

Iran WINS as Trump SURRENDERS, Tel Aviv Under Heavy Fire | Larry Wilkerson & Dave DeCamp

Col. Lawrence Wilkerson and Anti-war.com's Dave DeCamp react to the breaking news that Trump just announced a two-week ceasefire on terms favorable to Iran, waving the white flag and halting offensive operations. Did Iran just land a decisive victory? We discuss this and MUCH more! 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> #iran #trump #israel 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/spiritho> #iran #trump #ceasefire

#Danny

Welcome, everyone. Welcome back to the show. It's your host, Danny Haiphong. Everyone, hit the like button as you come on. I have with me, joining for the first time, the editor of Antiwar.com, Dave DeCamp, and Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, returning guest, friend of the show, former chief of staff, and retired Army colonel. Gentlemen, thanks so much for joining me today. Thanks for having me, Danny. Of course. Well, let's get started with the news—the breaking news—which is that it appears Donald Trump has backed down, has essentially surrendered in a huge way with this two-week ceasefire that was announced, backing off the major, civilization-ending strikes he said he was going to launch against Iran at 8 p.m.

April 7th. He ended up not doing that. Now we have this two-week ceasefire. I'm just going to pull up what Trump said and get your thoughts on it, Colonel Wilkerson—about what exactly has happened here. Here are Trump's initial remarks: he said, "A big day for world peace. Iran wants it to happen. They've had enough. Likewise, so has everyone else. The U.S. will be helping traffic build up in the Strait of Hormuz. There'll be lots of positive action, big money. We can go on and on and on." And then Iran said something completely different.

The United States has been forced to accept Iran's 10-point proposal, which includes a fundamental commitment to non-aggression, continued Iranian control over the Strait of Hormuz, acceptance of uranium enrichment, lifting of all primary and secondary sanctions, compensation to Iran, and many other things. Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, help us understand what exactly happened here. We're already hearing about violations from the Israeli side, particularly in Lebanon, and strikes on Iran's

oil. And Iran apparently has already closed the Strait of Hormuz again because of these violations. So what exactly happened? Why are we in this moment now?

#Larry Wilkerson

I see two possible outcomes—reasons, causes, whatever you want to call them. One is the standard one. I go back to Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi, who said, not once but twice, that the United States, in the middle of diplomatic negotiations, attacked us along with Israel. That's one possibility—that we're setting all this up to resume the war with even greater ferocity, if that's possible. The other possibility is that Trump somehow realized he'd walked himself into a cul-de-sac and is searching desperately—his TV program comes to mind—for someone to fire, perhaps, and for some way to get himself out. And so he's opted for this. Now, that one is reinforced, I think, as is the first one, though.

Let's go back to the first one for just a second. Some of Israel's senior leaders have called this, quote, the political disaster of Israel's history, unquote. So that would be aimed at helping him with the subterfuge. But to the second possibility, the big impediment to this is going to be Israel, ultimately. And let's look at what the ten points said. The ten points say, "We won." They say, "We won." Go back to the Pakistan–China statement, which Ambassador Freeman gave a great webinar on the other day, and they were not quite so favorable toward Iran in their five points. But nonetheless, these points are all, with respect to Iran, either neutral or in their favor—the latter overwhelmingly so.

And yet he said he wants to use them as a template for negotiations, for diplomacy. If that's a sincere move, we're talking about things like all sanctions being removed—including secondary sanctions—reparations being paid, and other measures that clearly mark Iran not just as the titular winner of this latest conflict, but the overall winner. So I have no idea where we're going from here. My money, my crassness, my senility, and my suspicion of Donald Trump would lead me to believe that it's another, as Foreign Minister Araghchi declared, attempt to lull Iran into a moment of diplomacy only to bash them again. But I think we've come to the end of that rope.

And I think there's no way for Trump to extricate himself from this cul-de-sac, which he almost single-handedly—if you've been paying attention to how he got to this decision—created for himself with the help of his biblical mate, Bibi Netanyahu. He'll be the spoilsport either way, probably. But I don't know which one's going to happen, or what version or modification of the two will happen. I think we're at a moment of change here that I wasn't expecting this quickly. I was expecting him to declare victory and leave, and let Netanyahu swing in the wind—particularly in Lebanon, where he's swinging in a very violent wind.

#Danny

Yeah.

#Larry Wilkerson

But he hasn't quite done that, so I've got to stay tuned.

#Danny

Yeah. Yeah, well, Dave, your own assessment: Iran has just announced that the Strait of Hormuz is closed until Israel stops its strikes on Lebanon. And of course, there have been strikes on Iran as well during this period. So what's your reaction to what's happened here, and why we find ourselves in this situation?

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, well, it was also unexpected for me to see Trump come out and announce a ceasefire deal based on Iran's ten points. And we're already seeing—just before we got on, I saw there was another Truth Social post from Trump. He got angry last night that CNN published the statement from Iran's Supreme Security Council that was essentially declaring victory over the U.S. He claimed it was a fake statement. Then this morning he's saying, "Oh, there are all these different points and letters that people are publishing, but this is not what we agreed to." And now U.S. officials are putting that out into the media. So if Trump is serious about ending this and is actually willing to base it on those points, then I think there's a chance of a deal.

But unfortunately, I find it very hard to believe. And as some of those points say—like lifting all the sanctions—I mean, as I understand it, during the negotiations before the war, which I believe was just a ruse to buy time for the buildup, apparently even then the U.S. wasn't offering sanctions relief. So, you know, that's one point. And obviously, there are a few other points. We're not really seeing an effort to rein in Israel, which is going to be required if they really want peace. I mean, according to Pakistan's prime minister, the ceasefire was supposed to include Lebanon—he said that in his announcement. And then what did Israel do? They launched a new operation in Lebanon that they're calling Operation Eternal Darkness.

