

Jeffrey Sachs: War on Venezuela Will End in DISASTER, WW3 Incoming

Professor Jeffrey Sachs reacts to the ongoing fallout from the U.S.'s attack on Venezuela & the kidnapping of its president, Nicholas Maduro. Prof. Sachs reveals the dark truth behind the operation and the collision course toward war it has ignited. LIKE the video and 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 Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> #venezuela #maduro #trump

#Danny

Welcome back to the program, everyone. As you can see, I have with me Professor Jeffrey Sachs. It's great to be back with you, Professor Sachs. Welcome back to the show, and Happy New Year. Wonderful to be with you. Thank you. There have been more details emerging from the Venezuela operation — the military operation that saw the kidnapping of Venezuela's President Nicolás Maduro by the U.S. military, as well as airstrikes that are now reported to have killed upwards of 80 people, including 32 Cubans who were part of President Maduro's security detail. I wanted your comments on this operation and what it says about the Trump administration and the foreign policy he is wielding.

#Jeffrey Sachs

Well, this is a brazen, illegal, and dangerous operation, and we're only at the early stages of understanding its implications. This kind of regime-change operation, which is part of the American security-state toolkit, has really become completely unleashed under Trump, especially in recent months. The United States is at war, or threatening war, all over the place right now, and what has happened is extremely dangerous. To my mind, it is, in fact, a grotesque violation of the U.S. Constitution. But I think, in general, we are in an extra-constitutional state. In other words, we are no longer a constitutional republic; we are in the hands of the military-industrial complex.

And Trump has unleashed this in Venezuela, and he's making threats to do the same all over the place right now. Of course, in the past year, the United States has also bombed many countries—recently Nigeria, as well as Yemen, Syria, and Egypt. The list is up to seven countries that the United States has recently bombed. And, of course, Trump and Netanyahu are threatening a renewed war on Iran. So what we're seeing is something that is dangerous, unconstitutional, and brazenly illegal

under international law—meaning a grotesque violation of the UN Charter—and it's unlikely to be the last of such episodes in the near future, but rather one of many potential ones. I think the United States is basically going rogue on any international standards or domestic law.

#Danny

And President Trump has continued the threats. I want to play for you what he told *The Atlantic* regarding the new Venezuelan president—now the sworn-in president—former Vice President Delcy Rodríguez. This is what he had to say to her when Delcy Rodríguez told the Venezuelan people that she was not going to bow, that Venezuela was not going to bow, to his ongoing threats.

#Speaker 1

That's right. I called him this morning a little after 9:30 a.m. He had just arrived at his golf club in West Palm Beach. I asked him to respond to what Delcy Rodríguez said yesterday in her televised address, which was not consistent with what the president had said in his press conference. His answer to me was, "If she doesn't do what's right, she's going to pay a very big price—probably bigger than Maduro."

#Danny

That's what Donald Trump had to say to the current president of Venezuela, Delcy Rodríguez—although Delcy Rodríguez says Nicolás Maduro remains the president.

#Jeffrey Sachs

We have a thug as president of the United States, threatening the lives of other world leaders—kidnapping them, threatening the worst. Threatening other leaders, like President Petro of Colombia, is thuggery. We have international law to prevent human annihilation, to prevent the tragedy of international anarchy, replacing it with international law. Trump is ripping up the UN Charter, obviously not paying an iota of attention to it. In my view, this is extraordinarily dangerous.

#Danny

Professor Sachs, what are the possible implications in the medium and long term of this operation? Because, as you know, as we're speaking, Nicolás Maduro is in New York, going to be arraigned. He's being charged under supposedly domestic law in the United States. Yet this was an operation where Trump says he's going to control and run Venezuela—his administration is going to run Venezuela from now on. And that's why there's a massive military presence still surrounding the country. What are the possible—you said this is dangerous—what are the possible implications moving forward?

#Jeffrey Sachs

Well, I think there are specific dangers in Venezuela, and then there are more general dangers of complete international lawlessness by the United States—and, by contagion, other countries as well. When it comes to Venezuela, we're in the first days of a purported regime change operation. I would estimate that there have been about a hundred such regime change attempts by the United States since the end of World War II, and most of them lead to prolonged disasters of one kind or another. We've had regime change operations—people will remember Iraq, or at least know about it. The White House was chortling about the great success and the great triumph, and we saw pictures on the street of the waving people, and so forth.

And we know that it plunged Iraq into chaos—years of chaos, violence, economic crisis, and social crisis that have not by any means come to an end. That history has been repeated dozens of times. In Libya, the United States brought down Muammar Gaddafi in the fall of 2011. Libya is in a civil war today, about 14 or 15 years later, to be precise. So we're in the first days of this American adventure—this illegal, brazen adventure. The government of Venezuela has not changed. There has been a kidnapping of the president, but the government of Venezuela is intact. Trump says the United States runs Venezuela. That remains to be seen. Trump is full of bluster and bravado and megalomaniacal sentiments, but these don't translate to reality quite as simply as the president boasts.

