



The Solari Report

August 01, 2019

The Emerging Multipolar World Silk Road Tug-of-War With The Saker



Catherine Austin Fitts



The Saker



The Emerging Multipolar World Silk Road Tug-of-War With The Saker

August 01, 2019

Catherine Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to The Solari Report. This is our 3rd Quarter Report with the Saker: The Emerging Multipolar World. Things are so explosive that I called him and said, “Can we do it early?”

So, Saker, welcome to The Solari Report.

The Saker: Thank you so much for having me. As always, it’s a real joy and pleasure for me.

Fitts: You have now published The Essential Saker #3, and I’m very excited because it means that I get to read another Saker book. Tell us a little about it and where we can acquire it.

The Saker: You can get it on my website, which will redirect you to The Saker community website where you can order it. It’s the third book, and it is the biggest of all three and is really thick. It’s just over 800 pages. Why? Because it covers an extremely important but also extremely dangerous period, which is the 2017-2018 period.



I think that last year we came very, very close to a possible war. It's a big book, and it covers a lot of important material. I think that it is the most important one of the three for sure.

Fitts: Let's pick up with where we left off with the war on Iran. Tell us what has happened since we talked last and where you think we are right now regarding the effort by a variety of interests to start another serious escalation in the Middle East.

The Saker: It's a 'back to the future' kind of scenario; we are back to threats. Iran has been the object of threats of all sorts from the Anglo-Zionist since the Islamic revolution. The US has had several 'go's' at trying to coerce Iran to do this or that. I think that Trump clearly wanted to try the same approach as he did with Syria, as he did with North Korea, and Venezuela – maximum threat and maximum tension and statements. It appears that the war is about to start, and then it doesn't.

The question is: How do we explain that? Some people say that's Trump personally involved. He said that he didn't want to kill innocent Iranians, which I think is laughable considering that it's the United States that is killing millions of people abroad under both Trump and Obama. Now he suddenly turned on the interior and there was this report – and I don't know if it's true or not – but it sounds ridiculous enough to be true. The report is that Trump actually made the request to bomb some segment of Iran where the government wouldn't mind to save face, and he was turned down. Considering the current level of incompetence of the government in the United States, I would not say that this is unthinkable.



I think that what we are dealing with is completely decapitated power. That is how I see the US right now, with no policy whatsoever. So, the substitute for this flag-waving and making all sorts of roaring threats, “I can stop this war in ten days, but I don’t want to kill ten million people,” and that kind of talk is just such a chasm between the real world and the nonsense that comes out of Washington DC. They seem to be completely oblivious to the fact that they are losing the empire. I think that is the big news.

Fitts: We have the British Navy showing up in the Strait of Hormuz and now getting involved with tanker warfare back and forth. What is the British role?

The Saker: The usual: Basically, being a poodle. There is no other role for that.

Getting British war ships inside the Strait of Hormuz makes them perfect targets and very easy targets to engage. As I have said many times, if the empire gets serious about attacking Iran, expect them to flush all their ships out of the Persian Gulf and not put them in. When you put them in, it’s the same as when the US started parading its ships in the Black Sea. That makes no military sense whatsoever and is purely a political show. There is nothing of substance to it in terms of protecting them because he can’t protect anything.

Fitts: One of the things that makes me nervous, and it’s something that we’ve talked many times about, is how unthinkable a land war would be and how unwinnable a war with Iran is. But if you look at the politics of the interests who are trying to engineer war with Iran, ——



– as they pop up in US politics – there is clearly an incredible war going on, and it is impossible to see it clearly.

We don't need to discuss it, but we just had the fifth New York policeman shot in the head. It was said to be a suicide, but it's clearly not. We had a fire district in New York, and the seven commissioners just issued a resolution saying that the World Trade Center buildings came down through internal demolitions and they want a new investigation – which has to be one of the most courageous acts in American politics of the last two decades.

So, you can see that there is tremendous tension about what has been going on to engineer war in the Middle East.

It's impossible to tell what is really happening behind the scenes, but clearly there are people who want war with Iran and are willing to do suicidal things with the US empire to get it. The questions are: Why do they not stand down? Why are they willing to rush into a suicidal mission?

The Saker: There are a couple of reasons for that. It's supposed to create a perfect storm. Obviously, Israel wants Iran to be hit as hard as possible. The only people who are lobbying hard for a war with Iran have always been the Israelis and their agents here in the United States. But besides that, there are several other things. There is this problem that the United States military is not a credible threat anymore. It cannot be used effectively to sway anybody to do anything.



After the US military really growled and showed muscle in front of Venezuela, and then Venezuela didn't cave in, that is really terminal. That leaves Liechtenstein, Monaco, and the Vatican as tiny states that might be persuaded to be afraid, but the rest of them, absolutely not. That is a huge problem for the United States because, what is the dollar backed by nowadays? I say it's backed only by aircraft carriers, and these aircraft carriers are not credible; they don't represent the threat that can actually get political goals achieved. So, that is the second reason.

One of the reasons to attack Iran is to prove that the US is still the 'big guy' on the block of the indispensable power, the best military in the world history, and the rest of the hot air that we know so well.

You need a real victory of some kind, even if it is largely fictional, to prop it up. It's not dissimilar to the rationale for Israeli strikes on Syria. The main purpose of these strikes right now is to prove that they can still do strikes. Never mind that they don't hit anything of relevance, but they still do strikes, so they save face by saying, "We kicked them. We hit them."