And they've launched over a hundred airstrikes in a matter of ten minutes, killing hundreds of people. I mean—and Trump is telling the media today that, oh, it doesn't include a ceasefire in Lebanon, that's a separate conflict. But as you mentioned with the Strait of Hormuz, every signal from Iran is that they're going to insist on this point with Lebanon today. And I just don't see Trump really doing what it would take to get Israel to agree—to really threaten the military aid and things like that. So I agree with Colonel Wilkerson, his point that I also really have no idea where this is going to go, how this is going to go. But these are certainly bad signs right off the bat. And now there's reporting that there are going to be some kind of talks in Pakistan either tomorrow or Friday. So we'll see if that happens.

#Danny

Yeah, well, Iran has said that those talks are conditional. Throughout this whole thing, Colonel Wilkerson, it appears that Iran is setting the terms, and it's really the United States and, of course, Israel that have to either follow those terms or face consequences. Israel has already rejected this ceasefire, and they have, as Dave said, gone crazy—absolutely, uh, genocidal on Lebanon. But it appears that Iran is not in the position many are fearing, which is this ceasefire being kind of a naive move to essentially get a pause to try to strike a deal. It appears that Iran is very much wanting and ready to retaliate against violations of it. But what do you think of this, in terms of where this really is?

#Larry Wilkerson

I think Iran has won, for all intents and purposes. And Iran could win, even if this is totally obviated—even if the diplomacy is interrupted again by strikes—and still win. I go back to that headline in **Haaretz**, which I think was very, very accurate: all Iran has to do to win is not lose. All America has to do to win—and Israel too, now—is achieve a spectacular victory. And this operation in Lebanon is another demonstration of Netanyahu. And I'm not going to say the IDF's, because they're carrying it out basically because he told them to. I don't think there's much heart in doing this in the IDF, other than the bloodthirsty nature they always display these days.

What they're being given in Lebanon is their butt on a silver platter by a Hezbollah that was supposed to be roundly defeated. This is worse than July and the surrounding time in 2006, when they got their rear end handed to them too. It's even worse than 1982, when we ordered them out—when Sharon was the minister of defense—and they really ransacked a couple of camps and killed a whole bunch of people they didn't need to kill. This is worse. So I don't think Netanyahu's hold on power is sacrosanct at all now, and I don't think it's going to last much longer. It's in question how he's going to be outed, turned out, or whatever.

But I think he's walking on very perilous ground right now. And perhaps even the U.S. intelligence community—what's left of those who tell the truth and are honest and looking for some policy guidance that might work—might have let the president know that Bibi is in trouble with his own people. And it's double-pronged trouble. You've got Naftali Bennett and others excoriating him for not finishing the job in Gaza. You still have all these Hamas fighters underground, armed and ready to go, and he hasn't eliminated them because his IDF has told him, "We're not going into those tunnels. We are not going into those tunnels."

"If you will lead, Mr. Prime Minister, we'll go in, and we'll be 100 meters behind you." So he's got real problems. Maybe that's a product of, or part of, this new willingness of Trump to look at things. Plus, he's been exposed completely. Even in the New York Times and other sycophantic press in this country, he's been exposed—I think accurately, or fundamentally accurately—as to how he made the decision to go into Iran, and who gave him the principal advice, who gave him the deal-breaking advice over his own counselors: Bibi Netanyahu. How many times has Bibi done that in the past,

whether it's Iraq, Syria, Libya, or now Iran? So I think that's getting to be a really dicey business in Israel right now.

I'll stick to my prediction that there won't be a Jewish state in the Levant past about 2030—if it even makes it that far. There may be a state there, but it'll have to be democratic, truly democratic, and it'll have to welcome everyone. That's a changing ingredient in all this that I think even Miriam Adelson's and others' billions of dollars aren't going to change. And then, looking at the other side of it, let's talk about the technicalities of some of this too. I had to deal with OFAC, and I had to deal with their sanctions team, and with the offices that monitor sanctions compliance—how sanctions are applied through the banking system or by other means.

Once I had an individual I had great faith in because he'd been part of working groups I'd also been in, and I saw how competent he was. He said, "Do you know how long it would take us to unwind sanctions on just one country? Pick Iran." Weeks, months, even years—because of the entanglement you get into, the intricacies, and so forth. So even if we said we were going to lift sanctions, even if the Europeans said they were going to lift sanctions, even if we lifted secondary sanctions, it'd probably be a year or two before we could really make a difference for the Iranians. That's what worried me in many respects about the JCPOA—one or two aspects of it—because when you say you're going to lift sanctions, you're saying it, and a year later, maybe you still haven't done it.

So this is all full of technicalities that are problems, too. But I come back to the same thing we were talking about earlier. I just don't trust this president, and I don't trust this sort of ten points—nine of which lead to Iran's success, spectacular success—as being a sheet of paper from which anything is going to come out that will, in fact, stop this war and discontinue our relationship with Israel, which is poisonous as hell right now and ruining everything we stand for in the world, if not already ruined. So I can't see how we get out of it with these points as the orchestration, if you will, of getting out of it and having anything to say that looks like something Donald Trump would accept. So where are we headed, and how are we headed there?

#Danny

Yeah, well, Dave, we're already getting reports of immediate, very direct violations—even from Iranian media—saying that the United States has begun violating the ceasefire, attacking Tehran. We're hearing that air defenses are already active in Iran for Israeli attacks. That leads to the question, Dave, that I'd like your opinion on: why go through these kinds of motions for the United States and Iran? Because you mentioned all the confusion about what Donald Trump was posting during the Trump administration, from the White House.

