is going to be. Is it going to be the Chinese platform, or is it going to be the Anglo-Zionist platform? That is part of what it’s about, and that is a 0 or 1 issue.
**Saker:** The thing is that they have no chance of winning. It’s just not going to happen – not when there is such a huge financial interest. The US has a small share of the Chinese international trade, and there is an entire region that they won’t prevent China from participating in. The US just cut itself off from the entire Eurasian land mass.

Another thing which is also a very serious sign of decline in any empire, is when you contradict your own ideology. When you say, “We are for free trade,” and then you actually hide tariffs; you call them sanctions but essentially it achieves the same result, you are going into productivism.

Whatever your ideas of economics are, productivism is not what this country is supposed to stand for, but it clearly does. It is the only way that it can still hope to compete, which is pathetic.

**Fitts:** I couldn’t agree more and that is why I was out in 1998.

America and China are both betting on technocracy, not on markets, and I think that they are both wrong. My fear is that you split the world into two technocratic systems, both of which are deeply unattractive. That is what it appears to me.

You published a new great article, and you published an interview with Dmitry Orlov that I want to bring up before we dive into ‘Will There be War?’
Regarding your article; one of the great powers of your book is that you always come back to the understanding that politics plays on a platform of our culture and the history, and you always go deep into those things. One of the things that you talk about in your most recent report is the extraordinary debasement of the culture in the United States. It’s not something that I’m happy about, but it is something which I think is unbelievably powerful and important.

Somebody published an article recently about when one of the pharmacies that delivers to Congress noted how many Alzheimer’s drugs they were shipping to Congress.

One of the things that I talk a lot about on The Solari Report is on the entrainment technology which is being used, and I think that all the lying, all the secrecy, and all the push to convert news to entertainment are literally destroying America’s mind. When you are in Thailand, and you look back and listen, it’s as though the place has gone mad. It’s like watching a ‘nuthouse’.

**Saker:** If you compare the kind of exams young US Americans were taking at the beginning of the 20th century in schools and what they are taught today, it’s night and day completely. There is definitely a de-evolution happening on many, many levels in the US right now. Most people who are in their 40’s, 50’s, or 60’s remember that the country changed dramatically over the last decade, and not for the better.

**Fitts:** One of the things that you point out – and I’ve written and talked a lot about this –
– is a survey you had where 98% of American males had used pornography in the last six months. I bring that up because pornography – to me – has been one of the most economical ways to get control files on people.

It’s relatively easy to entrap somebody from pornography into some kind of pornography that has an underage person, and then you have them.

Saker: Absolutely. It’s the same thing for homosexuality, which in the past used to be considered a security risk. You wouldn’t get a security clearance because you could be the object of blackmail.

Fitts: I happen to think that the strategy to get control files on people through the systems has been a very well thought out, very intentional policy.

You consider this, and I’ve seen other things happen and other signals indicate that the CIA would love to do the ‘Rape of Russia’ here. One of my greatest concerns about war in Iran is whether the goal is to control Iran or whether the goal is to destroy the US and do the ‘Rape of Russia’ here.

Saker: I think that the situation with Iran and Russia are really completely different. In Russia, Russia benefits from having the ultimate last argument that if things go completely out of control, Russia can destroy the entire United States within about two hours – which Iran can’t do. So, this translates into the neocons – however crazy they are and out of touch with reality –
– they are probably more inclined to fear Russia than they would Iran. There would be a very good reason to fear Iran, but I don’t think that they are sophisticated enough to understand what that reason is whereas with Russia, it’s simple. Under 20 minutes, and the US does not exist anymore. That is clear, but with Iran, it is much more complex and it depends on many assumptions that you make.

When you look at a potential war between the empire and Iran, it crucially depends on so many assumptions, and it makes the outcome very hard to predict.

All that you could say is it is an extremely dangerous situation, and I think that any responsible military analyst would say, “Don’t do it.”

**Fitts:** One of the questions is Netanyahu and he just won his election. It certainly appears as though, if there is anybody driving the train towards war, it’s Netanyahu and his backers trying to get Trump to go to war.