It's the same thing happening here. Recently, the US claimed that they shot down an Iranian drone. I don't know if you saw that.

Fitts: I saw it.

The Saker: It's so obvious. It's literally 'kindergarten-level' face-saving and is very, very pathetic.



Fitts: Right, but you see the headlines go back and forth, and it's hard to really know what the truth is and what is not.

I don't know if you just saw the allegation by Iran that the Israelis had assassinated Amano, the man at the UN who oversaw the nuclear inspections.

The Saker: I didn't see that, but that would be very typical.

If you want to see what the truth is, let's look at recent events. On the 17th of July, Seyed Mohammad Marandi wrote a very good article in *The Moon of Alabama*. I highly recommend it. It's called 'A US Led Naval Coalition in the Persian Gulf Will Raise the Threat of War'. Professor Marandi explains that the Iranian position is to hit disproportionately back if they are hit, thereby deterring a hit.

They have developed a very sophisticated policy of deterrence, and it is actually an extremely effective one. If you think about it, from the Islamic revolution until today, Iran has never been attacked directly and hard by the US from the Israelis. They have been attacked by the entire world by means of Saddam Hussein, and they succeeded through some very hard conditions to prevail. But his idea is that the policy of deterrence is, "We hit full-spectrum and very hard if you even attack us with a limited attack."

I don't know if that is the case, but I have no reason to distrust Professor Marandi. I think that it is a very good deterrence policy and they are very smart.



Fitts: I had assumed that the logical strategy, given the power that Israel has within the Israel coalition, was to just squeeze, squeeze, squeeze with economic sanctions. So, the question is: Can that get the US anywhere?

The Saker: First of all, let's always go through the basics. Unilateral sanctions – or even by one group of countries against another sovereign nation – are illegal. They are a violation of international law, and they are basically an act of war.

It is always important to keep that in mind because the word 'sanctions' sounds like, "Daddy caught his little boy stealing from the cookie jar, and he told him to copy five times on the board, 'I won't steal cookies from the cookie jar'." That is the emotional context of the word 'sanctions'; it's no big deal.

What we are talking about here is provoking a country by engaging in an illegal act of war. I want to make sure that this is clear before we go any further.

Fitts: Right, but don't you think that it's absolutely clear globally that the US is violating international law in many different arenas, including this?

The Saker: I do believe that. I do think that the Kristallnacht for international law was the bombing on the Bosnian Serbs in 1991. Since international law has been completely disregarded and trampled on, even the most sacred principles of international law are completely ignored. That, paradoxically, is good news. It is the empire showing its true face.



Even at the time of Obama-he had the charm of a car salesman- he was trying to pretend that he had some respect for the European allies whereas, Trump doesn't even have the manners to do that. He is totally straightforward in his despising everybody. Look at what he is saying to praise Macron, and now he is saying that they are doing extremely foolish things. He is getting in fights with everybody, and that is due to an inability to operate in that function.

I think that he and Zelenskiy are the two examples of people who are completely clueless, and as a result, there is complete chaos.

Fitts: Here is what was interesting: Bush was clearly far outside the international law; Obama was clearly far outside of international law; Clinton was certainly, as a matter of policy, planning to be. But there is something about Trump's style that he is very forthright about being outside of international law, and somehow that seems to finally make it clear.

The Saker: I think it's more than just international law. I think that the empire has essentially completely given up on all the fundamental ideological building blocks of the Western society. Concepts such as democracy, human rights, freedom of speech, pluralism, and all that are gone. We are now in a society which basically might make right ideology primes everything, and reality has absolutely no bearing on anything. It's a terminal stage for an empire to enter that phase.

The comparison that I have in my mind would be the Kerensky regime in Russia in 1917. We are talking about such an overwhelming inability to get anything done that regular analysis of ideology and politics don't apply anymore.



Fitts: I hate to say this, but FASAB 56 was probably the death. If you are saying that we reserve the right to fake our books, that is crossing a clear line about your inability to function.

The Saker: We see the exact same towards everybody. The problems are not being tackled. Loud statements are made around some issue, and then the interest goes onto something else.

I absolutely fail to see any kind of policy actually working-none.

Fitts: The latest development is that Coats has just resigned, and we see a Texas Congressman from the fourth district's name circulated as the new Director of Intelligence. It's not somebody I'm familiar with. The fourth district is a location for a tremendous number of defense contractors, so there is big money to be made in the fourth district by having wars or the danger or appearance of war.

It seems to me that you are moving out the people who could say, "No, this is a mistake," and putting in the people who are going to go along.

The name being circulated is John Ratcliffe, and I think he was one of the sponsors of the 2016 Israeli Cyber Security Bill integrating US and Israeli cyber security commands.

This looks like a person who is on board for the plan – whatever the plan is. In other words, you are losing the adults in the room, and you are getting the people who are going to cheerlead for whichever way the power wants to go.



The Saker: Yes, that is absolutely true and there is no doubt about it. Recently, Andrew Bacevich wrote a very good article called ‘The Decline of our Nation’s Generals’. I reprinted it on my blog. He describes that phenomenon in looking at generals, but you could look at civilian people and you have exactly the same problem.

Fitts: It’s a very significant problem in the civilian bureaucracy. I know that just from having worked in it.

Let’s talk a little about Tulsi Gabbard. One of the things that I’ve been following is this house resolution, which is a non-binding resolution basically to castigate the BDS – the boycott movement that is designed to object to what Israel is doing outside of international law and on Palestine. There were only 17 Congressmen who voted ‘no’- one Republican and 16 Democrats, and Tulsi Gabbard not among them.

