

# Putin's War BOMBSHELL Destroys Trump's Ukraine Plan

Vladimir Putin has dropped a huge bombshell on Trump and his plan to end the Ukraine conflict on terms favorable to the US & NATO says former CIA analyst Larry Johnson & Patrick Henningsen. This video breaks down the truth about the conflict the neocons in the European and US establishment don't want you to know. Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis! Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: [chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com](https://chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com) Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho>

## #Danny

Donald Trump himself has said that there is peace on the horizon — it's very close. But Vladimir Putin just recently spoke to the Defense Council in Russia, and I wanted to play what he said.

## #Putin

What can be our goals in terms of military construction, considering the situation along the line of contact? First, we will definitely achieve the objectives of the special military operation. We would prefer to address the root causes of this conflict by diplomatic means. But if the other side and its foreign sponsors refuse to move in this direction, Russia will liberate its historical lands by military means, creating a buffer safety zone. This is another major objective.

## #Danny

What's your assessment of Russia's response to what's been going on between Trump, Europe, and Ukraine regarding this peace deal, and your comments on what Vladimir Putin had to say? One word: no.

## #Larry Johnson

No, you know, this chatterbait circle jerk happens every time the U.S., the Europeans, and Zelensky get together. Whether they're talking to each other or trying to have any kind of appropriate engagement, any possibility for a diplomatic solution — Russia has to be involved, and it's not. Russia gets consulted, and Putin spends five hours trying to explain things to Whitcomb and

Kushner, but the Russian position hasn't changed since June 14, 2024. Before that, Russia had been willing to allow Donetsk and Luhansk to remain part of Ukraine. All they wanted were guarantees to protect the rights of Russian speakers and the rights of the Orthodox Church.

But under pressure from the West, the Ukrainians blew up that agreement and walked away from it. Then, on June 14, 2024, Vladimir Putin, speaking to the Russian Foreign Ministry's senior personnel, laid it out very clearly: the territories that voted to become part of Russia—Crimea, Donetsk, Luhansk, Kherson, and Zaporizhia—are now permanently part of the Russian Federation, and the West must recognize them as the legal republics of Russia. Not just some de facto recognition, but an actual legal acknowledgment. Get all of NATO out of Ukraine. Withdraw all Ukrainian troops from Russian territory, meaning those five former Ukrainian oblasts. And hold elections. Those are the key issues.

And Russia has not varied from that. The only change is that Putin and others have basically said that the deal now on the table—if it's not accepted—means that as Russia continues to gain territory in Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv, Sumy, and Poltava, they'll keep those areas, or at least give the people living there the chance to vote on whether to join the Russian Federation. So it's clear Russia hasn't changed its position. And this notion that, oh, well, if Ukraine just agrees to let Russia have Donbas, Donetsk, and Luhansk, everything will be settled—no, no, no. Kherson and Zaporizhia too. They're not giving those up. And the West refuses to understand that.

## **#Patrick Henningsen**

I mean, just to add a little bit more to what Larry was saying there—I think Larry outlined the strategic side very clearly. What strikes me is that people, especially in the West, need to listen to the central complaint from the Russians. Putin is talking about historic Russian lands being liberated. You have to address that point. You've got to recognize what's being said there. Why? How did we get to this point? How did Russia get to the point where it believes that historic Russian lands need to be liberated and repatriated to Mother Russia?

And the answer to that question is one of the big points in all of this—how the civil war, I repeat, civil war, began after the Maidan, the U.S.-backed coup in Kyiv in February 2014. A civil war ensued, and the U.S.- and European-backed government in Kyiv enacted a policy of lustration against people who were mainly Russian speakers in Donetsk and Luhansk, also in Crimea, and across the rest of Ukraine—Russian speakers throughout the country. So there was ethnic discrimination based on Russian heritage, Russian identity, and Russian language—ethnic discrimination followed by ethnic violence, organized state violence along ethnic lines, using Nazi and Azov Battalion gangs and radical militants, radical Ukrainian nationalists, unleashing those dogs along racial and ethnic lines. The U.S. has intervened in the past to quell such violence or launch humanitarian interventions on that basis.

