

Col. Larry Wilkerson: U.S. ISOLATED: NATO & Europe Reject War

A heated interview examines the resignation of a top U.S. counterterrorism official over the war with Iran, framing it as a moral and political rupture inside the America First camp. The discussion criticizes Trump's response, questions claims of an imminent Iranian threat, and argues the conflict was driven by outside pressure and false narratives. It also explores possible hidden casualties, NATO tensions, Europe's reluctance to join the offensive, and the growing collapse of support for the war at home and abroad.

#Nima

The breaking news is about Joe Kent, the director of the National Terrorism Center. He resigned in protest against the imposed war on Iran, saying, "I cannot in good conscience support the ongoing war in Iran. Iran posed no imminent threat to our nation, and it's clear that we started the war due to pressure from Israel and its powerful American lobby." We also had Donald Trump responding, talking about what happened and how he feels about Joe Kent's resignation. Here's what he said.

#Guest

Your director of national counterterrorism, Joe Kent, just resigned today. He said he can't support your conflict with Iran. What's your reaction to that?

#Speaker 03

Well, I read his statement. I always thought he was a nice guy, but I always thought he was weak on security—very weak on security. I didn't know him well, but he seemed like a pretty nice guy. But when I read his statement, I realized it's a good thing he's out, because he said Iran was not a threat. Iran was a threat. Every country realized what a threat Iran was. The question is whether or not they wanted to do something about it. And many people, many of the greatest military scholars, have been saying for years that presidents should have taken out Iran because they wanted a nuclear weapon. If we didn't do the attack—or I'll go a step further—if I didn't terminate the Iran nuclear deal, one of the worst deals ever made by Barack Hussein Obama... Remember when they sent Boeing 757s over there loaded with cash?

#Larry

Yeah. Do you have the letter in front of you? Do you have Joe Kent's letter in front of you? Yeah. Read about the third paragraph from the bottom — the one about his wife.

#Nima

Let me just find it here. Yeah, he's talking about how his wife was lost in Syria—yeah, was killed in Syria. And that's why he hates the war, why he feels this way about these endless wars in the Middle East.

#Larry

And you got to know Joe Kent before. Joe Kent was really a MAGA staple—he was a MAGA beast. And for him to do this, kind of like Charlie Kirk having his, you know, epiphany about Israel, is remarkable, because he was an attack dog for MAGA. That's why they put him in the position they did. And Trump's remarks there were just stupid—just stupid. Everybody knows that Donald Trump and Joe Kent were pretty close, but he wouldn't have made him head of the counterterrorism center if they weren't. So this turnaround, and that expression of, you know, pain caused by the loss of his wife, tells me that Joe Kent had a real epiphany himself about what this war is all about and what Syria was all about—because that's what he's really saying.

And everything Trump has done with regard to that region—and for that matter, with regard to Ukraine too, and Venezuela, and potentially Cuba, and even threatening Greenland—is Donald Trump. That's Donald Trump. In other words, he's worse than any of the worst Western Roman Empire Caesars we think we know so much about, whether it's Caligula or Nero or any of the others who were more or less at the bottom of the heap. Trump is worse. And that's what Joe Kent is saying. Charlie Kirk said it about the connection with Israel; now Joe Kent has said it about Donald Trump.

#Nima

Do you expect Tulsi Gabbard to do something?

#Larry

I was thinking about that this morning. Who's next? It's got to be Tulsi. She simply has to do something to resurrect her future. She's not a stupid woman—she's a smart woman, a good politician. She had the right understanding of the JCPOA after studying it carefully. She knew more about it than I did when I walked in to brief her. I stopped the briefing—I'd brought three experts with me, including Trita Parsi—and I said, "Ma'am, Congresswoman, we don't need to waste your time. You know more about it than we do. All we're going to do is wrap up this briefing, get out of your office, and ask you to be with us on it rather than against it." And she said, "I'll make my decision. I'm still studying." So she needs to resurrect herself. She's got a lot of potential. She's still young. But if she stays with this ship till it goes down, she's finished.