You wrote a beautiful piece which we reposted on, ‘There Goes Tulsi Gabbard’. Why don’t you tell us a little about it?

The Saker: First of all, I think there is something crucial that we need to point out here. Whether this resolution is binding or not binding, – the exact words that they use – whether or not this resolution was in favor of a one-state solution or a two-state solution, that’s the small print that nobody reads. The real purpose of such a resolution is typically to force everybody to kneel, to show submission, and, therefore, become an accomplice.

I would make a parallel to the way the Europeans reacted to the highly likely Skripal case, which was self-evidently idiotic if you have any kind of knowledge about how things are done in the real world, ——



— yet they are all in the name of solidarity. They say, “Yes, yes, yes.”

We have something similar here. I think that the resolution served a very important purpose, which is to prove that Tulsi Gabbard does not have what it takes to say no to Israel lobby. That by itself is good enough to justify the resolution from the point of view of the authors.

On top of that, it gets Gabbard into the habit of complying and bowing her head. It is political expediency. She knows that it is all lies and deception and hypocrisy, but she votes because she needs to do that in order to stay in the race.

Therefore, the system already corrupts her in order to make her go up. That is how the system works, and this is what is so crucial.

The individuals don't matter anymore. It doesn't really matter who is in the White House, and it doesn't really matter who is in the 'up position' because individuals don't affect the system. We have seen that for so many individuals during the past decade over and over and over and over.

The perfect example is: Who is the most trusted, honest person possible? Colin Powell. He was clearly the hero; the perfect guy. Then he shook the water – he filled the bottle with fake Anthrax in there.

Fitts: The 'yellowcake'.



The Saker: So, even with a man like Colin Powell, eventually they break him and he caves in. They just did that with the one candidate who was truly against war. Everybody else was the same. It was a choice between Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola, but Gabbard was the only one who was very distinctively different in her behavior, and sure enough, they broke her so far upstream.

Fitts: Here is the deal: I was run out of Washington by essentially these people – whether you want to call them the Ziocons, the neocons, or whatever you want to call them. I will call them ‘transnational organized crime’. They run the narcotics trafficking, and we have now allowed tremendous integration of our information systems with their intelligence services, whether it’s the British or the Israelis, and God only knows if we’ve let the Saudis in; I don’t know.

If you only listen to half the rumors about the access that they have to our information systems or NSA intelligence, there is an integration happening, which is very dangerous because we are integrating the power of government and the most powerful intelligence service capacities in the world with transnational organized crime. So, it’s not surprising that transnational organized crime is operating outside the international law because they don’t believe in law. They got to where they are by breaking the law, and that is what they are good at.

One thing that I know from dealing with them is that you are talking about physical harassment and information cyber harassment and legal harassment and financial harassment.

I put up a video recently of Richard Perle saying that anybody who doesn’t vote the way of APAC or whatever somebody wants, ——



—— they will lose their next election. We've seen the video about Cynthia McKinney where she was targeted twice and run out of Congress twice essentially by that group.

So, you are talking about people who play dirty. I think that the question for everybody in America is: How are you going to stop them? That is why I think the fire commissioners are so absolutely brave. Whatever those transnational organized crime elements are, they were clearly involved in 9/11.

So, the question is: How do we stand up to them?

The Saker: We can look at history. What is happening now to the United States is not that different from what was taking place in the Soviet Union in the late 80's, and even during the Yeltsin years.

Fitts: That's very true.

The Saker: Russia was a colony, and the country was completely colonized by the empire. The constitution was written by 'American advisors'. Russia underwent what the US is undergoing right now, which is the later phase of the colonization. That is when there are big coming-outs, and it becomes in-your-face and unapologetic.

The only way to change that is regime change. This is the single-most important thing that comes out of the Trump-Gabbard situation, which is that individuals don't make a difference anymore – Trump didn't and she didn't – to the extent that Obama had a little honesty initially. Maybe he tried. I'm not sure about that, but we can assume that. If he did try, he certainly failed.



What we have here is essentially an occupation government which rules against the will of the people of this country, and basically this country has been turned into a banana republic.

The way to change that is regime change. There is no other example. I don't know of any other example of that kind of power structure willingly saying, "Okay. You don't want us? We'll leave." That's not going to happen.

Fitts: Here is the challenge of regime change; you have an entire system. America breaks down to 3,100 counties. They are all dependent on the subsidy rolling out of the centrally-controlled reserve currency. So, it's the central bank and the fiscal policy. This is why the budget and the politics of the debt are such a nightmare. So, you have to have 3,100 counties be prepared to reengineer the money if you are going to have a regime change. You need a bottom-up financial reengineering to match a regime change. Everybody is waiting around praying that their cash flows continue when, in fact, those cash flows are financing something that is killing them.

The Saker: The regime change has to be not just external; it has to be real.

Putin got into power in Russia, and once he came to power, that was not regime change yet. The real regime change happened when he got rid of the oligarchs. That is something that we are not going to see happening here.

Fitts: It's not really regime change. What you are trying to do —



— is reverse a coup d'état and return it to a Constitutional Republic, and you are trying to kick out transnational organized crime.

In other words, you are trying to reassert the rule of law.