Well, they did post this—the official statement from Iran, from Abbas Araqchi. In this statement, Dave, what really struck me was that it sounded like they weren't even negotiating with the United

States at all. It was almost as if Iran was doing a favor to Pakistan and the mediators, and to those urging for a little bit of relief and breathing room. But why do you think this is going on? Is it all just smoke and mirrors, or is there something really significant happening here?

#Dave DeCamp

Well, I think there are a few factors here. One thing we've seen over the past few weeks is the Trump administration, and particularly the president himself, really scrambling to deal with the economic fallout from this—putting out fake information to try to juke the markets and bring the price of oil down. So I think that could be part of it. And as you mentioned, that statement from the Iranian foreign minister—it does look like the U.S. kind of concocted these negotiations, got Pakistan to play the mediator, and then declared that they'd accepted this agreement.

A 10-point proposal as a basis. And, of course, they're walking all sorts of things back. So I think the reason for this kind of display was so Trump could try to wind this thing down and also save face, rather than make it clear he was capitulating here. Though, as you mentioned, it doesn't look like there's a real ceasefire. I mean, even overnight there are reports of attacks across the Gulf states. I saw the IRGC release a statement about launching attacks overnight against U.S. and Israeli interests in those countries.

So is it all, you know, from Iran's perspective—if they see Trump saying he wants to negotiate off that 10-point proposal, if they think there's a possibility of that—then I'd assume they're going to try it. But they're also making it clear that they're not, despite what Hegseth said this morning at his press briefing. You know, he's saying they're begging for a ceasefire, claiming they can't make drones and missiles anymore, even though they're still firing them across the region. So I'm not really surprised that Iran is trying this, or trying to see what happens here. But when it comes to the U.S., I mean, it's hard to know.

You know, this is kind of just what I suspect—that this was all created to try to calm the markets, so Trump didn't have to look like he was essentially surrendering. I mean, I think the one benefit, the one positive thing here so far, is that Trump—he was threatening to destroy the entire country of Iran and its civilization in a night. So at least we didn't see those major power plants he was threatening, you know, to try to sink the country into darkness. But I'm worried that if this completely falls apart and the attacks continue, we might see that, because the U.S. and Israel are showing that the only thing they can do is just bomb the crap out of them.

We're seeing that in Lebanon. One thing I was thinking—you know, Israel has this pattern where, before a ceasefire, they really ramp up the bombing. So I thought maybe that's what we were seeing in Lebanon. But again, all signs point to the U.S. not actually putting any pressure on Israel for a ceasefire there. Yeah, I mean, I just see this as, you know, again, that press briefing from Hegseth. And Colonel Wilkerson mentioned that article from The New York Times that revealed the briefing Netanyahu gave, where he guaranteed that regime change would happen.

They said Iran wouldn't be able to close the Strait of Hormuz, that their missiles and drones would be destroyed in a few weeks—and none of that happened. What's interesting about that report is that it's probably a controlled leak from people within the administration, because it puts almost all of Trump's senior advisors, including Marco Rubio and John Ratcliffe, on the record saying, "I don't know about what Netanyahu was telling you; not sure that's really going to work." Except for one guy—there was one guy the report said was all in, and that was Pete Hegseth. So I think there's a chance that if this turns into what Trump recognizes as the disaster that it is, they might be getting ready to have a fall guy, and that could be Pete Hegseth.

#Fox News 1

Yeah.

#Danny

Yeah, I think that's a really good point. And Colonel Wilkerson, I just want to play out exactly the scenario that Dave was laying out there—that Iran is still firing. I mean, Israel is essentially not part of this ceasefire at all, not only because it's violating the ceasefire terms with Lebanon on that front, but also because Israel has given no reason for Iran to be included in the ceasefire. So here's Fox News after this.

#Larry Wilkerson

Danny, let me just say one thing—from a military viewpoint here. Yeah, sure. Having witnessed many ceasefires, having been part of forces in a ceasefire, having seen it throughout history, having seen Bibi Netanyahu—who I don't think understands what the word "ceasefire" means—look anywhere: Lebanon, Gaza, the West Bank, whatever. Ceasefires are really hard to implement. When you have a country the size of Western Europe, like Iran is, and you have the IRGC spread everywhere, and every Iranian—and I have this on really good authority—every Iranian was out in the street shooting, or out in the desert shooting at those C-130Js and those Black Hawks and everything else, with everything they could muster.

So you've got the entire Iranian people aroused now—with the AK they have in their closet, the shotgun they have in their front room. You're going to have a hell of a time starting a ceasefire. It's going to take at least 96 hours, or longer, for the word to get out, especially since we've blown up all of Iran's communications and other things. So it's going to take a while before it can have the kind of impact a ceasefire should. And then again, as was just talked about—who the hell is going to honor the ceasefire? Is everyone going to honor it? And is it really going to be honored at the top, except in the rare exception, if you will? Ceasefires are difficult, especially with people like Bibi Netanyahu and others who don't know what the word means.

#Danny

Yeah, and it appears Iran is very aware of this. Here are a few reports. So Iran, even as we speak, is still striking Israel and also the Gulf region, because there are reports of a U.S.-Israeli attack coming out of the UAE on an oil refinery in Iran. But here are a couple of reports—just a minute or so for each of them.