Trump’s initial policy statement was quite the opposite, but you watch what is happening and say, “Are they blackmailing Trump? Do they control the reserve currency so he has to do what they say?”

It almost looks like the Clintons post-Monica Lewinsky impeachment. Are they depending on Israel for all of their covert operations in numerous places around the world? How is it that Netanyahu has Trump over a barrel?
Saker: Because Trump is surrounded by neocons, and Trump betrayed all the people who were his closest and most influential friends and supporters who could have resisted them.

It was clear to me as soon as he fired Flynn that we would end up in this situation. One can have reservations about some of the things that Flynn said and did. I’m not saying that he is my hero, but I am saying objectively, Flynn was the embodiment of Trump’s campaign promises in terms of international security. He had very clear ideas. Flynn had some goofy ideas about Iran and China, but he plainly said, “We need to work with the Russians to pursue our common interest,” and he was the first person that the neocons tossed out of there.

I really don’t like Brennan, but he is another one they tossed out. So, it’s not surprising that Trump right now is completely alone.

We discussed this last time. It is possible that Mad Dog Mattis was the sanest person in the White House when he was still there and that is scary. That is not good news. When you end up hoping that Mattis will prevail, that tells you how desperate the situation is.

By now, I think that Netanyahu has total control. The US is essentially an occupied country, and it has been for a while now. But also keep in mind, Netanyahu wants the US to fight on behalf of Israel. He is not exposing his own people – or at least not directly. If Trump gives the order to attack, it’s all of CENTCOM that is going to be exposed.
**Fitts:** I would say that it’s not only Netanyahu because Israel is a country of 4 million people. If you look at who Netanyahu’s backers are in the city and in Beverly Hills and in New York, we are talking about a network. But there is no doubt that if you go to war in Iran, it will be youngsters from the seven southern states of the United States who will die, and then it is a relatively small network of people who will win.

**Saker:** Yes, and not only that, but I really think that there are many ways I can credibly describe how you would start a war with Iran. I have no idea how you would stop it.

If there is a zero sum, and there is a complete incompatibility – which would happen if the war became overt – it has been a covert war for decades now. Let’s say that it really happens. At that point, the Iranians have no reason to negotiate with Americans whatsoever, and they have such a broad spectrum of possible responses, none of which is clear what the next step is.

I really think that it would make Iraq look like a ‘cakewalk’. Iraq was an easy, safe thing to do.

**Fitts:** That is what Tulsi Gabbard said.

**Saker:** She is right, and on her video, she puts in quotes by Trump that said, “We can’t fight regimes that we barely understand. We destabilize entire regions.”

Trump, during his campaign, said all the right things. He really did.
**Fitts:** Here is my concern: Let’s say that the United States declares war on Iran, I would say that war would be impossible to win.

**Saker:** I completely agree with you. The very, very first article that I ever wrote for my blog was about the prospects of the empire attacking Iran.

**Fitts:** I remember and read it.

**Saker:** I think that the fundamental logic is still true. If anything, things have gotten worse for the empire. I agree that this war is completely unwinnable.

Do you want to go through possible scenarios?

**Fitts:** Yes. Let’s say that you are the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and you have been ordered to go to war. What do you do?

**Saker:** I say, “Over my dead body, Mr. President, and I will not execute your order.” That is what I would do. When Fallon was Chief of CENTCOM he said, “Not on my watch.” That would be my response.

Here is the deal. Let’s look at three basic scenarios. The first one is somewhat of a pinprick and is a symbolic strike just to feel good. It’s the kind of thing that the Israelis have been doing in Syria.

Let’s say you hit several high-visibility targets – you hit some so-called research centers, etc.
All that it will do is solidify Iran’s results, and that is all you will achieve. There is no way that Iran is going to say, “Oh my God! They mean serious business. Let’s surrender and roll over.” It’s just not going to happen, and that is a ridiculous scenario.