The Saker: That is one option, but there could be others. In theory, you could absolutely have a fascist kind of coup. In theory, you should have a coup by the military. There are different options here. It all depends on individuals, on specific circumstances, and particularly what triggered the crisis.

I think that as long as the US can print as much money as they want and the rest of the world continues taking that money, it seems that the system can continue for a long while.

The problem is: What happens when people stop taking that money? We see signs of that alternative being built. Once that happens, there is the saying in English, “Victory has many parents, but defeat is orphaned.” It’s the same thing here. When things go well, the ruling elites are all happy with each other and they all smile and act very friendly. As soon as the system starts collapsing, they all get into a fight with each other, and then the friendliness goes away. What you see then is the real face of the system, which is violence and deception.

Fitts: My name for that is the ‘Midianite thing’, and that is one of the reasons I think Epstein is in jail (and reportedly committed suicide). They are trying to keep a lid on the ‘Midianite thing’. It is clearly a problem.

The Saker: There are many rumors about that character, but I don’t know what is really true or not. It is very secretive.



Fitts: I strongly believe that a lot of the money that was laundered required a supporting control file operation. I won't bore you with the details, but if you look at the people involved, I've always believed that the money coming out of HUD was part of what capitalized his operation and the Clinton Foundation primarily at the same time. One of the reasons they cancelled the HUD mortgage loan sales was so that they could use those mortgages, move them over to Epstein, and that is where he got his financing from – liquidating those mortgages. But that is a different conversation.

Let's keep going around the world. Iran and the Middle East are far from the only hot spots. Have you been following Venezuela?

The Saker: Yes I have, and there, it's always the same thing – a complete failure of all American attempts to influence the events in a specific direction. It's somewhat amazing, and is astonishing.

Fitts: It's amazing because after all the threats and very aggressive talk, suddenly it is complete quiet in the US media. It's almost as though nobody wants to mention, "Uh-oh! It's not working."

The Saker: Yes, but that is the old approach. I don't know who it was, but I am absolutely sure that there was an American General who said in the late 1980's/early 1990's that, "We don't win unless CNN says we win." That was one of his statements. Unfortunately, I've forgotten the name of the man and I never could find it again.

Here we have the opposite. We are not defeated unless it says that we are defeated. So, as long as the media moves the attention somewhere else – on Putin eating babies for breakfast or Russia about to ——



— invade Poland and Portugal – you switch to something else because it’s embarrassing. The United State has amnesia, and it is absolutely crucial for the political stability of this country. If people had a memory and could track events over more than a one-week or two-week attention span, they would realize that the so-called ‘indispensable nation’ fails at absolutely everything.

Fitts: One of the things that we talked about the last time was how, if Trump even attempted a land war. – let alone a serious air war – that Iran would retaliate and it would cost him the election. I still believe that is the case.

The Saker: His options are very limited. Of course, he can engage into a fictional air strike, but as we know from Professor Marandi and many other people who I have correspondence with all say unanimously the same thing: The mood is extreme resistance; they are not going to cave in; they want to fight; they are ready to go; they understand very, very well what is happening.

The explanation of the media of what is happening with Iran is very good, so people understand and they are ready. They have been ready for it, and they have been preparing for many, many years.

I don’t see the point of a limited strike; a bigger strike, yes. Let me just restate what I say on every show: I don’t believe that there ever was a real Iranian nuclear weapons program. I believe that there aren’t any today for a host of reasons, including pragmatic military reasons that I can explain, and because the supreme leader declared that nuclear weapons are haram and they are not acceptable in Islam.



I don't believe that this had anything to do with nuclear weapons. However, it does have to do with beating down a successful Islamic Republic, and that is the real problem of Iran. They make Israel look comparatively weaker, and they have a lot of economic and cultural and religious influence. They have been a successful society that has managed to build itself in the face of a never-ending constant US and Israeli attempt at sabotage and disruption, and still they managed to do it.

I think that the existence of Iran is even more offensive to Anglo-Zionists than the existence of Cuba.

Fitts: But how much of it is Israel wanting to be the hegemon in the Eurasia versus if Iran's relationship with China and Russia is highly successful? It dramatically impacts the equity ownership and other positions along the Silk Road.

How much of this is really a battle with China?

The Saker: I think that it is secondary. The crucial thing is that Israel is not the main regional power in the Middle East. Israel is directly threatened by Iran, and not because of wiping anything off a map. That is nonsense. But in their point of view, Iran refuses to accept a state for Jews only. They refuse to accept apartheid for the Palestinians, therefore Iran must perish from an ideological point of view.

From a military point of view, remember Israel and Saudi Arabia have no military that it can effectively use. They have a very expensive military, and they have plenty of advanced fancy gear, but once 'push comes to shove' and they have to fight people who are willing to resist, they are very bad.



That makes them weak regionally, whereas Iran is the opposite. Not only do they have a huge pool of Iranian forces that they can send abroad from different organizations – from the revolution and from the military – but they also have economic ties, cultural ties, and they have allies who are by themselves, very good fighters.

First of all, there is Hezbollah, but Houthi also did a very good job fighting in Yemen. This is a state that can actually deliver.

Fitts: So, the Israelis and the Americans believe that they can go very far on cyber warfare. They clearly believe that is their ‘ace in the hole’.

The Saker: I don’t really believe that. I think that it is the same as climate weapons and HAARP and secret weapons and ‘super-duper’ stealth aircraft, and the space command that Trump created. This is all words and ‘hot air’.