#Nima

The whole agenda, Larry, somehow is falling apart—not just because, you know, when you see Europeans not that interested in getting involved in an offensive against Iran. That shows something's going on, not just in the United States but outside the United States too. Because so far, we can't say the Europeans haven't been involved. Since day one, they've been trying to help the United States defensively, and they've tried to defend Israel. But they're not that eager to be part of this offensive effort. They see that as a red line—if we can put it that way. The whole concept, the whole rhetoric, is just falling apart. And you can see who's the establishment and who's not. For example, Mike Johnson came out today totally defending Donald Trump. And here's what he said, Larry.

#Speaker 05

Yeah. On the Gang of Eight, I got all the briefings. We all understood there was clearly an imminent threat—that Iran was very close to enriching nuclear capability, and they were building missiles at a pace no one in the region could keep up with. They were far outpacing our allies, our friends, and us in defense capability, even though we had personnel, installations, members of the armed services, and civilians in the region. Iran was building up ballistic missiles at such a rapid pace, and we knew their plan was to fire them at Americans. The commander-in-chief and his administration had a very difficult decision to make.

I don't know where Joe Kent is getting his information, but he wasn't in those briefings—clearly—because the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and everyone, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Kane, they had exquisite intelligence. So we understood this was a serious moment for us. Had the president waited, I'm personally convinced we would have had mass casualties of Americans—service members and others—and our installations would have been dramatically damaged. So we had to act. The president felt he had to strike first to prevent those mass casualties. That's the summary. I can't tell you the classified part, but that's the public version, and it's accurate.

#Larry

Let me just tell you what he didn't say. This is what Johnson would have said if he'd been honest and free with his words—maybe at the beginning, maybe in the middle, maybe at the end: "We are on God's side. We are on Jesus Christ's side. And we are going to triumph because it's time for Jesus to come back down. It's time for Armageddon. It's time for the end times." That's what Mike Johnson would have said if he didn't think it would be politically bad to say that from the Speaker's rostrum. Because that's Mike Johnson. Otherwise, it was mostly lies.

There wasn't consensus—no question in my mind now, after exploring it more fully. There wasn't consensus. And certainly, Kane—if he didn't advise against it, he gave enough information that any commander in chief with half a brain would have said, "Maybe I'm not going here," and picked up the phone and called Bibi Netanyahu and told him to cease and desist, because he wouldn't be with

him. Because Bibi would not have gone if the president had put his foot down and said that to him. Johnson's lying through his teeth. He's lying through his teeth.

#Nima

The way he's talking—his point of view—is one of the main reasons people came out and voted for Donald Trump. They thought Donald Trump would be different, but now they see he's the same. And those people, like Joe Kent and Tucker Carlson,

#Larry

They're disgusted. They're disgusted with their own people, if you will, because they got led down the primrose path by a lot of folks making arguments they were sympathetic to. Hell, I'm sympathetic with some of those arguments. I'm sympathetic with the argument that we don't need to have wars in the Middle East—stupid wars like Iraq, Syria, Libya, Afghanistan, and so forth. That's what Trump was saying, and that's what attracted them to him. Go back and look at those comments. I wish Johnson had Bibi Netanyahu up on the right screen while he was talking—where Bibi says, over and over again for 20 years, that Iran is going to have a nuclear weapon in a week or two.

Iran is going to have a nuclear weapon next year. Iran is at 90 percent enrichment. They'll have a new one—how many times did Bibi say that? And Johnson was just saying the same thing. This is all manufactured garbage meant to support a president who has completely reversed himself on his main tenet regarding national security: no more stupid wars. Did you listen to me, people? And especially no more stupid wars in the Middle East. That's what he said repeatedly. That's why they voted for him—many of them. That's why they voted. Now he's losing them. He's losing them so fast it's like rats jumping off a sinking ship. And Johnson is going to stay there until the ship goes down, because Johnson believes it's the end times. He believes God is directing this war.

#Nima

Larry, what does Donald Trump want from the Europeans and from NATO allies when he says they're not helping us? Here's Donald Trump criticizing the Europeans.

#Speaker 03

All of the NATO allies agreed with us, but they don't want to—despite the fact that we help them so much. We have thousands of soldiers in different countries all over the world, and they don't want to help us, which is amazing. I mean, amazing. I didn't do a full-court press, because I think if I did, they probably would be. But we don't need help. That war has been long prosecuted, as far as I'm concerned—almost from day one. We knocked out many of these things. We knocked out the navy essentially in a couple of days.