#Danny

Yeah, Professor Sachs, I don't know if you heard him on Air Force One. He said that before and after the operation, he consulted not with Congress, but with the oil companies.

#Donald Trump

Yes, before and after—and they want to go in, and they're going to do a great job for the people of Venezuela, and they're going to represent us well.

#Danny

And I'm curious if you have thoughts about this, because many are saying that the Donald Trump administration, especially this time around, is really pulling the mask off the U.S. empire.

#Jeffrey Sachs

Well, I don't think there's much of a mask if you take the time to look. Interestingly, of the many dozens of documented regime-change operations by the United States, the U.S. typically denies most of them. So the U.S. government lies for a living, and it's our job to understand beyond the lies. It's not so hard, because what the U.S. does is rather brazen—the U.S. government, that is. And

in the case of Venezuela, the United States has been at regime change for at least 23 years. In 2002, there was a coup attempt in which the CIA had foreknowledge and gave approval. The United States wanted it to go ahead. Hugo Chávez succeeded in keeping power despite the coup.

But the U.S. was already engaged in regime change in Venezuela in 2002. In the late 2000s—around 2007 onward—the government of Venezuela took increasing control over its vast oil reserves. And this, of course, caused a rupture with ExxonMobil, a very powerful actor in U.S. politics and a major funder of it. From that point on, there was an intensification of the U.S. government's war with Venezuela. My guess is that the U.S. made several attempts to bring down the regime through a kind of color revolution operation in 2014—much disputed—but you can look at how things work.

And then from 2017 onward, during Trump's first term, there were absolutely direct and brazen attempts to break the Venezuelan economy. In fact, U.S. sanctions between 2016 and 2020 caused oil production in Venezuela, because of the sanctions on the state company, to fall by around 75%. The GDP per capita fell by around 60%. This was a catastrophic decline. The U.S. sanctions played a huge role in that. They didn't bring down the regime, but that was the intent. So Trump had been after the oil and after regime change since the early days of his first term. In the fall of 2017, interestingly, at a dinner Trump hosted with several Latin American leaders on the margins of the UN General Assembly, he spoke openly about his idea of the U.S. invading Venezuela.

And other Latin American leaders at that dinner told him, "That's not a good idea, Mr. President." But he was already thinking about this invasion back in 2017. So this is a long-term effort. I think it's important, when people try to understand U.S. foreign policy, to see that these are projects that often take place over a 20-year period. The project to bring down the government of Venezuela is a two-decade-long project. It gained special force from the recognition by the United States, around 2007—actually by the U.S. Geological Survey—that Venezuela's oil reserves are the largest of any country in the world, larger even than Saudi Arabia's.

So this has been a long effort. If we talked about other topics—Ukraine, Syria, or Palestine and Israel—these are all long, deep-state efforts. What's distinctive about Trump is that he unleashes the most violent impulses of the U.S. security state. He has no foot on the brake, only on the accelerator. He tells us what he's doing, pretty brazenly. And it's unconstitutional and in violation of international law. But when that's raised, he'd say, "Constitution? What are you whining about? International law? That doesn't exist. We're America first." So this is very crude, very dangerous. And I think there's a lot more to come, I'm sorry to say.

#Danny

What does the Trump administration—the U.S. as a whole, as an empire—what does it want from Venezuela, from Latin America? Some are seeing this as a major shift in U.S. foreign policy. I see it

more as a reorientation. But what is it? Is it just the oil? I mean, Trump isn't exactly hiding that fact. But is there something more to why the Trump administration, the United States right now, are waging this heavy policy of aggression?

#Jeffrey Sachs

Well, I think it's unleashing aggression—deep state impulses. The U.S. has continuing hegemonic aspirations, of course. It understands better now that it faces other real superpowers: China, Russia. I think, by the way, India is one as well. The U.S. hasn't really come to grips with this reality, but it has raised anxiety. And so Trump is, yes, pulling off the mask—or pulling off the gloves—and right now using American power to bully, bluster, and attack at least the smaller and more vulnerable states. This is part of the basic deep state approach to U.S. hegemony, just crasser than we would see in other administrations. But frankly, we haven't had a peace-oriented president for a very long time. Trump says it out loud; others do it more covertly. But it's been pretty ugly for a long time.