If you look militarily, you have to develop and train these systems, and there is a corporate culture. It takes decades to make those kinds of changes. I think that what they are doing is the opposite of the Russians, who are on the other side.

Whatever happens, you accuse Russian hackers because you don’t need any proof for it. It’s that simple. You just accuse Russia of being the hackers, “They did it.”

If we lose an election, it’s the Russian hackers. In the same way, you can say that we can block all of Russia and Iran. “I flip this switch, and their entire electric grid will go down.”



Do these people really think that the Russians and Iranians are stupid and that their electrical grids are all that easy to affect? I think it is nonsense, and I think that it is propaganda. I think that 95% of the efforts of American politicians right now are directed at perception management – not at all at the real world.

Fitts: Here is what you are saying – and I think it is really important to understand. You are saying that reality is concrete. There is a concrete reality, and ultimately if you are going to dominate in a military capacity, you have to be effective at land war. You have to be able to control a territory.

The Saker: Absolutely.

Fitts: That is what we are talking about. Who has the capacity to implement, affect, and win a land war? The United States does not, and the United States combined with its allies, to the extent that they are willing to support us, also does not.

The Saker: That is absolutely true. That really is a huge threat because nobody is afraid.

Going back to the secret weapons with advanced capabilities in Venezuela, I think that there were two or three cases of electrical power grids being sabotaged. As far as I know, regular explosives were used. So, that should tell you something right here.

Fitts: Really?



The Saker: If you put an explosive on something, that means that it wasn't cyber anything. It's basically sabotage – good, old-fashioned World War II sabotage. There's nothing wrong with it, but that is in a small country.

If the Americans are so powerful, there would be no electricity all over Venezuela immediately. Why isn't it happening?

Fitts: Exactly.

The Saker: And now they are going to tell me that they are going to disconnect all of Iran or all of Russia? Please!

Fitts: I don't know. I find the whole situation baffling. Here is what I can't understand: I've been in Europe for a month, and I keep running into different conversations about what is happening in the Middle East. I finally said, "I just don't understand Israel. Why would you inflict this much pain trying to force the United States to start a war that it is going to lose?"

The Saker: But in that sense Israel is no different from the US. The general public has been rendered so passive and ignorant that they don't realize that when the real risks are taken they are going to pay for it. They are unaware of it.

Remember that Israel is a highly ideological country. It is a country in which ideological dogmas are presented as actual truth. For instance, the superior is smarter than all of the rest, and the only language that the Arabs understand is violence. They have all these typical racist clichés.



If that is where your thoughts are, you won't be able to be swayed away from it by reality. When the Nazis started losing the war against the Soviet Union, they didn't go, "Hmnm. I think our racial theories are probably nonsense." They didn't do that, but they might have thought it. They may have thought it even before they started the war, but the ideological imperative is such – particularly in a collapsing society – that if you express criticism or doubts of that ideology, you are declared a traitor. It becomes a crime to be critical.

Fitts: We do have a group of people leading a country whose experience is that lawlessness has worked. My theory is that one of the reasons that they have been able to build such a political coalition in the United States is because they have been very effective online at getting control files, including using things like pornography.

So, I think that there has been a very significant covert effort to centralize control. People who have been good at organized crime have been good at doing it.

I just think that lawlessness has worked.

The Saker: Yes, but the other tool that the empire uses is corruption. The US is the world expert, for sure, on their ability to corrupt people. Most of the CIA's successes are not due to brilliant intelligence work, but because much of their officers are given the task to basically offer straightforward bribes, and it works. There is nothing very sophisticated about it.

If you have a printing press and you can print as much money as you want, it is no problem to hand out as much money as you want.



That is how it works. But the adversaries that the United States dealt with over the years were very different than those who are against them today. That is crucial because there was a qualitative change.

Fitts: Let's turn to Europe. We are having a turnover in leadership in Europe. We have a new president of the EU, and we have a new president of the ECB. Europe is in the middle of this thing because part of the challenge of the Silk Road is that Asia is rising, and Eurasia is right 'smack-dab' between the world's biggest consumer market and Asia. So, Europe is in this mix, and Europe has been exceptionally obedient to the United States, but we also see the Anglo-American Alliance with Brexit breaking away from the EU.

We have new EU leadership. The EU has a role to play in this because they are right in the middle.

The Saker: They use something to a similar aging call girl: They don't know how attractive they still are and how much money they can get for their services. They are now dealing with a boss who essentially has left the room. So, there is a forced chaos in Europe. They are in a transition, but for the time being, I still don't see meaningful regime change.

There are signs and indications that there is a change happening progressively, but it has been occurring for a while. The US has nearly lost every popular vote that it has set out to do. We still haven't reached a point of true explosion, and I think that this is probably where Europe is headed. There needs to be a real crisis for Europe to start recovering sovereignty. Right now, it is terminal.



Fitts: If there is a war in Iran, and somebody is foolish enough to drop a nuclear bomb, Israel has nuclear bombs and the US has nuclear bombs. So, if somebody is foolish enough to drop a nuclear bomb, Israel is the one that is going to pay – not North America.

The Saker: First of all, I don't disagree that there is a risk of use of nuclear weapons. I usually am irritated when people irresponsibly say that nuclear weapons have been used in Syria and Lebanon and Yemen and Iraq. That is not true.

But is there a risk of use of nuclear weapons? Yes, particularly in the context that I don't think that the US will ever invade Iran as an entire country, but I think there is a risk if there is a shooting war starting on a limited ground operation to destroy the Iranian infrastructure along the Strait of Hormuz. We are talking about at least 80,000 people involved in that kind of attack.