Let’s try something more serious. Eric Margolis wrote an article recently about that. If I remember correctly, he said that the initial day of air strikes – missile and bomb strikes – would take 2,300 strikes on the first day. That basically tells the Iranians that this is a total war, and we need to prevail, at which point the entire Middle East blows up. The Iranians are not only very sophisticated, but they are deployed all over the region, they have long-range weapons, and they have extremely competent special forces. They have a fantastic intelligence community, and they will hurt the US badly.

At that point, what can the US do? More of the same? Another 2,300 strikes? And for how many days?

I will agree that the carriers are probably safe from the Iranians because they will be out of the Persian Gulf if real shooting starts. And I do agree that the US can destroy the Iranian air defenses and maybe the air force. But then what? Then you are essentially looking at a scenario that I always mention, which is the 2006 Israeli attack on Lebanon and Hezbollah, specifically. The Israelis have complete naval supremacy, complete aerial supremacy, and vastly superior artillery, and they send their best forces into Southern Lebanon. They could enter, and Hezbollah could not stop them from entering.
The point is that they couldn’t even control a village that was two miles off the Israeli border. Throughout the 33-day war, the Hezbollah had people there who were resisting. Iran could make that look like a cake-walk. So, that would be a nightmare.

**Fitts:** You have 80 million people who don’t want to be occupied.

**Saker:** And with lots of allies all over. There is Muqtada Al-Sadr in Iraq and Hezbollah in Lebanon. These are serious fighting forces. The key thing is that they want the fight and are not afraid whatsoever.

**Fitts:** Let’s assume that the US tries to engage in an air war. Does Iran shut down the straits?

**Saker:** If they believe it’s for real, but they might not if it’s a pinprick. However, they might threaten. But if it’s for real, and we are talking about 2,300 strikes per day, then absolutely.

I disagree with those who say that the US cannot try to keep the Strait of Hormuz open; they can. First of all, they can keep the northern rim of the Persian Gulf – which has many artillery missiles – into a fire-free zone. You hit it extremely hard, and the number mentioned by Bolton of the 120,000 troops is what you would need to try to not invade Iran. You would at least, push them away from the Strait of Hormuz as much as possible, and then basically resist and protect throughout the Middle East CENTCOM’s units and forces.

Thank God it doesn’t seem that it is going to happen.

The last number was 10,000 troops, right?
**Fitts:** Trump said that he was going to send 1,200.

Where are you going to get 120,000 troops?

**Saker:** The only place that you can actually put them is Saudi Arabia, but the problem is that all the countries around Iran don’t want that war. So, it is going to be another big headache and they are not going to help. The Iraqis have already said that, and I think that Turkey has already said that. I think that the Turks said that, too, so there is zero support. So, it is going to be a very, very dangerous attempt.

If the US tries to fight Iran to keep open the Strait of Hormuz, they probably can do it, but the cost would be horrendous. That means that Trump can kiss his re-election goodbye. That is probably what keeps him from doing it right now. Somebody probably told him that we are going to have such a problem that it’s not going to be solved by the time he runs again.

**Fitts:** If he tries to do a land war in Iran, he loses the election.

**Saker:** A purely air war is dangerous because Iran is not going to respond in the air; they are going to respond on land.

**Fitts:** Then if he tries to do an air war against Iran, he loses the election.

**Saker:** I think so, and I think that might actually be the final collapse of the US empire. I think that the US is going to ‘tank’ the whole world economy and the political tensions are going to ‘go through the roof’.
I should tell you one more thing, which is very pessimistic, but I think that they are crazy enough to consider using nuclear weapons on Iran. They haven’t done it so far, and I totally disagree with those who say there are nuclear devices set up in Yemen and Lebanon. I know some people say that, but I think it’s nonsense.

However, it is true that during Desert Shield when the 82nd was sent to Saudi Arabia, it was Cheney who was asked, “What happens if the Iraqi armored corps crosses the border and attacks? It’s still a very weak force compared to its infantry.” Cheney replied that the first line of defense would be the carriers and the tactical aviation on carriers, but secondly, he said that the other option was to use nukes and I think the US considered that.

