

# Larry Johnson Drops a BOMBSHELL: Generals Just Told Trump to STAND DOWN

Follow me: Substack: [https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?](https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page)

utm\_campaign=profile&utm\_medium=profile-page X (Twitter): [https://x.com/Dialogue\\_NRA](https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA)

Patreon: [https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?](https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=)

utm\_medium=unknown&utm\_source=join\_link&utm\_campaign=creatorshare\_creator&utm\_content=

## **#Nima**

Hi everybody, today is Monday, April 27th, 2026, and our dear friend, our brother, Larry Johnson, is here with us. Welcome back.

## **#Larry**

I'm back. I think you win the shirt competition today. Yeah, it's good. Yeah, the master considers his students to be good. Yeah, it's good. Hey, yeah, I'm not going to be one of those teachers that, when the students overtake him, get jealous and go, "Oh, well, no, no, no, no." I encourage your success, Larry. Let me start with what has happened with the...

## **#Nima**

The meeting was the White House Correspondents' Dinner at the Washington Hilton Hotel. And something strange happened — someone came in, you know, penetrating these layers of security and shooting at the participants of the event. And here is one of the witnesses explaining what happened during that event.

## **#Speaker 03**

From me to that building. And there was a security guy there too. I mean, I don't think anyone knew what he was doing. Describe him. What did he look like? I'm not even sure what he looked like.

## **#Speaker 04**

And what made you think he was the shooter? How do you know?

## **#Speaker 03**

I saw him put the gun together and start shooting.

## **#Speaker 04**

Oh my God.

## **#Speaker 03**

Yes. I mean, he put it together and started running towards the stairs to go down to the ballroom.

## **#Speaker 04**

Who did he shoot, and in what direction did he shoot? What did he shoot?

## **#Speaker 03**

I don't know what he shot. It just seemed like he was shooting all over the place.

## **#Nima**

Larry, putting the gun together, it reminds me of Tyler Robinson putting the gun together.

## **#Larry**

Yeah, well, I don't know what she's talking about, because the reports that were put out said he had two types of firearms. He had a shotgun, which you don't need to put together. It can be disassembled, but that's not an easy process of just pressing a button and it comes apart. And he carried a semi-automatic pistol — it's called a .380, that's the caliber. So again, where did he—she implies that it was a long gun. There's CCTV footage of him coming; he runs down a hallway, and then you see him sprinting past the security guards, and then you see them draw their weapons and start firing in his direction. But you don't see a long gun.

I mean, that's not easy to hide. So we're not seeing that. That's what sort of puzzles me. It appears that he had just a handgun, and that's what was fired. But, you know, just lots of odd things. Because how did they take him down? We've got no footage of that. I guarantee you they got footage of that, but they're not showing it. He wasn't shot. Now, if he's carrying a firearm and if he's firing a firearm, with all of those Secret Service personnel and then supplemented by police, he should have been lit up like a Christmas tree. I mean, they should have filled him with so many holes he could have done Swiss cheese advertisements.

But he wasn't shot. He didn't have any visible gun wounds. The picture they show of him when he's handcuffed, lying on the ground — there's both a picture from the front and then a longer-distance shot from the side. There's no blood coming out. You don't see any. Nobody's provided any. You don't see an EMT or one of the police officers with rubber gloves on doing first aid. You don't have that. And some say, well, maybe he could have been shot in the leg. Again, if he was shot in the leg,

you're going to have a tourniquet on, and you're going to be providing medical treatment. There was no medical personnel around him.

They're just letting him lie there on the ground. It looks like they stripped him completely naked, which is why he's lying there, and then he's got this silver emergency blanket over him. So, you know, those are the odd things about, you know, people were—apparently there were shots fired. We know that. At least six to eight shots fired. Where did the bullets go? Again, I'm not suggesting that this was, quote, staged. Orchestrated is the better word. Because when you say staged, it sounds like you're suggesting it was not real. No, it was real. And I believe this guy was the real deal. But then you get into that—it was this.

Did he come up with this on his own? Or did he have somebody encourage him to do this and help him prepare to do this? I think it's the latter, just by virtue of the fact that his decision to travel cross-country on a train, carrying a shotgun and this handgun, as opposed to flying. Well, you know, if you fly, you would have had to fill out paperwork, and you would have had to lock the cases, lock the gun case, both for the handgun and the shotgun, and it would have been in the belly of the aircraft. On Amtrak, on the train coming across country, you don't have to do that. And that's one of the real security gaps still in the U.S. transportation system. You can get on a train carrying.

You can have a concealed weapon on you. Nobody's going to know the difference until you get it out and start shooting. So, you know, maybe he thought, you know, came up with it on his own. Hey, you know, I should probably take the train instead of the plane. But then that's—good Lord—that's a good solid two-day journey. You know, maybe they can get it done in 24 hours cross-country on a train, but still, that's an arduous trip. But then the real thing that caught my eye—when all of this shooting starts—the very first person that's taken off stage is J.D. Vance. And you're going, what? Look, the Secret Service's job is to protect the president. OK, they'd also protect the vice president.

But the number one guy to protect is the president. So as soon as you hear gunshots, grabbing his ass and hauling him out of there is what should have happened. That did not happen for 20 seconds after J.D. Vance. From the time that they grabbed J.D. Vance and started him off stage, 20 seconds passed before the Secret Service grabbed Trump and started moving him. And what's interesting is when the shooting starts, you know, Melania reacts with horror, and Trump's just like looking at her. Trump's not, you know, he's been shot at before. You'd think he'd be flinching. He's not flinching. It's almost like he knew this was going to happen. Did he know? I don't know. But just the reaction, his reaction was strange.