#Larry

They don't have a navy to speak of, so he knocked out a navy they don't even have. He knocked out an air force that was so old it couldn't fly. The only thing they have, Amy—the only thing they have—is ballistic missiles, and they have plenty of them. And, you know, Churchill—Churchill is always quoted as saying everything that's ever been said in the world—but Churchill said the only thing worse than having allies is not having them. Donald, you need to go to school. You need to go to military school. You need to learn what it means to not have allies. And he's losing them—rapidly losing them.

And he's losing them because they don't want to do stupid things like he does. And in one case, at least, the Spanish leader—he's losing them because that guy has a sense of ethics and morality. And oh, by the way, did you know two more countries joined the case against Israel in the court? Two more countries. I think before we're through with this, we're going to have anywhere from 30 to 40 countries signing on to South Africa's application to the court for prosecuting Bibi Netanyahu. And you've got more countries each time, so that if he enters that country, he gets arrested immediately.

#Nima

Do you feel that you—well, you know, I'm talking about Joe Kent. Does he know something that we don't know, in terms of the casualties or what's happened so far? Because somehow, when he's criticizing what's happened in Syria, it shows that he's concerned about American lives as well.

#Larry

Yes.

#Nima

And it's not just about that. What is the Trump administration putting out? They're saying the casualties are six or seven. But there was an interview today on Press TV with a senior Iranian intelligence official, and he said the United States suffered over 3,200 casualties recently, along with staggering equipment losses in the first week of the war. And, you know, the two sides don't line up—the two pictures don't match. So many of us are asking, is it possible that Donald Trump is hiding something?

#Larry

Well, I know he's hiding casualties. I don't know if he knows he's hiding casualties, because people are afraid to tell him the truth—especially if it's an unpleasant truth. They don't want to tell him, and the military is no exception to that. They won't tell him either. And let's just back up a minute and say, no matter where you look in America's history—even going all the way back to George

Washington and the Revolutionary War—less so there, because Washington was probably one of the most upright and ethical military commanders we've ever had. America's lied about its casualties in wars. We lied in Korea. We lied in Vietnam. We lied in World War II. We lied in World War I. Wilson was an inveterate liar. We never tell the American people the full cost of our decisions to go to war until well after the war is over.

Take the German counteroffensive in the Ardennes, where we lost 78,000 in less than four weeks. That's more casualties than General MacArthur took in the entire war in the Pacific and the Southwest Pacific theater he was in charge of. And we didn't tell anybody. We didn't tell the American people. It didn't flow back immediately. So, yeah, there's a lot going on, but I don't know if Trump is doing it himself intentionally or if he's just not very well informed. I don't know what the total count is, but no, it's well over a hundred. I don't think Iran's figures are anywhere near accurate either. There's just no way to verify it because there's such a lockdown on real information—starting with the master lockdown, Bibi Netanyahu. For example, I think the casualties in Israel are fairly large.

But he's not reporting anything. And the newspapers—even Haaretz—are saying things like, "Well, an Israeli was killed today walking across the street," or "An Israeli was wounded, but he wasn't wounded badly, she wasn't wounded badly," whatever. A schoolgirl was hit by a flying piece of shrapnel from a drone that Iron Dome had shot down. That's how they describe their casualties. But I know they have more casualties than that. For example, 25% to 30% of the ninety-plus thousand called up from the reserves went AWOL—didn't show up because they didn't want to go to Lebanon. So lies run all through this thing, and they've been there from the start. We lied about the diplomacy. We've lied about the war. We've lied about the casualties. We're lying about Iran's capacity to withstand us.

Just the president saying, "We destroyed their Navy." Okay. What Navy? What boats did you destroy? You destroyed a few little boats—yeah, a few little boats. Okay, you torpedoed one, against international law. It was in international waters, coming back from an exercise with India. You torpedoed it. Oh, that was another war crime to add to our credit. I don't know how to parse this administration with regard to truth. They do not tell the truth. They've made a living on lying, so it's extremely difficult to say what's happening. We know, for example, that the hospital in Landstuhl, Germany—because we have people there, and even the press has carried some of this—has told pregnant women to go away.

It's told civilians in general to go away. It normally serves the community there. It has a fairly substantial throughput capacity for the central part of Europe, to send casualties back to America or wherever they need to go for treatment. We know they've shut down civilian care, and we know casualties are coming into Landstuhl. But we don't know how many yet, and we don't have someone standing there counting them as they come in. But we know they're coming in. And we know, for example, that Iran very carefully—painstakingly, even—took out four or five of the most important radars in ancillary countries.