I know the US considered that during the Korean War. I think that if they really get hurt, they might start using tactical nukes. I wouldn’t put it past them because they are crazy enough for that.

**Fitts:** If you are Russia and see them use tactical nukes, what is your response?

**Saker:** Your response has to be political first of all, and as strong as you can. There is a huge political price that you can extract from the empire for doing so and the world opinion is going to explode in outrage.

Secondly, militarily you try to stay out of it. You do not want to be involved with a nuclear power gone crazy.
I think all that Russia can do, of course, is if anything that looks like a real war in the Middle East happens, they would do the same thing that they did the first time around, which is the Russian military would go on full alert. They would be ready for a contingency, but I don’t think they are going to enter into a direct shooting war with the US because that would expose Russia to a crazy nuclear power. That is not what Putin has been elected to do.

**Fitts:** In 2014, the head of the Council on Foreign Relations described the neocons and what they are up to as the ‘unravelling’. In other words, their ‘cowboy behavior’ was unravelling the world order.

Every time I thought that the empire was going to come to an end, I saw two things happen: One was something that I would describe as ‘secret weapons’. I can’t prove that, so I am guessing. The other thing is ‘covert operations’.

You would see covert warfare through the information systems using blackmail and bribery, like getting Japan to go along or things like tsunamis that were mysteriously timed. Then suddenly, America would be back in the game. What that said to me is that we have invisible weaponry – whether through the systems, or the things like the Stuxnet virus or ways of blackmailing people behind the scenes, or ways of delivering fire from the sky – and those things continue to extend the life of the empire.

Because I don’t really understand what is behind those and what their tactical options are, my question is: Is that toolkit available to keep this thing going longer than you and I would think it should?
Saker: It depends. You mentioned several things. First of all, covert operations, yes, very much so, particularly corruption. The empire has really distinguished itself with a long experience in corrupting people. That weapon still functions very well.

However, when you are dealing with people who are harder to corrupt, that weapon is not very effective. The example that comes immediately to mind is Hezbollah. The very first time that I got interested in this movement, I spoke to somebody who had just returned from Lebanon. They said that corruption was endemic there. The only people who don’t take money are the people from Hezbollah.

I thought, “That is interesting. Who are these people?”

I really believe that the leadership of that organization and most members are profoundly idealistic and incorruptible. I think that the US had a successful attempt during, what I call, the ‘Gucci revolution’ in Iran when they tried to overthrow the Islamic Republic and put Rafsanjani in power. That is the kind of events that are possible. Obviously, there is corruption in Russia, and the US can use that because it is an effective weapon.

I personally don’t believe that the secret weapons exist. The reason is that a weapon has to be, not only tested, but it has to be practiced with. If it is any type of new technology, you don’t know how it will actually perform in a battlefield. It’s one thing to write a virus which is contained, and your environment is the computer. The real warfare is much more fluid and much more complex. I don’t believe that a weapon is effective unless it has been extensively tested and tested in combat, and units need to practice with it.
I don’t see that the US tactics have changed in a significant enough way to indicate the availability of some kind of secret weapons, so I don’t think that they exist. I might be mistaken, but that is my best ‘guesstimate’.

**Fitts:** I disagree with that, but I think there is only so much that you can do with them if you don’t have them.

The one thing that I would point out is that if you just look at the money, the stock market needs the threat of war, but they decidedly do not need war. In other words, they don’t want war; they just want the constant threat of war. That is how they make money.

The only thing that would trump that financially is if the reserve currency was about to collapse and we had to drop a nuclear bomb to keep the reserve currency going. I wouldn’t, but there are those who would.

**Saker:** I’m sure that there are those who would. That has been my biggest concern for all these years. I am truly afraid that the weakening of the empire makes the empire far more dangerous. If you look at the US armed forces, I think that the nuclear triad is the part that works best; that is the one that is effective; that is the one that can actually deliver on its designed specs.