#Fox News 1

Well, Jesse, as anticipated, the sirens are now wailing over Tel Aviv, indicating that another missile is inbound. It looks like those bright lights in the sky are the missiles, and you can see an interceptor in hot pursuit. It's always quite dramatic when you see those interceptors going after them. These ones might disappear behind our building here—we're going to lose sight of them—but they're still quite lethal and coming into Tel Aviv. I didn't see an interception in this case.

#Danny

So there's that scenario. Really, Fox News has been the only one reporting on these things in many cases, because they're the ones panicking the most about it. But here's the report on the Gulf.

#Fox News 2

Well, Dana, the President's announcements have been addressing the ceasefire between Iran and the United States, and, in general, peace here in the Middle East. But we can report today there is not peace here. In fact, the country we're in—the UAE—says it's been taking incoming fire from Iran, writing: "The UAE's air defenses are currently engaging with missile and drone attacks originating from Iran. The Ministry of Defense confirms that the sounds heard in various parts of the country are the result of the UAE air defense systems intercepting ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and drones." Also, Kuwait is reporting that Kuwaiti air defenses have been dealing, since 8 a.m. today and up to now, with an intense wave of hostile Iranian attacks, where 28 drones were intercepted that targeted the state of Kuwait. So, uh, you know, there's the report—and we have Dave, definitely, and then Carl works—and you can react to this. You know, we have...

#Danny

Now, footage of direct impact—especially on the UAE—because, as I said, there was an oil refinery hit in Iran, the Lavan Island oil refinery. And here's the UAE today, just after this, targeting an oil refinery there. So, Dave, how about you step in? Ceasefires are hard to implement, as Colonel Wilkerson said. In many cases, it seems like we're just in another phase of this war.

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, and, you know, I saw something—this was just something I saw on X. I don't know if it's confirmed at all, but the U.S. and Israel denied that they bombed that oil facility in Iran. There was some report that it could have been the UAE—a UAE fighter jet or something—that bombed it, which, again, I don't know if that's confirmed. But there have been indications that the UAE, the Emiratis, and the Saudis want this war to continue. And I could also see Trump being like, "Well, why don't you guys do it? You guys start getting some hits in." Um, and then, you know, with this administration—I mean, it's so clownish, and they just brazenly lie so much—that I can see them saying, "Oh no, the ceasefire is fine."

Even though both sides are firing missiles and bombing each other, I wouldn't put it past them to try to portray this as a great success. That's something we saw with Trump and the ceasefire in Gaza. The media pretty much ignored the so-called ceasefire in Lebanon, so he was never really asked about it. But for more than a year, Israel was attacking Lebanon without facing a single attack from Hezbollah. And, you know, this is another reason why all of this is so difficult—how is Iran supposed to really believe anything they say, especially after being bombed during negotiations and seeing how these ceasefires have gone down?

An important detail is that both the ceasefire in Lebanon and the one in Gaza—I mean, I shouldn't even call them ceasefires, they were de-escalation deals—the U.S. is supposedly monitoring them, kind of overseeing them. And of course, because the U.S. is totally on one side, it doesn't do anything when Israel constantly violates them. So there's just no trust. You know, the way they've carried themselves diplomatically—it's just, you know, there's going to need to be goodwill and trust for a real deal to happen here. And it's hard to imagine the U.S. and Iran actually coming to terms like that.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah. Carl Wilkerson stepped in here. I mean, they don't trust the U.S. one bit in this scenario. So then why do it?

#Larry Wilkerson

Yeah. If I were them, I wouldn't trust us either. And Dave is absolutely right. We tracked it—I mean, we tracked the days of the ceasefire in both Lebanon and Gaza. There wasn't a single day that Israel didn't kill somebody. And then they always came up with some kind of excuse: "They crossed the yellow line," or "Oh, they got close," you know, whatever. But there wasn't a single day. I got to asking myself, what in Hebrew is "ceasefire"? Does Netanyahu not understand what it means? No, he doesn't understand what it means. He doesn't want to understand what it means. So you have that too, and it's an issue. It's a big issue, in my view. And in Lebanon, it's a particularly big issue

because they've killed people every single day of the "ceasefire." It's just an additional ingredient in what may be to come, and how Israel has the capacity to screw up whatever comes next. I don't put it past Trump, though, to be complicit in that.

#Dave DeCamp

I was just going to say, I think one big difference here with Iran—and I think one of Israel's big goals, both during the last war and this one—was to get Iran to the point where they could bomb them at will, without having to worry about getting hit by their missiles. You know, to turn them into a situation like Lebanon, where they didn't have to worry about air defenses, they could just fly over and bomb them. But they haven't gotten anything close to that. So, you know, we might see different behavior from them when it comes to this one.

#Larry Wilkerson

A group of us got the chart the other day, and I think it's reliable too—on the missiles. Everything from David's Sling to Goliath's whatever, the Iron Dome components, to things we were supplying like THAAD, Patriot 1, 2, and 3, and all the different types of air defense missiles. And we saw two days, four days, seven days, nine days, twelve days—that's the remaining stocks. So one reason you're not seeing as many Israeli missiles go up is because they don't have them. And the ones they do have, they're husbanding, because they want to shoot them at the Karam Shahs and others that are coming in and really do extensive damage.

So that's another element in this too—that Iran is actually, I think, if you want to say "winning," whatever the hell that means in a war like this—winning the battle with Israel, even though it's using primarily, if not exclusively, drones and ballistic missiles and other missiles in between. The Karam Shahs and the really fast missiles are doing the most damage, because there's really no defense against them. That's a powerful statement for Americans to be hearing, in particular, because that's what the Golden Dome is supposed to do for you. Think about the huge territory of the United States—a trillion dollars to build this thing—and it'll be about as effective as Israel's Iron Dome is now under relentless strikes. It will not work, in other words. I hope we're taking that lesson from this. I doubt it, but I hope we are.