Fitts: What is the most that Israel can field in a land army?

The Saker: In Iran, nothing because Iran is too far away. You need to project your ground forces. You can't just take an armored brigade and fly it 1,000 miles up north. It doesn't work. Israel can reach Iran with missiles and aircraft only.

But that is irrelevant because think of what happened in 2006 with Hezbollah. That is exactly what we are looking at. We are looking at a repeat of that, but in a much bigger, much bloodier scale. So, that is really the risk. I think at that point, the US would be more likely to use a tactical nuke to try to 'shock and awe' the Iranians, which is not going to work either.



I think they are perfectly capable of doing that, and you know they admitted to it.

Cheney was asked during the first Gulf War, “What would happen if the Iraqis crossed the line and attacked the 2nd Airborne?”, which is infantry.

He said, “The idea was that the Navy would use marked aircraft to protect them. If that didn’t work, tactical nukes.”

So, the US has always been looking at nukes with a desire to find a way to use them, and a humiliating defeat would be exactly the kind of circumstance which would press a narcissistic and weak people – like what we have right now in the White House – to say, “Fine, then we will nuke them if that is what they want!”

Fitts: The problem is not that the people in the White House are going to want to do it: It’s the people who have the gun to their head – whoever that is – who want to do it, and you don’t have a Tillerson or a Mattis or a Coats there to stop it. That gets back to the question of: Who is forcing this? Who is behind the scenes?

Trump did not come in with a mandate to continue war in the Middle East. It was quite the opposite.

The Saker: First of all, I think that the biggest consequence of using a nuclear weapon would not be military; I think that that would be an absolute collapse of the empire really fast because of the outrage that this would trigger worldwide. The Europeans would go ‘bananas’ if the United States started using nukes anywhere.



I think that the price would be horrendous in terms of a political price to pay, but I am afraid that there is so much arrogance and imperial hubris in the mindset of the US military personnel that with most generals, if you asked them to suffer defeat or use a tactical nuke, which do you think you would go with? I think that the vast majority would say to use a tactical nuke. They would say, “I don’t want the world to know that I’m weak.”

Fitts: Basically, what you are saying is that it’s either use a tactical nuke or lose the reserve currency.

The Saker: That is one possibility. You can also lose the currency without using a nuke, but I don’t see any chance of success for any kind of military operation against Iran right now. Depending on how hard Iran hits back, once they fully get in front of them, they will realize that they really have no good options. I think that out of sheer anger, hubris, and panic they are capable of using tactical nukes.

Fitts: So, this gets back to who are the people behind the scenes who are pushing this.

The Saker: I don’t think it’s people; I think it’s the system that breeds that. The system has its own internal ideological logic. Under that logic, the indispensable nation shall not be defeated and this is not negotiable.

Fitts: We have been defeated constantly.

The Saker: The perfect example – and I have heard this many times from military personnel – is that we never lost a battle in Vietnam.



We lost the war because of the peaceniks and the hippies, but we never lost the war militarily. These people don't understand a simple premise and a basic fundamental reality that wars are a continuation of politics through other means.

You can destroy or kill any number of people or hardware. If you haven't achieved the means of your victory, you have lost.

It's the same thing here: You lose even when you win.

Fitts: Well, we clearly lost the war in Vietnam. It wasn't because of the hippies and the peaceniks. I totally agree.

The Saker: The true history of the Grenada invasion really has to be written. It's even better than what people say. It's just absolutely unbelievable what happened there. And that is Grenada! You want to take on Iran – the people who train the Hezbollah and the Hutus? Seriously? 80 million?

Fitts: I don't see how anybody is going to occupy and control a country of 80 million.

The Saker: Occupy and control is not going to happen. That is not even a possibility.

The biggest and hardest thing that it could do is what they did in Kosovo on a possibly even bigger scale – that kind of hammering. What you do is first hit the military infrastructure, and then go onto the rest that supports the military. It was similar to this in the Indian wars.



If you can't get the fighters, get their families, their villages, and their infrastructure. That is what was done to Serbia. When the US was unable to defeat the Serbian military, what did they do? They hit the people of Serbia and Montenegro. It's always the same thing.

Israel has been doing that to Lebanon for years; basically, taking civilians hostage and making them pay. I think that is one good definition of terrorism.

Fitts: The war of terrorism.

Let's also touch base on the Ukraine. Trump has essentially turned to Europe and said, "It's your problem." What is Europe going to do?

The Saker: First of all, Europe can't do anything. Frankly, neither can the US. There is an assumption of action – of agency and ability to do something – but I don't think there is much that anybody can do about the Ukraine at this point. It's a failed state and a done deal.

The last election was absolutely amazing because twice, all the nationalists and all the neo-Nazis got a huge slap in the face by the people. The people are clearly fed up, but there is nothing they can do because the real power in the Ukraine is not the power of the vote, but the power of the mob and the power of the street. The people who put Poroshenko into power are still there; they haven't lost a single fighter.

Now Zelenskiy has to choose between doing the will of the people and facing real physical threats for him and his regime, ——



or do the will of the Nazis and be as hated as Poroshenko was, which is probably what he is going to do. That is where he is headed. He is going to do a repeat of Poroshenko. At least that is what it appears like for the time being. It's hard to tell. The man is completely unpredictable, having no record.