The issue is: How much good would it do to actually be used? I think that it would be a disaster, but it is one that can look tempting to somebody who is losing.
Fitts:  It would be a disaster to the disaster. Would it be a disaster to Israel?

Saker:  I think it would. The fundamental notion of Israeli presence in the Middle East is that they are superior to everybody, Arabs only understand violence, and they will terrify everybody into submission. I don’t think that that can work, and Israel is going to be a target for sure.

The Iranians and the Lebanese understand perfectly who is holding the real power and the key to the attack, and the Israelis know that they are going to get hit. The Israelis are a typical example. It’s a very small country with no strategic depth, and their nuclear weapons are not actually useful to them. If they use the nuclear weapons, for example against Iran or Hezbollah, they would not militarily degrade them, and it would not change the fundamental balance; it would just make things worse. At that point, nobody has to throw any kind of restraint.

Fitts:  If we are going to find a rational pathway to a multipolar world, which is what we are in the process of doing, part of this is turning to Netanyahu, the people who financed him, and the dual citizens in the Congress, and saying, “Sit down and shut up! We are putting the adults back in charge.”

Saker:  Yes, but I don’t think that it is possible right now in the empire. I don’t think that it is happening. I think that the adults in the room are the Chinese and the Russians, and I don’t see any adults in Washington.
Fitts: That is the problem. You have a group of interests who are – from what I can see – psychopathic, and are willing to destroy the planet to assert some kind of control. But the reality is that if I were in their shoes and I wanted to control, I wouldn’t behave the way that they are behaving. I would go back to the *Zero Days* Stuxnet documentary.

Saker: But you are not a psychopath, and that is the problem: You are not in the White House; the psychos are.

Fitts: There is a wonderful book that I love that is said to be by a Polish scientist who essentially did a study on the relationship between psychopathy and politics.

Saker: I’ve heard that, too.

Fitts: It’s *Political Ponerology*. He said that the psychopaths make everybody crazy until they finally realize, “Oh, they’re not like you and me; they are psychopaths. We need to organize and develop strategies to put the psychopaths back into their box and not let them control the governance structure.”

That is what we have: We have psychopaths controlling the governance structure and, it is destroying the US brand worldwide.

Saker: Absolutely.

Fitts: There is nothing to be gained from that. In other words, whatever is going to happen, destroying our brand is not necessary.
We don’t need to do it. It’s going to make the ultimate transition much more expensive and much harder.

America has extraordinary goodwill around the world. It is still amazing to see the extent of the goodwill we still have, and there is no need to destroy it.

**Saker:** I completely agree with you, but the problem is that the people who are in power don’t want to see that. It’s more than just the government. When I see how in lock-step the US media is, and the kind of accusations that are made against Tulsi Gabbard, for instance, that really tells me that a peaceful transition is most unlikely.

The media still hasn’t accepted that Trump has been elected. They can’t even get over that.

**Fitts:** The financial addiction to secrecy is extraordinary, but also the financial addiction to an official reality which is not true, is extraordinary.

**Saker:** And they are all becoming accomplices. For example, look at 9/11. The way that the entire political elites in the US and the media totally botched and supported the ridiculous narrative offered by the government puts them in a position of being accomplices now. That is a form of solidarity. They are in the same boat now.

**Fitts:** It’s a felony.

**Saker:** That is exactly it; it’s a felony.
Fitts: You had a great interview with Dmitry Orlov. For those of you who haven’t listened or read my interview with Dmitry, he came from a Russian background but came to the United States and then went back during the ‘Rape of Russia’ and really watched and studied the collapse. He has done marvelous discussions of societies that have collapsed and how to prepare.

You had a discussion with him, and you talked about the Ukraine. I would like to touch on the Ukraine before we close.

One of the things that he described is how Russia, by ridding itself of, what he calls, the ‘14 piglets’ and pulling back into its core, has been able to reverse the drain of the empire and rebuild. I think that is important to understand because it doesn’t seem that the sanctions are really working. If anything, they are going the other way.