#Danny

Yeah, I mean, the news now, Dave, is that at least 154—or I think it was 254. Let me get those numbers straight. Two hundred fifty-four people in Lebanon have been killed. Killed? Yeah, killed now. That's the latest. I mean, it keeps updating every minute, it seems like. And this feels like we heard all the panic from Mark Levin and Israeli officials saying they were informed late about this ceasefire. Obviously, it wasn't their idea to even go in this direction, rhetorically or otherwise. So

now it seems like they're lashing out. Iran has just said, Dave, that they're going to deliver an even heavier blow to Israel if they don't stop. And Trump must choose between a ceasefire or war with Iran via Israel. Your reactions?

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, I mean, it seems like this issue is going to be forced. Like I said before, I could see them trying to claim that everything's going great. But with this—hundreds of people—I mean, Lebanon is such a small country. What's the population, like five million? Yeah. Killing that many people in a single day is just horrific.

#Larry Wilkerson

And they're mostly civilians too. They're not Hezbollah fighters.

#Danny

They have a hard time killing Hezbollah fighters, yeah.

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, it's the only way they know how to do things now—just kill a lot of civilians from the sky. So, yeah, I mean, I think... so far, you know, I haven't seen any indication from Trump that he's going to put pressure on Israel to stop in Lebanon. So if that doesn't happen, then the ceasefire's off, and there never really was a ceasefire. But... we'll see. I mean, I'm sure Trump might be deliberating things. He might be authoring a new Truth Social post about this. Maybe he'll wait for the markets to close, though. Yeah.

#Danny

Yeah, Colonel Wilkerson, jump in. I mean, the one thing I hope people notice is that while Iran is engaging in this ceasefire arrangement—whatever we want to call it right now—they seem very determined to continue the war if they have to, if these terms aren't moved on in good faith. So, your thoughts on this? Me, or...?

#Larry Wilkerson

Yeah, to you, Colonel. I got confused. I was just looking over these ten points again. The whole idea of the five-point plan from China and Pakistan, which Ambassador Freeman elaborated on quite extensively—no one was listening much—and now this one. If you read them down and look at them, they all make sense. They make sense not just from an Iranian perspective, which of course was Iran's intent, but also from the law of land warfare, the law of warfare in general, international

law—the Nuremberg Tribunal, the Geneva Convention. They make sense from the perspective of things that the United States of America, however imperfectly, used to be the upholder of and the main enforcer of, always backsliding a bit here and a bit there.

But nonetheless, it was a momentous post–World War II move—essentially to stop World War II and World War I, which were really the same war in different theaters and over a different time span—from ever happening again. In other words, to stop what we did that killed 100 million people in the Second War, and maybe, all told, including influenza and other things introduced by the war, about half that number in the First World War—to never have it happen again. That was the purpose of the United Nations. That was the purpose Dwight Eisenhower put his full military weight, and later his presidential weight, behind.

That's the reason Dwight Eisenhower gave a speech—not at the end of his eight years, but at the very beginning—essentially saying, and this is almost a direct quote if I can get my mind to work: this is no way of life at all, not in any true sense. It is humanity hanging from a cross of iron. And he was talking about what he foresaw happening if we didn't maintain the institutions, the policies, the relationships that were created out of this incredible angst over what had happened to the world in two world wars. "Let's stop it," they said. And they had nuclear weapons to help stop it, if you think that's a helpmate.

But they nonetheless put in place all manner of checks and balances—no go here, no go there. They came close in Cuba, even closer in Berlin in that hot summer of 1961, a far more serious crisis than Cuba because Berlin was strategic for the Russians. The GDR was disappearing; it was strategic for them—very serious. Cuba was just a gambit, and they were willing to back off from that. That's not the way history has recorded it, because Cuba was thirteen days of drama. Berlin was a long, hot summer of terror, especially for the people living in Germany. Ask any of them who are still alive. So we did all that—and look at what we've done since 9/11. We have destroyed all of it.

We are the leading power in the world, and for a president to stand up and say he's going to commit war crime after war crime after war crime—to decimate another country of 92, 93 million people, a country with a history that just befuddled Donald Trump—is astonishing. "Bomb them back to the Stone Age," he said. And back comes the Speaker of the Majlis, I think it was, saying, "Okay, here's a map of us in the Stone Age. We encompassed the Mediterranean Basin. You know, bomb us back to the Stone Age. Thank you very much." I mean, this is absurdity, Danny. And yet we're witnessing it. And we're witnessing it from Thomas Jefferson's, George Washington's, and James Madison's republic.

#Danny

Yeah, well, Dave, even in the talks about this ceasefire, it gets more and more ridiculous—almost insulting—from Donald Trump. He goes on Truth Social and says all these things, completely contradicting himself. Generally, when a deal is made, both sides try their best not to contradict

each other. But every time Donald Trump engages the United States in talks, in a so-called deal or agreement, it always ends up contradicting the other side. Here he's talking about how there's been a "productive regime change" in Iran.

There will be no uranium enrichment. They're going to send B-2 bombers to remove all the nuclear dust, quote-unquote. And there will be special surveillance. Basically, the United States is in control here—that's the messaging, of course. It's a lot of words and bluster, but it completely contradicts everything Iran has said. And this is where we stand in these two weeks. Even the phrase "two weeks" seems to be a kind of fixation for Donald Trump and the administration.