So Russia did that in February 2022. And the Ukrainian Orthodox Church has taken things a step further—the criminalization of the largest Christian church in the country, based on ethnic or anti-

Russian discrimination by the Ukrainian government, fully endorsed and backed by the United States and European countries. So this is only going to end one way. Obviously, we're past the civil war stage now. People in the West need to realize that throughout history, when there's a violent civil war—no matter what country we're talking about—it usually ends, or there's a high risk it ends, with the country being broken up as a result. This isn't some major theoretical physics equation; it's just basic historical precedent and common sense.

This is what happens after a violent civil war. And when you add the amount of weapons, money, and political capital that's been force-fed into Ukraine to make this happen, the results are going to be catastrophic. Russia is reacting to this—not only to the situation itself, but also to secure its own national security in response to this new, hyperinflated threat. The Ukrainian military on steroids, pumped with NATO cash, weapons, and political backing from the West, is a major security threat for Russia. It has to do what it needs to do to make sure its national security objectives are met, that any existential threats on its border or doorstep will no longer be a threat. Plain and simple, any other major power would react the same way.

That's the conversation Russia is trying to have with the West but cannot, because with the U.S., Russia is dealing with rank amateurs—a hodgepodge, motley crew. Trump's foreign policy team, the main actors of which have no portfolio at all—Steve Witkoff and his son-in-law, Jared Kushner. This is ad hoc foreign policy. This is not a serious government in Washington. The Trump administration is not a serious organization. You know, if Trump went about his real estate business the way he goes about international relations, he wouldn't be able to build anything in New Jersey, because he completely discards law and precedent. The bureaucracies in the business world are clear.

You can't build a casino in Dubai unless you follow certain processes. But he doesn't want to follow anything in terms of international diplomacy and regards international law as nothing. Look at what they're doing in Venezuela, or look at Gaza or Iran. That shows you where the Trump administration stands on international norms and laws. This is not a serious government—the Trump administration, internationally. And that's why they're going to fail again and again and again. I said this a couple of weeks ago on a big podcast when the 28-point plan came out. I said, I don't think it's going anywhere because they just haven't demonstrated that they're able to execute beyond tweets, beyond "perfect phone calls," beyond fake deals that aren't deals. You know, it's like photo ops—that's what this president is good at. But he's not good at executing any major negotiation or agreement, so it's kicked into 2026. We'll have this conversation again in February.

## **#Danny**

Here's the headline: "Moscow refuses to give up land after Trump claims peace deal is closer than ever." And then NBC News—so that was the UK—NBC News in the U.S. said Ukraine and the U.S. hail major progress in peace talks, but huge hurdles remain, especially whether Moscow will once

again reject making concessions. What do you make of this narrative? It seems pretty entrenched now that it's Russia that's refusing to make concessions—to Ukraine, to Washington. Well, Russia is not going to make concessions.

## **#Larry Johnson**

And Russia doesn't need to make concessions. Russia's not in a tough place economically or militarily where they're under pressure, like, "Oh my God, we've got to back away from this." If anything, in terms of domestic politics, Putin's coming under more pressure to be more decisive. I've heard some fairly prominent Russian soldiers say they feel like they've been fighting with their hands tied behind their backs. They want to be free to pursue this. So again, this is the West just talking to itself—pretending that because they sit down and have a conversation, that somehow constitutes progress or negotiations. I had a friend who managed—he was the chief of staff to Barry Goldwater's vice-presidential candidate in the '64 election, Bill Miller.

And my friend told me about this time he went to a country club in Arizona—it's, you know, a pure Republican country club—and he was talking to this one woman who said, "Man, we're going to have a massive victory, a massive victory over Lyndon Baines Johnson in November, because everybody here supports Goldwater." Well, yeah, if you're just talking to your friends at the country club, that's the impression you're going to get. But then there's a thing called reality, which Patrick was very ably describing. Russia has laid its terms out and said, "Look, to the West, if you want to negotiate, these are our starting terms now. This is where we have to start from, and then we can move on to other issues."