Fitts: Let me turn to the empire's parallel universe. In all of these different situations we are seeing the empire say one thing, and we are watching a totally different reality.

There is a multiple personality disorder which is more extreme than we have ever seen. One of the symptoms of that is: You are watching behavior in the United States. I've been in Europe for four weeks, and it's such a relief because there is so much incoherence in the United States that it really makes it hard to manage day-to-day.

You watch in the media debates and discussions of total irrelevant issues and 'he said/she said', while at the same time in the budget and in the debt spiral you are watching the economic model under extreme stress and pressure.

We have this reality of what is happening to the empire under extreme financial stress and pressure, and on the other hand, we have a complete inability to deal with reality. It's almost like watching the Salem witch trials.

The Saker: You are absolutely right! I am laughing because it's true.



Fitts: I did an analysis of the Salem witch trials long ago, and one of the things that I discovered was that you had two groups. One was an older, cost-plus model, and the other was new and young and entrepreneurial. They were under extreme stress because the Brits were talking about pulling their charter, the Indians were thinking of invading, and you had real extraordinary economic difficulty with people trying to get enough to eat. Right in the middle of it a preacher showed up who had been promised a certain amount of tithes, and he's not getting his tithes. He tells the stories of the witches that the kids have made up, and suddenly his tithes shoot up because it's phenomenally entertaining.

You get somebody in the entertainment business who is making money from entertainment, and then you are 'off to the races'. The two groups fight, and they fight by killing each other's women. It was just a way of them fighting, but what they were doing during the fight was ignoring the real problem, which was the Indians and the pulling of the charter.

It was interesting how it stopped. Finally, somebody said, "If we all keep going to trial or being in the jury instead of planting, we are going to starve next winter."

The Saker: Somebody has to plant.

Fitts: Somebody has to plant food, and somebody has to be productive. Otherwise they are all going to starve. That is what ended the Salem witch trials.



There are these two tsunamis coming at each other. One is of the fundamental economics and the falling productivity, and the other is of a group of people who are involved in serious distractions, and it is getting worse as they fight. The question is: How do you turn that and focus people on dealing with the real issues? At some point everybody is going to have to eat. If there is no food, it's a big problem.

The Saker: Yes, but I think that this is something very typical of terminal ideological society when you have a complete inadequacy between what is discussed and what the public problems are and what the real problems are. Look at all the regimes when they were falling. I think the Tsar Regime and then Kerensky and the Soviets and the Nazis all went through that period. There is a problem when you are in extreme decline, and you are going into deep delusion, and some magic thing will save you, and nothing magical will happen.

We are really repeating the Titanic experience here. We have an orchestra playing and a captain that is gone, and the ship is sinking but most people are still dancing to the music.

Fitts: It's interesting. Throughout the ship there is an exceptional amount of serious talent which has been sidelined – whether it's competent bureaucrats leaving because they won't play the game or state and local officials who are still trying to hold things together. Throughout the system, you have an enormous amount of productive people, and they have been sidelined. If they were put back in control of the nuts and bolts throughout the society, you could move extremely forward in productivity.



If you look at all the different ways that the productive are trained in the United States, it is extraordinary that they don't give up.

The Saker: That is another thing that is common to terminal regimes. The system basically isolates and removes from the position of influence all the skilled people – the talented, the principled, and the decent ones – and promotes only the scum, the idiots, the confused, or the blackmailable. That is something that is very typical. It's not something unique that happened here; it happens all over the place.

Europe is very much in the same condition. Their leaks are just terrible. That is one of those very fundamental diagnostic tools. When you see all the people who could make a difference being moved away and being replaced by non-entities, that is also a very, very worrisome sign.

Fitts: I know how productive the system could be if that top 10% were allowed to be back running their pieces. It's quite remarkable. When you run organizations – I've run businesses and I've run government agencies – and 10% of the slugs (and the neocons are slugs 'par excellence'), and you let the slugs run things, the organization quickly disseminates into swamp and mess, and it's disgusting. You think, "This thing is hopeless. We have to let it collapse."

If you come in, put the 10% productive in charge, and get 80% of the followers following them, which nobody gets. Eighty-percent of the people are following around whoever is in charge. If you can swing out the slugs and put in the productive people, it's like magic; it's unbelievable.



If the slugs have organized to be very good at killing, poisoning, beating, threatening, etc., we fundamentally have been invaded by transnational organized crime, and we don't know how to deal with it. We are going to have to figure it out, or we are going to go down.

The Saker: I think that the only way to figure it out is to go down. Then what happens after you go down? There is collapse, and then the first generation who comes up – the actual regime changers – usually overdo it. There is a lot of ideology coming from the regime changes. Only the second generation starts being much more responsible. There is usually more statecraft after a very painful period of transition. Regime change means the regime goes down, then chaos, and then rebuild. That cycle, which can last 20 years, can be really painful. That can be almost as bad as a war.

Fitts: Here is my concern: If you wait to go down the way they did in Russia, the psychopaths have stolen a great deal of money. They are going to have a field day.

If you listen to some of the trial balloons that I have listened to of doing the 'Rape of Russia' here, that collapse means they get to buy everything at \$0.10 on the dollar, and they are going to double down on their profits and control.

The Saker: Absolutely true, and we know who is going to be doing the buying. The only people who will have a lot of disposable income will be the Chinese in that circumstance.



Fitts: No, you are going to have the people who stole all the money. The people who engineered the financial coup are sitting with an absolute stockpile. Maybe they have a bigger stockpile than the Chinese, but there is no doubt that the Chinese are going to be big buyers.