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, that was his initial deadline, I think. But yeah, I mean, it's just more signs that this thing is likely to fall apart, if it hasn't already. And I wouldn't be surprised if later today we hear something like, "Oh, if Iran doesn't get its act together, then power plant and bridge day is back on—I'm going to obliterate the country," or whatever. You know, unless he got enough pushback, because there was a lot of it, especially after his threat yesterday when he said an entire civilization would die tonight. I mean, I don't know if it gets more barbaric than that.

#Larry Wilkerson

Couldn't have a better declaration of genocide, could you?

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah. Maybe the one thing he said the day earlier—that the entire country, I forget exactly how he put it, but, you know, it could be wiped out in a night. But yeah, I mean, how are you not supposed to take that as a nuclear threat, as a genocidal threat? And to your point about post-World War II international law, the Geneva Convention—one of the favorite lines of the Zionists, of the super pro-Israel people defending the destruction of Gaza—is, "Oh, you guys did it during World War II. You dropped nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Look at Dresden." They're pointing to these things to justify what they've done.

And it was really interesting that Joe Biden, when he was still president—I don't know if he really meant to say this publicly—but he said Benjamin Netanyahu told him the same thing. In one of their talks, during the full-scale genocide in Gaza, when they were taking out those huge apartment buildings full of women and children, apparently Netanyahu said to Biden, "Well, you guys did it in World War Two." And apparently that was a real conversation that happened between the prime minister of Israel and the president of the U.S. And we've seen a lot of people like Mark Levin.

I know Tucker Carlson had a show about this—how Mark Levin was essentially hinting, like, "Oh, you know, see what happened in Japan after we dropped the nuclear bombs," kind of suggesting that

maybe we should do that in Iran. And of course, Israel has nuclear weapons, something that's never talked about. So these threats are real. When he's saying we could destroy the country or take out all the power plants or whatever—I mean, if this goes sideways, which it already seems to have, I think we might see more of those threats and potential escalations.

#Danny

Yeah, and Colonel Wilkerson, Abbas Araghchi has just laid it out very clearly—that these ceasefire terms are not ambiguous, that the world sees the massacre in Lebanon, the ball's in the U.S. court. And he directly cites this tweet, which had some controversy around it because it appeared there was a draft that seemed to have been handed to him by the prime minister of Pakistan. But in it—this is what Abbas Araghchi is sharing—it says that the United States and Iran have agreed and announced a ceasefire, along with allies, to include everywhere a ceasefire, such as Lebanon. So this directly includes Lebanon, effective immediately. So it's right there. I mean, those were the announced terms, at least what we know of what has been announced. And it seems like Donald Trump might have been lying again. Colonel Wilkerson, your thoughts?

#Larry Wilkerson

Well, I've always said that the real sore point in all of this—the leverage point, if you will—is Bibi Netanyahu. And I think the ultimate leverage he holds is his own nuclear stockpile. Frankly, I have no doubt in my mind that he would use that stockpile if he felt that he personally, and the state of Israel as a whole, were in existential danger. I have no doubt he would initiate a nuclear exchange. And I say "exchange" because, as you know, and I think Ted Postol is right about this, the Iranians may well have something to send back in kind.

I have no doubt, based on my work with the A.Q. Khan network in the early 2000s, the breakup of that network, and what we learned about the people involved—particularly the North Koreans and the Iranians—that what the North Koreans taught them wasn't so much nuclear lessons as underground lessons: how to work underground, how to even test a weapon underground without anyone detecting it. We proved that was possible. We didn't detect their first test, and the only reason we detected the second was because Geneva's seismic center let us know there had been a seismic event in a certain area. We then surrounded that area with air and other atmospheric testing mechanisms, and that's how we detected the second test.

So, all that is to say that Iran could be a nuclear power right now, or very close to it—all done underground in a very sophisticated laboratory they built down there. And that's still very much in operation, working full time. Will they take that enriched uranium, match it to a warhead, and put it on a Khoramshahr or whatever, and launch it if they have to? I'm quite confident they will if Bibi fires one or two. And I've said, as a military professional, he'd be insane to shoot just one or two. In

a country the size of Iran, with the target array it presents in terms of underground facilities, you'd probably have to send 35 or 40 of the low-kiloton weapons the Israelis have to do the kind of damage you'd be aiming for militarily.

So we're still confronted with that. And we're still confronted with this insane man, I think—that's a fair characterization—now in charge of Israel, and in charge of people who don't know what a ceasefire is, who kill civilians ruthlessly. And, by the way, kill them 70, 80, 90 years after we said this wouldn't happen again, that we would not allow it to happen again, that we were going to build institutions and international laws to keep it from happening again, and that we would be the main enforcer. And ditto, ditto, ditto, ditto. And now we've destroyed all that. We have in our possession—and so do the Russians, the Chinese, and six other nuclear-weapon states—the means to destroy ourselves. And we've taken all the treaties down. Americans, wake up.

#Dave DeCamp

Well, I don't know if you guys have heard, but there's a new international body that's supposed to bring peace to the world, called the Board of Peace.

#Danny

Oh, that's been completely forgotten, actually.

#Larry Wilkerson

With the arch-criminal Tony Blair in charge. Yeah, right.

#Dave DeCamp

That was less than two weeks before he started this war. Trump held his first Board of Peace summit, and he actually threatened to attack Iran during his speech. That was one of the most bizarre things I've ever watched, because he had all these leaders there, like, "Oh, there are diplomats from India and Pakistan—stand up! You guys had a war, now it's all solved, I solved it!" Making people clap for them. It was just so strange. And yeah, it's like, you know, we're living through such insanity. Yeah.