Russia's ultimate goal is to get solid security guarantees from the West that NATO is no longer going to push east. And ultimately, to have any kind of credible, authentic agreement that Russia could rely on, it's going to take a treaty—a treaty between the United States and Russia that's ratified by the U.S. Senate. Barring that, there's not a single agreement Russia could sign with the West that would guarantee its security. Nothing. Because Trump, no matter what he thinks, is going to be undermined by the likes of Lindsey Graham, Chuck Schumer, and other members of Congress on the House side as well, who, frankly, have been taking money from Ukraine.

They've received millions of dollars to support Ukraine. So this animus, this hatred toward Russia, isn't just going to disappear overnight because Trump signs some sort of agreement. The only way you're tangibly going to get the United States firmly committed to a security arrangement with Russia is through a treaty. That's not going to happen. Not going to happen. So, you know, this is just the verbal equivalent of masturbation. That's all it is. That's why I call it "chatterbation."

## **#Patrick Henningsen**

This is so complex. And the longer this goes on, the longer this process drags out, the more complex it gets. That's the problem. What's required here, if you want to get a negotiated settlement—okay?

—this isn't my gig. It's Trump's gig. He's omnipotent, he knows everything. It's funny—I noticed this at the Doha Summit. Donald Trump Jr. was on a panel there, going on about "my father, my father." He says "my father" more often than Cindy McCain. He just keeps saying, "my father."

## **#Larry Johnson**

That's great.

## **#Patrick Henningsen**

He says, "The great thing about my father is that he's so unpredictable. Nobody knows what he's going to do next. He's not like those other bureaucrats, those other politicians, or former U.S. presidents. He's very unpredictable." Like this is some great asset, right? This is the kiss of death in international relations, because you can't interface with other countries and world powers by being completely unpredictable. And the joke of it is, Trump doesn't know what he's going to do next. He's the one who's clueless, because he doesn't know where he's going. He has no direction at all—and neither does any of his team, okay?

These are rank incompetents. These are charlatans. These are people who, quite frankly, are only interested in how much wealth they can accumulate while they're still in power, to set themselves up for when the party's over. Okay? Sorry to break it to people. There's no way that this president, given how complicated the situation is, can execute a multilateral deal—and for the reasons Larry said, domestically. So if it were my gig, I'd handpick a team of people if I really wanted to make this work, make it happen, make history, and win the Nobel Peace Prize, okay?

To me, I would just go and recruit the best diplomats, statespeople—you know, people of the caliber of Larry, Ray McGovern, Douglas MacGregor, John Mearsheimer, and so forth—respectable people who understand diplomacy and international relations. I would then deploy them to Germany, to France. I mean, I would even use Richard Grenell for this job, among others. And to Finland, to Denmark, to the UK. Then I would deploy another team to the Democrats, another team to the warmongering RINOs. You need to really work every corner of this global room. And the last place I would send anybody is to Kiev, because when you arrive in Kiev, after you've done your work and laid the groundwork for this, you then tell the Ukrainians, "Sign there."

It's over. That's a fait accompli. And that's what it would take—very decisive, intelligent statecraft, the likes of which Donald Trump is not capable of, nor is anybody clinging to him in this orbit of opportunists and political grifters. That's the problem. And look at how he's handling the situation in Venezuela. Just take a good look at that. That's the level you're dealing with—people who believe it's about military force, making up stories about what the country is doing or not doing, and using that to somehow justify something that's probably going to end up being worse than Iraq, in the way people are going to look back at it.

So based on this, I don't see, in the next three years, that there's going to be any negotiated settlement led by the United States unless there's some radical change in Trump's cabinet—or Trump is removed and somebody else comes in who could actually do it. Otherwise, the risk of war is very high, because this is the paradox of the U.S. presence in Europe: the U.S. can't stay in Europe, but it can't leave either. Leaving the Europeans to their own devices is really asking for trouble, and ultimately the U.S. would be drawn back in to put out a fire started by Britain or one of the European partners—and that would be by design. So Europe and NATO, and the U.S. in NATO and Europe, only work with competent, sane leadership.