It's getting uglier. There's a lot of anxiety in the United States to keep its supposed number one pole position—whatever that really means. But Trump is after, as he said, the complete domination of the Americas. He doesn't even hide that fact. He doesn't see these neighbors as sovereign. He doesn't see Canada as sovereign. He doesn't see Mexico as sovereign. He doesn't see Greenland as part of Denmark. He doesn't see Venezuela as sovereign. He doesn't see Panama as sovereign. He doesn't see the Americas as anything other than an extension of U.S. power. And it's not limited to the Americas. He views the Middle East the same way. And I think the ultimate aspiration of the American deep state is somehow—though it's impossible—to hold on to those global hegemonic ambitions.

#Danny

I wanted to show you, Professor Sachs, something that hasn't been talked about much, and that's the media's role—the mainstream media's role—in fueling this war on Venezuela. Semafor, which is tied to the intelligence community, is one of the deep state's mouthpieces. They released this: Semafor said that The New York Times and The Washington Post learned of a secret U.S. raid on Venezuela shortly before it was scheduled to begin Friday night, but held off publishing what they knew to avoid endangering U.S. troops, according to people familiar with the communications between the administration and the news organizations. What's your assessment of this in terms of the media's role with the deep state? It seems like they knew what was going on and decided not to publish.

#Jeffrey Sachs

I wouldn't go after this too much, because the media generally don't publish operational details in the middle of an operation—whether the operation is legal or illegal. But what I would say about The New York Times is that it didn't editorialize about this coming war, as far as I know, at all before the

attack. I was, I'd say, pleasantly a bit surprised that it ran an editorial afterward saying the attack was illegal. But beforehand, I think it ran maybe two op-eds—one in favor, one against—and nothing from the editorial board. No warnings or explanations to the public about what would be a brazen, unconstitutional, dangerous, and illegal attack. So anyway, the mainstream media—it's pathetic. No surprise here. Almost unreadable. The Washington Post is a megaphone for the CIA. The New York Times is almost useless for really trying to understand anything. But again, no surprise. This isn't anything new.

#Danny

Yes, I think in the Washington Post there were two op-eds—one in The New York Times that was against what had happened in Venezuela, and one in the Washington Post that said something to the effect of, "We should be happy that Maduro is gone. Of course, this is great for Venezuela, for the people of the world. And also, Maduro is in a lot better shape—he's going to be in a humane prison," I think they said. So this is the extent of the kind of coverage we get. But, Professor Sachs, in the last few minutes I have with you, I wanted to ask about the larger world picture now with regard to Venezuela, because Venezuela is under fire from the United States.

Trump is threatening a possible second strike if things don't go his way. There are also protests in Iran, which Donald Trump has said were "locked and loaded," should Iran go too far in supposedly suppressing them. Israel is clamoring for war with Iran, with the help of the United States. And of course, we still have the conflict in Ukraine, which is raging. The Trump administration doesn't seem too interested in reaching a settlement that Russia would actually agree to. How do you make sense of this overall global picture now that the U.S. has expanded its theater even further into Latin America—Venezuela, and now maybe Colombia, Cuba, Mexico? I mean, the list goes on and on.

#Jeffrey Sachs

Yes, I think we're heading toward an expanding war. I don't think the story in Venezuela is over yet, and Venezuela itself could become very complicated, very hot, and conflictual in the coming days. That's one immediate point. But when Trump threatens war in half a dozen countries—and especially when he meets with a war criminal, Netanyahu, and says that the United States understands and supports Netanyahu's position vis-à-vis Iran—I think, unfortunately, you can have a pretty high sense, a high likelihood, that there will be war with Iran soon. And if that happens, it will be vastly more dangerous than what's happening now in the Americas, because that's the most explosive zone in the world.

And it is an area where the great powers can easily clash, and where escalation—even to nuclear war—becomes possible. So, without making forecasts, I would say that the belligerence of Trump's words in recent days is not subtle, and it likely reflects an ongoing CIA and military preparation for

further war. Trump told us the war with Venezuela is coming. We saw it. It was pretty clear that something was going to happen. Something's happened. It's pretty clear, I think, that this is not the end of the story there, and Trump is basically telling us there's more to come.

#Danny

What will be the consequence then for the Trump administration, for the United States? What consequence will all this bring?

#Jeffrey Sachs

Well, I think this makes the world vastly more dangerous. The lawlessness, the attempt to destroy the United Nations and international law as a functioning force—part of global society and global geopolitics—is very, very dangerous. And we don't really see a cessation of that. Trump's rhetoric is the crudest we've ever had from an American president, I would guess. I can't vouch for every word that James Polk said—he was an expansionist, and we've had other imperialists—but Trump's vulgarity in this regard is absolutely brazen. His impulsivity is extremely high. The point is not Trump's impulsivity; the point for me is that the military state of the United States has always been revved for war. It's the job of a president to keep a foot on the brake. There is no foot on the brake right now, and that, to my mind, is extremely worrisome.