And Trump, you know, that's one thing I thought after the attack on Venezuela and the abduction of Maduro—that was kind of a turning point. After that, Trump's base pretty much lined up to support it. There were a few outliers, but a lot of people said, "Well, I guess that went well." And then Trump did this interview with the New York Times. I mean, you talk about these constraints on warfare that were set, and just basic morality. They asked him, "Do you care about international law? What's stopping you? What's constraining you?" And Trump said, "My own morality is the only thing I have to worry about."

#Larry Wilkerson

We're in trouble.

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, yeah. I remember reading that—it was right after the Venezuela thing. I was like, man, this is not going to end well, this whole thing.

#Danny

Yeah, well, your comments on this—there's also a report that, as all this is going on, Iran is still asserting its control over the Strait of Hormuz to such a degree that it's even reporting—this is from the Financial Times—that they're going to charge one U.S. dollar per barrel of oil on these tankers. So I guess the average tanker carries about two million barrels. So, uh, empty vessels can go through, but if you're loaded up with oil, then you have to pay that one-dollar toll, and it's to be paid through cryptocurrency. Now, before, the report said it was Chinese yuan, uh, or criminal organizations— I mean, this was really the sticking point for the United States: what impact Iran's control of the Strait of Hormuz would have on the markets, as well as, of course, U.S. dominance. This doesn't seem like it's changing, and that begs the question of what that will mean.

#Larry Wilkerson

Well, it's not anything new, really, if you look at it. The Panama Canal charges, the Suez Canal charges, the Strait of Hormuz would charge. I'd love to go back and dig into the details of the Law of the Sea Treaty, which about two-thirds, if not more, of the world has signed onto. We adhere to it, and our freedom of navigation exercises are based on it, but we've never put it before the Senate. We tried to—Secretary Powell tried to—and got rebuffed by the Senate, saying there's no way they'd get a two-thirds vote. And this is all because of big companies, big corporations that want to mine the seafloor and go down and get oil out of the seafloor at enormous depths—think Deepwater Horizon, for example. Their lobbying power has kept us from even bringing it up in the Senate.

But they deal very explicitly with internal seas, with fjords, with straits in particular—like the Strait of Malacca, the Strait of Hormuz, the Bab el-Mandeb. So I'm wondering, why have we grown so old that we don't remember what we did? No one has brought the sea treaty up and said, "What does it say about the Strait of Hormuz? What does it say about the Bab el-Mandeb? What does it say about other places?" Does it allow territorial waters to overlap in the sense that you can charge for passage through those waters? Or does it say that it doesn't matter how narrow the strait is—that even if the 12-mile limit in the Law of the Sea Treaty overlaps and doesn't accommodate the strait, it still depicts it as territorial water of the countries on either side?

It says international water, where ships fly that strait—whether it's a mile, two miles, or whatever—international water. Now, can you charge for that? All of this is to say that we have the guidance we need to deal with all the straits in the world, with all the internal seas and such—territorial waters, economic zones—all these things we've carefully laid out and spend billions of dollars enforcing around the world with our freedom of navigation exercises and other things like that, which we throw in the face of the Chinese in the South China Sea. Where is it? And who's talking about it? I'll tell you where it is. It's where all international law is—it's where the ICJ is, the ICC. It's dead. And who killed it? Washington killed it.

#Danny

Yeah, Dave, please, jump in.

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, I mean, I would say that point seems like a good compromise. I believe Iran's initial demand was reparations from the U.S. so they could rebuild—money for reconstruction. And the new point says they'll charge this fee and split it with Oman so it wouldn't all go to Iran, but that money would go toward the reconstruction project of the country that was attacked in an illegal war. So it seems to me like it makes sense. Now, would this be an indefinite arrangement? I mean, that's where they'd probably get into the details—if there were a real deal—about how long this fee would be implemented or not. But to me, it seems like if there's a real deal to be made, something like that is going to be included.

#Danny

Well, they're just—Carolyn Leavitt, spokesperson for the Trump administration—just came out and said this. So we can definitely, I think, conclude on this because, you know, there seems to be nothing about the Trump administration, or really the entirety of the empire at this point, that can be taken seriously other than its brutality. Here's what Karen Love had to say about the ten-point plan. Essentially, Iran's ten-point plan was thrown in the trash. Here she goes already.

#Speaker 1

So let me be clear and correct the record. The Iranians originally put forward a ten-point plan that was fundamentally unserious, unacceptable, and completely discarded. It was literally thrown in the garbage by President Trump and his negotiating team. Many outlets in this room have falsely reported that plan as being acceptable to the United States, and that is false. With the president's deadline fast approaching and the United States military completely decimating Iran with each passing hour, the regime acknowledged reality to the negotiating team. They put forward a more reasonable, entirely different, and condensed plan to the president and his team. President Trump

and the team determined the new, modified plan was a workable basis on which to negotiate and to align it with our own fifteen-point proposal. The president's red lines—namely, the end of Iranian enrichment in Iran—have not changed. And the idea that President Trump would ever accept an Iranian warship as a deal is completely absurd.

#Danny

So, let's begin with you, Trump.

#Larry Wilkerson

That's not what Trump said.

#Fox News 2

I just—like—do you believe any of this?

#Danny

Because ultimately what we have, it seems like, is a ceasefire football. They're just passing it around, and each one of them is saying something different—even within the Trump administration. So do you believe any of this? I mean, of course, the United States, being the so-called exceptional hegemon, can't ever admit defeat, can't ever admit that things aren't going well, would talk like this. But is there any fact here, Colonel Wilkerson? And then to you, Dave.