And the last two U.S. administrations, I'm sorry, don't fit that bill. Although, in a strange way—and Larry may or may not agree with me on this—with Biden, they had solidarity between the Europeans and the Americans. Now, we don't like the result of that solidarity, but there was solidarity there. Now you don't have that, and the chaos factor increases as a result. So that's the difference. Because Trump, in classic fascist—and I'm not being flippant—classic fascist fashion in politics, is about alienating your allies and not talking to your opposition, because you don't feel you have to. And this is kind of how this U.S. administration is behaving. And there are a lot of problems that are going to go with that, and we're starting to see that now with repeated failures.

## **#Danny**

Yeah. What did Vladimir Putin say before the 2024 elections were decided? When he was asked who he would choose, Harris or Trump, he said, "Well, I'd choose the Harris side because it's predictable. It's predictable, right?" So, any reaction to this? I wanted to first, you know, give some context here. I said on a different program that Trump could actually look very much the part of a powerful actor if he were to go with reality and play the "I'm going to be the one to settle this" role. Russia might even allow it, if it were on their terms. But Vladimir Putin said to the Defense Council exactly what we've been saying in terms of the actual situation. So I'm just going to play this and get your reaction to what Patrick said and what he said.

## **#Putin**

It was a major year in terms of delivering the objectives of the special military operation. The Russian army has been holding strategic initiatives along the entire frontline. Our troops have been advancing confidently and steadily. This includes the elite units that were trained in the West—they're being defeated by Russian troops. They're equipped with foreign weapons and equipment. This year, over 300 communities have already been liberated, including major cities that the enemy turned into strongholds with long-term and permanent fortifications. But they could not withstand the courage, valor, and combat prowess of our fighters.

## **#Danny**

Not sounding like capitulation is on the table here, which begs the question—your reaction to this, as well as anything Patrick Henningsen said?

## **#Larry Johnson**

No disagreement at all with Patrick's assessment. I'd put it this way: just because you put wings on a pig doesn't mean the pig is an eagle, okay? The only thing the West has done effectively throughout the course of this war, or "special military operation" in Ukraine, is on the propaganda front. They've mastered the art of lying and pretending they're winning—and in the process, persuading an enormous number of European leaders and average people, as well as people in the United States, that, by God, Ukraine is on the cusp of victory. Just one more little push, and Russia is going to collapse into a puddle. They just can't continue like this. They're losing too many men, they're running out of gas, their economy is on the verge of collapse.

I mean, good Lord. The lies go on and on without any kind of logic to them. So I recommend sort of the Muhammad Ali rope-a-dope strategy—you know, he stood back and let the other side punch themselves out until they got so tired they couldn't keep fighting. If the situation were really as the Ukrainians pretend it is, and as many in the West pretend it is, why does Ukraine need any more support? They're winning, right? Why do they need money? They've got the Russians just teetering on the edge of the cliff. They should have no problem finishing them off. But at that point—oh no, no, no, no—we need more money. Yeah, they need more money because they're getting paid. I guarantee you, that Ursula—fond of lying, or I mean von der Leyen, but I like "fond of lying."

I think it's a much more poetic image. And Kaja Kallas—probably one of the dumbest people ever to inhabit a political office. Actually, let's not pin it on women; just one of the dumbest people, period. I guarantee you they've been getting money. They've gotten rich off this war. So what's the incentive to stop it, to keep the money flowing? What we're seeing right now is the culmination of Russia recruiting and building up its ground forces over the last three, three and a half years. Now Russia has about 1.5 million troops, with roughly 700 to 800 thousand of them committed on the ground in Ukraine. And Ukraine can't match that.

The best estimates for Ukrainian forces are about 300,000. So this has the potential to end very rapidly now, despite people talking about a stalemate and saying it's going to continue into 2027 or 2028. I frankly don't see how it goes beyond next June—if it even lasts that long—because the combat losses are steady and significant for the Ukrainians. Russian casualties have fallen dramatically. The biggest period of casualties was from the summer of 2022 until the summer of 2023, but since then it's been a diminishing number. Meanwhile, Ukrainian losses are probably eight to nine times those of the Russians. And there's a big difference in population size: Ukraine right now has a population of about 19 million, while Russia's is around 140 million. It's a simple math problem from here on out.