Saker: They are hurting Russia, but they are hurting Russia in a way that Russia needs. It forces Russia to change economic policies. So, it’s not like they are having zero effect, but the overall effect is a positive one.

Fitts: One thing that I thought was interesting is, if you read the CIA literature on why Russia is going to fail, a big part of it is the demographics and the fact that their population is shrinking.

One thing that you pointed out in the interview is that people from the Ukraine are immigrating to Russia. So, Russia was smart because they didn’t take responsibility for any of the territory. They left the territory as is, but now they are creaming off the best people.
Saker: You are hitting on something which should be self-evident to anybody, but apparently it’s not. Russia doesn’t need more territory. So, the notion that Russia would try to acquire more territory is just ridiculous. They have enough territory right now. They are giving away entire land pieces in Siberia for free, and immigration is helping Russia. In some ways it’s not, but in some ways it is; it’s a mix.

Definitely, Russia can benefit with all the people in the Ukraine. The Ukraine had a very advanced Military-Industrial Complex. The first thing that the Ukronazis did is sever all ties with Russia, which made these companies all essentially bankrupt, and the people who had the skills and the know-how and the habits knew exactly what they were doing. These are people who lived under one country in the past. They moved to Russia to start working on the Russian Military-Industrial Complex, for instance. In many cases they work for shipping or aerospace.

Russia has a lot of people, but among those were medical doctors, and many of them were offered very good conditions in Chechnya by Ramzan Kadyrov. So, they were given apartments there, and now the hospitals in Chechnya are staffed with very competent Ukrainian doctors.

Russia needs people much more than Russia needs territory; Russia doesn’t need more territory.

Fitts: Coming up in the next quarter, what should we watch for in how these events unfold? What should we watch for –
– what the Iranians are doing, what the Russians are doing, what the Americans are doing, and what the Chinese are doing? We haven’t brought up the Chinese. Where are the Chinese in all of this?

Saker: I think that they are quietly and very effectively building an alternate system with other countries. That is what they are doing.

There is nobody out there that wants the US to collapse because it would be a dangerous collapse, but they also understand that the international system as it is, is completely controlled by the US and pro-US interests, so they are trying to find an alternative to that by creating regional organizations and having regional initiatives. They are basically building up an alternative and making it attractive for people to switch from one model to another. That is the fundamental plan of Putin and Xi Jinping.

Fitts: Everything that I see is very much bottom-up deal by deal, and is very practical. It is a very objective-based reality bottom-up. It’s getting together and saying, “What are the 20 things that we can do to improve liquidity and trade? How do we build?”

It is very practical.

Saker: It is exactly that. There is no grand alliance or some kind of united military between Russia and China. None of that is happening; it’s really on a project by project basis.

Fitts: For the next quarter, until we talk with you again, what do we watch? What do we keep an eye on?
Saker: Unfortunately, I would say that it is the same list: War with Iran – yes or no. I think probably not, but it’s a ‘guestimate’ because it’s impossible to predict. Irrational people don’t act rationally. That is a big one, obviously.

Venezuela is another obvious one. We didn’t discuss this very much, but there is complete chaos in the Ukraine with elections of Zelenskiy. He was clearly elected because he is not Poroshenko. But right now, what he has been doing since he got elected is very unimpressive. It’s a mixture of buffoonery and jokes and saying mutually exclusive things.

He says in Russian that he wants to negotiate with Russia, and when asked by a journalist in Ukrainian he says, “Absolutely no negotiations with Russia.” So clearly, he doesn’t really know what he is doing. Could there be an internal collapse or a resumption of, not only a civil war, but further political disturbances with the new elections? Yes, the Ukraine is in a dangerous situation right now.

Fitts: I agree.

Do you have any closing thoughts or anything that you want to say before we close?

Saker: I know it’s naïve, but I am still watching Tulsi Gabbard and listening to what she says. I’m surprised that she doesn’t have more traction because she is basically saying the same things that Trump did when he was running, and a lot of people voted for him.
Fitts:  It’s interesting. She is not only saying it, but she is saying it very well. You have Senator Paul giving speeches to Pompeo about, “You don’t have the authority to declare war without Congress.”