The Saker: But if there is a regime change, there is going to be ‘hell to pay’ for those who were in the old regime. Typically, they get dispossessed, shot, jailed, exiled, or their assets get seized. There is ‘hell to pay’ after you’ve been caught being a parasite for decades.

Fitts: One of my theories about Brexit is that is one of the reasons the British are so eager to protect the secrecy in the offshore havens. I really do; the Queen is no fool!

The Saker: They didn’t become who they are by being dumb. I agree.

Fitts: Let’s look forward to the next three months until you are back with us. Tell us about you and what you are going to be doing and what you are going to be researching and what you are going to be writing. We want to know what you are considering.

The Saker: My two big ones remain Iran and the Ukraine for different reasons, but those are the two that I find are the most concerning. I think that with the Zelenskiy issue, the chances that he will do something meaningful are melting by the minute. He hasn’t done much, but everything he has done has been really bad and incompetent. I think that the Ukraine is headed for complete chaos.



“Never say never”, but at this point in time I don’t see a workable solution to attack Iran. I think they would have to fold.

The big issue there is: Will Israel have the means to force the US to do its dirty job for us? I don’t know; this is something that I cannot answer.

Fitts: I would say, “No”, but they are going to do everything in their power, and I think that they are going to kill many people. I think that it is going to be a very ugly fight.

The Saker: Are you talking about covert operations and murder of scientists, or do you mean that as air strikes?

Fitts: I mean trying to get their way regarding policy in the US government and US politics.

The Saker: Don’t they already have total control? What is it that they don’t control?

Fitts: I don’t think that they have total control yet. I think there are still significant interests that don’t want them to have total control. So, I think they represent a faction, but I don’t think they control all the levers of power. I think we see many different symptoms that there is a fight going on, and I think that fight is going to get worse.

The Saker: If it is true and that is what is happening, then that really explains the recent resolution. If there is a fight then what they need is to get all the potential opponents like Tulsi Gabbard to bow their heads and get them into the habit of, “Don’t mess with the Israel lobby because you are going to be dead.”



If that is effective and they pursue that further effectively, there is going to be absolutely no change as long as they are anywhere near the White House. I don't see anybody removing them either.

Fitts: I read your coverage of the vote, and I proceeded to find Thomas Massie's website. I learned all about him and gave him a \$100 donation.

Any Republican who votes 'no' on that resolution deserves a reward. Don't you think?

The Saker: I do, but on the other hand, I need to look at the rest of his votes. He still was within the Republican Party.

Look at Rand Paul. Everyone knows he is an honest man, but the fact that he was sitting in that party, he was limited in what he could do.

Fitts: I would say that for both of those parties. Massie's record is very impressive, but I did not know much about him. I followed Rand Paul, but I didn't know about Massie.

The Saker: Did he offer any explanation for his vote?

Fitts: Not that I know of. His big focus was on the budget bill, and he introduced an Amendment and got 47 votes to change the name of the bill to the 'Kick the Can and Other Items' bill.

The Saker: Definitely look him up.



Fitts: He is quite interesting. He runs a cattle ranch in Kentucky, and he is an engineer who trained at MIT. I think that he built all of the solar on his own ranch.

The Saker: That sounds interesting and I will be observing that with interest, too.

Fitts: I agree with you. You need much greater, deeper fundamental change. One person can't do this.

I always believe that it makes a difference to have a good person, but this is a systemic issue and it goes to the heart of, what I call, the 'central banking warfare model'. Those issues have to be dealt with, and one person winning this election or that election can't change it.

The Saker: Not at all.

Fitts: I want to say before we end that two of the most gratifying experiences of my life were reading *The Essential Saker I* and *The Essential Saker II*. I am thoroughly enjoying the start of *The Essential Saker III*.

I have to recommend to subscribers that if you haven't discovered Saker's books, I encourage you to do so. Also, on his website he has a community, and there are regular postings, but very rich discussion at *The Vineyard of the Saker*. I strongly recommend that you access those books. You are going to have to read them and we would like you to put the books on tape, Saker.

The Saker: That is a lot of reading!



Fitts: I know, but if you are on those long drives, they are fantastic.

The Saker: I wish I had the time to do that, and I would certainly love to put them on tape

Fitts: Your voice is so great. If you combine the content with your voice, that would be fantastic. Or you need to find somebody in your wide audience who could do a really good job of reading your books. I think that people would undoubtedly enjoy listening to them.

Many of my subscribers listen when they are commuting back and forth to work. ‘Americans drive’.

We’ll see. Somebody will emerge from *The Vineyard of the Saker* community to do that for you. We are willing for them to emerge.

The Saker: I love it!

Fitts: Any last thoughts before we finish?

The Saker: No, that’s it, but let’s see what happens with these two countries. Hopefully, you are right that there is still a part of the country that is sovereign here. That could make a huge difference.

Fitts: Absolutely, and let’s keep praying for peace. It can’t hurt.

Saker, thank you very much for joining us on The Solari Report. You have a wonderful quarter.



The Saker: You too, and thank you so much for inviting me; it is a pleasure each time.

Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, that is it for now on The Solari Report. As I close every time: Don't ask if there is a conspiracy, if you are not in a conspiracy, you need to start one because we are going to have to reorganize the economy of the United States. We can do it and let's do it!

Ladies and gentlemen, goodbye and good luck.

MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.