#Larry Wilkerson

I think you have to go back. For those of us who've been sort of privy to some information from the inside about the latest U.S. military operations in Iran, you have to look at what a resounding defeat that was—in terms of the C-130Js, the Little Birds, the Black Hawks. From what we're told, every Iranian in the vicinity came out with a shotgun, a rifle, or whatever, and those are fairly common in Iran. They took potshots at them, and the disaster that occurred wasn't just because of that. Think Eagle Claw—Jimmy Carter and the attempt to rescue the hostages back in, what was it, '77 or '78? That was a disaster brought on by other factors.

This was a disaster brought on by hubris—by particular hubris in Secretary Hegseth and by particular hubris in Donald Trump, which I think has been dented a little now because of the casualties taken. And we don't even know what the human casualties were yet. We know there were some, but we know it was a disaster. That sort of shows what would happen if we tried even a special operation—if we tried a large special operation, or if we tried Marines and other, more typical ground forces in Iran—they would be ultimately destroyed. They'd be consumed by that vast country and that vast population. So that was a reality check, I think, for the Pentagon, and a reinforcement of what I

understand were even objections from the Air Force chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to what they were planning to do.

So take that for a moment as a kick in the butt, if you will, and then ask, what are we going to do from here? What's going to happen going forward, even if Carolyn Leavitt is right—and she just contradicted her president on almost every point—and we're going into some kind of negotiations that will be fouled immediately because we're nowhere near each other on the issues. What do we do? Where do we go? And I haven't even brought up Lebanon, where Iran has said, "We're going to keep pounding you, Israel, until you stop in Lebanon—and maybe we'll keep pounding you even then if we feel like it." So I don't think we've solved much here. I really don't.

#Danny

Yeah, Dave, what are your thoughts on this?

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, I mean, so where is it? Where's the proposal—the real proposal—if there are these other ten points that Iran submitted? I mean, then what is it? And why would Iran—just like we don't know where the pilot is, right? Who's the colonel? Who is he? I don't know.

#Danny

We don't even have a face to the name, really.

#Dave DeCamp

So, yeah, I mean, it's just them scrambling to deal with the fallout from this whole announcement that Trump made. Because, I mean, if Iran did do that—did change the proposal and give it to the U. S.—why would they be publishing the original one? It just doesn't make any sense. And it's just, I mean... as we said earlier, the lying about this war from this administration is on another level. You know, when I see her come out—Carolyn Leavitt come out—I just know I'm not going to hear anything close to the truth. We're going to get whatever's been fed to her. And same thing with Pete Hegseth—he's going to make a whole bunch of false declarations and say a prayer in between.

And even J.D. Vance—I mean, he's supposedly the skeptic in the administration—said a couple of weeks ago, "Oh, good thing we started this war. Maybe there could have been a suicide bomber with a nuclear suicide vest," or something like that. Like, it's just... and to the point that Colonel Wilkerson was making—what are they going to do? Where are they going to go from here? If they choose to escalate the war, are they going to go for ground operations? That would probably be a

disaster. I think it's just going to be their own hubris and inability to accept the reality of what's happened here. That could just lead to more war crimes and the kind of horrific bombings on civilians we've already seen. Yeah.

#Danny

Yeah, it seems like a big part of this. I think, Colonel Wilkerson, both of you bring up great points. And what happened in the days before this, with that so-called rescue operation that really was initiated by the downing of the F-15s—perhaps that had a big impact on how the United States wanted to behave from here. But still, in your final comments, guys, they're talking out of both sides of their mouth. The United States is... you know, there's a ceasefire, but they don't agree with any of the terms. They're ready to hit Iran hard. All of these things are still very much on the table. And, of course, the U.S. has shown no interest in the first 24 hours in enforcing this thing. So, your final comments, Colonel Wilkerson, and then Dave.

#Larry Wilkerson

Quoting *Haaretz*, all Iran has to do is not lose to win. All the United States and Israel need is a spectacular victory. Who's going to win?

#Danny

Yeah. Yeah, that "spectacular victory" seems pretty fantastical at this point. Dave, over to you.

#Dave DeCamp

Yeah, I mean, let's just hope that Trump sees this for the disaster that it is and decides it's worth it to put the screws on Netanyahu to actually end this thing. But unfortunately, we're not seeing any signs of that. Still, let's hope that somehow there's some sort of miraculous peace out of all of this.

#Danny

Yeah, and I've said it since the beginning of covering this thing: the only way the United States and Israel stop is when they're forced to stop. What that threshold is, is still to be determined. So, everyone, make sure you hit the like button before you go. We'll head out of here together. I want to thank everyone who gave a super chat—I'll put those up as a plug. First, Dave DeCamp, he's the editor of Antiwar.com; you can find that in the video description. Tomorrow I'll be live with Larry Johnson and Scott Ritter. We'll continue to follow the latest developments on this—2 p.m. Eastern time, April 9th. Until next time, everyone—Dave, Colonel Wilkerson, anything you want to say before we head out of here?

#Larry Wilkerson

I love that comment. They should have included Cuba in the deal. Hey, I agree—Venezuela too, yeah. Right, I agree.

#Danny

Yeah, yep.

#Larry Wilkerson

Yeah, definitely. That Russian tanker has taken some pressure off the Cubans.

#Danny

Yeah, I know China sent a huge amount of food too, because there's a food component to this as well. But we'll continue to cover developments, everyone. Hit the like button before you go. All the places to support this show are in the video description—Patreon, Substack, and much more. Antiwar.com is also there, so be sure to subscribe, follow, and support Dave's work. It's been great, it's been around for a long time, and it's a great publication. All right, everybody, take care. See you tomorrow. Bye-bye.

#Larry Wilkerson

Nice to meet you, Dave. Yeah, you too.