So, you have a couple of sane voices, and you’re right; they are not getting a lot of traction. I hate to say this but the reality is that we have an economy and a stock market that is exceptionally dependent on the threat of war. It’s almost as though if you listen to Tulsi Gabbard, and you understand what she is saying and you follow that threat, it unravels the entire official reality.

Saker:  I know that people are very skeptical of her – and honestly, so am I – but on the other hand, I would never say ‘never’. I think that it is well worth keeping an eye on her as a person who is at least a voice of sanity.

Fitts:  I agree and am a fan. I think that she is inexperienced and new, but if you look at what she is saying, she makes complete sense.

Saker:  But there is one problem. The negative thing is that she hasn’t dared to take on the Israel lobby. Unfortunately, that lobby is so crucial right now for the situation of the US. It’s as if: You can’t treat a patient unless you treat the most serious disease of that patient. She has been dealing with the consequences of the Israel lobby, but not naming the cause. I think that is a sign of potential weakness.

I think that sooner or later, this topic will have to become visible, and this country cannot recover as long as it is essentially an occupied territory.
Fitts: For the last quarter, I’ve had a great deal about this on The Solari Report, and I have talked about it plenty. If you attack the psychopathic policies of Israel right now and its impact on the world, you are attacked as anti-Semitic. There is this huge game. If you look at the Holocaust marketing, the way to do a holocaust of the Palestinians is to throw the World War II Holocaust in your face. It’s a very clever marketing strategy.

There is a wonderful documentary by a very gifted young Israeli documentary-maker called *Defamation*. It’s on the complete strategy of using all of this as a weapon.

Saker: I think I’ve seen it.

Fitts: It’s fabulous, and it’s weaponizing victimhood status so that you can get away with murder. It’s amazing how far it’s gotten them if you watch that push.

I don’t know if you have been following this, but they have been going to all the state governments trying to get laws passed state by state to make it illegal to boycott Israel, which is totally unconstitutional.

Saker: They even say that anti-Zionism is a form of anti-Semitism.

Fitts: I should have brought that up, and may have found it on your website. The state department appointed a man — and this is like Pompeo’s ‘over the top thing’. He is an assistant DA from L.A. They appoint him, and he is in charge of monitoring anti-Semitism worldwide. You can’t make this up!
The man says, “If you are anti-Zionist, it is automatically anti-Semitic.” I couldn’t stop laughing.

When you watch it, you realize that we are the clowns of the world. Why did they think that this was going to work? It gets back to what you said before: It’s the psychopaths.

**Saker:** Yes, that explains why they are doing it.

**Fitts:** Do we know how many people in Congress now have dual citizenship? We have no way of knowing.

**Saker:** There is no way of knowing.

**Fitts:** That is a good question.

**Saker:** It doesn’t mean anything because you don’t need dual citizenship to act as a comprador elite. Even those who don’t have dual citizenship act this way. I’m not sure about Trump, but he probably does not have Israeli citizenship. So what? The effect is that he is essentially the servant of Netanyahu.

**Fitts:** Right, and that gets back to who is in control and how they are controlling.

I hate to say this, but we now have 325 million (minus a few) control files in America. The question is: Who controls them?

There is much to be discussed and we will stay current on your website.
I can’t thank you enough for joining us quarterly. These are very insightful and rich discussions. I can’t tell you how much I appreciate you, and am so grateful that you are in our lives.

**Saker:** It’s an honor, and it is always a pleasure for me. I am very grateful to you.

**Fitts:** Have a wonderful day!

**Saker:** You too!

**Fitts:** Ladies and gentlemen, that is it for this week on The Solari Report. Next week we are going to be doing Deep State Tactics Part II. Stay tuned.

As I always say, “Don’t worry about whether or not there is a conspiracy.” As you can tell from my discussion this week with the Saker, “You really need to start one if you’re not in one.”

Ladies and gentlemen, goodbye and good luck.
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