And when they took out those radars, they created casualties. These are \$200 to \$300 million radars. One of them, as I understand it, was half a billion dollars—\$500 million. They took them all out with drones and missiles and blinded us, blinded us in that capacity for that time. And as I said, there were casualties at each of those sites when they took them out. We know that the embassy in Baghdad has been hit inside the Green Zone, but we don't know the casualties. Rubio is hiding that. So, you know, how will you ever know what the real casualty count is? But we do know that significant casualties have already been taken, both civilian and military.

#Nima

Lindsey Graham says that Europe's refusal to provide the United States with assistance in the war with Iran will have consequences—broad and deep consequences—because Donald Trump is angrier than ever. Larry, let me ask you, since you didn't have time to answer the question with that clip: what do they want from Europe? What is Europe capable of that the United States cannot do in the Strait of Hormuz, for example?

#Larry

Well, I don't think the United States can do it in the Strait of Hormuz. I really don't. So what they're looking for—first of all, what the military is looking for—is the kind of help we anticipated that interoperability with NATO forces would provide. And a case in point: we don't have a real fleet of minesweepers. We have some ships that have been called minesweepers because they were in the LCS class—you know, the one Lockheed sent off the ways one day, the first one they built that broke in half. So this is a really lousy class of ships, if you will, in most sailors' eyes. But we converted them. We didn't want to fess up that we'd spent hundreds of millions of dollars on ships that didn't work and had no utility, so we converted them into minesweepers in some cases.

Now, it's a real problem. Some of them have a metallic hull rather than a laminated plastic hull, so they're not very good as minesweepers. They detect mines—they attract mines if they have metal hulls. All to say that we depend on other countries in NATO who do have minesweepers, who practice it all the time and are very good at it. That was supposed to be part of the alliance: if we went to war under Article 5, they would provide the minesweeping. Same with other specialty areas. That's what we're looking for—we're looking for those specialty areas that NATO countries have in excess of what we have, especially minesweeping, to come to the Gulf and help us. And they don't want to do that. And I don't blame them one bit, the way Trump has treated Europe up to this point.

If I were a European leader, I'd look back at Trump and say, "You son of a bitch, would you like me to play the tape you had of your vice president over here at the Munich Security Conference? Would you like me to play the tape of Marco Rubio talking about it? Would you like me to play a tape of you talking about us?" Because you're the person who started this split. Now, it was over Ukraine principally, but there are other issues too. Trump made some egregious statements about what

NATO had to offer to America's defense, and they didn't forget them. And they've got some real reasons for not really being cooperative. You've got the Spanish leader who's doing it, I think, for moral and ethical purposes—and I applaud him. He has moral courage. But you've got other leaders doing it because they've got their own problems.

They have significant problems. Look at what they just did in the EU. They passed a law around the time the special military operation started—almost five years ago—saying they would never again buy Arctic LNG from Russia. It was really a sweet deal they had with Russia. It goes in European bottoms down to Bremerhaven or Le Havre or one of the other ports, and they handle everything in their own ships. All Russia does is top them off. Russia gets the money, everything's copacetic, and the Europeans have LNG out the yin-yang. What did they just do?

They just bought all of Russia's Arctic LNG, and it's going to be shipped down to Europe now. And what did they say when someone in the press asked—I was watching it, I forget which leader it was—"Why did you do that? You said you weren't going to do that anymore. You're punishing Russia." Well, it doesn't start until January 27. Do we think they're going to stop on January 27? Hell no, they're not, because they've got to have that LNG. We're not going to supplement that LNG enough for them to get off Russia. And they're going to have to open the pipelines back up to Nima eventually. So Russia's not happy with the way the United States is waging this conflict in Iran.

Not happy at all. Okay, so you've got to deal with Russia. You've got to deal with them in the future, or you're going to be, pardon my French, shit out of luck when it comes to your economies. You're already staggering from what we did to Nord Stream. What we did to Nord Stream—you're already being punished for that. Europe's got to figure itself out. It's got to sort itself out. And one of the things it has to do is realize it can't trust Donald Trump any more than Putin can, any more than anyone in Iran can, any more than anyone in the world can. That's the reality of the United States of America today. No one can trust us.