And then that of the Secret Service detail for him just didn't follow protocol. So, you know, I think when they look at this in retrospect, the Secret Service failed on several counts. One, how did this guy get past the checkpoint with a firearm? Because you say, well, he ran through it and they didn't stop him. Look, if you've got a security checkpoint with metal detectors and people have to come

through and put their belongings down and get checked, you also, as part of the planning for that, step back and say, okay, we're going to have some additional screeners there so that if you have to pull somebody aside, they can use a hand wand and check them out.

And then you've got at least two additional people who are carrying, like, a short-barreled rifle and can stand there. And the effect is that in the event someone actually tries to run through, breach it, they can stop them with deadly force, or they can at least tackle them. But, you know, if you've seen somebody with a firearm, my understanding from talking to a friend of mine who ran Ronald Reagan's Secret Service detail is that if someone's got a gun and they're anywhere in the vicinity of the president, you shoot them. You don't ask questions. You don't tell them to stop, drop your weapon—none of that. You shoot them. They've got that rule of engagement, which is they can use deadly force without fear of prosecution in that case.

**#Nima**

I think, Larry, if it was orchestrated, as you just mentioned, what is the main objective of that event? What do they want from this?

**#Larry**

So there could be a number of explanations here. One explanation is, let's say that this was orchestrated with Israel wanting to remind Trump that, hey, if you don't do what we say, we can get you—another assassination attempt. Another possible explanation: Trump wanted to use this, as he did in the subsequent press conference, as an excuse, as justification for building the new ballroom at the White House. Now, look, this had nothing—the security failure, the fact that this could happen—had nothing to do with the construction of the building.

It had to do with the failure of the Secret Service to follow proper procedure. Now, let's also acknowledge, though, the shooter did not—you know, the system ultimately worked. The shooter did not get into the ballroom. The shooter did not kill anybody that was in attendance, as was his stated intention. So even though the Secret Service failed to fully follow protocol, the system they had in place there still ended up working and preventing the president from being shot.

**#Nima**

It seems that I was using the wrong microphone here.

**#Larry**

Oh yeah.

**#Nima**

Every time you have to put the— I don't know what StreamYard is doing here, but it's so strange, by the way, every time we have to do this.

**#Larry**

Yeah, you sound better now.

**#Nima**

Yeah, it's better now.

**#Larry**

Yeah.

**#Nima**

Larry, getting out of this sort of propaganda that is happening in Washington and Donald Trump's—he's putting all of us in some sort of, he's distracting us from what's going on in the Middle East. What is your understanding about these new sort of weapons that they're sending to the Middle East, basically to the UAE and Qatar? We've seen a lot of cargo planes going there. What does that mean?

**#Larry**

I don't know. Well, let's put it this way. Back when they first deployed assets into the Middle East, into the Gulf, that was about 60 days ago. In fact, let's see, today is the 27th, 31 days in March. That's 58, one day, 28th of February. So yeah, it's 59 days, almost 60 days. Normally, those initial deployments go out with 55 to 60 days of supplies. So the units that were deployed, what they're getting now is basically they're getting replenished, resupplied with what they've already used up. They're getting resupplied. I don't think, but saying that, it's not like they're bringing in more Patriot missile batteries and more THAAD missiles. They don't have them.

I was, you know, over the weekend, late last week, CNN put out numbers based on talking to people at the Pentagon and some other government offices. They said, for example, the Patriots—they used up 50% of the Patriots. That just doesn't make sense. It's much worse than that. And here's the math on it: from 2015 to the end of 2025, they produced 4,620 of the PAC-3 missiles. And now we're into month four—we're coming into the end of April. So on average, let's give Lockheed Martin credit that they're producing 60 a month. So now they will have potentially 240 more. Well, of that initial 4,620, at least 1,000—and I believe it may have been closer to 2,000, almost a third of it—was sent in foreign military sales to other countries like South Korea, Japan, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar.

Then you had 1,000 that were used up in Ukraine. So, you know, we're now down to 3,000—let's say 3,600. And a number of those PAC-3 missiles were used in the June 12th war. So let's say that's another 1,000 that were used. So now we're down to less than a third of the initial amount. So these planes are carrying whatever resupplies they can, but the reality for the United States is its precision strike missiles and these air defense systems are being depleted very quickly. So I don't think there are any troops that are being ferried over there for a ground operation, for one reason. You look at the structure right now of Central Command. You have the commander for the aviation combined components—the general, Air Force general. You have a general or an admiral for the maritime components that are in there. And then they both report to the commander of CENTCOM, who's also called the Joint Force Commander. What are they missing? You don't have a ground force commander. There hasn't been one designated. So if you're going to use ground forces, you would have a ground force commander. So until we see that happen, that tells me there's not going to be any kind of ground operation, because the last thing you want is an admiral or an Air Force general directing ground operations. Let's reverse that. Would you take an Army general that runs the—like Keith Kellogg, 82nd Airborne—would you put him in charge of running an aircraft carrier?

Hell no. You know, he's not qualified to do that. Just because he's a general doesn't mean he's qualified to do that, because it requires knowledge of air operations off the deck of a carrier, for God's sake. So this is, I think, a lot of this movement is replenishment, the resupply. But, you know, they are prepared to—they're putting in place all the assets to renew the conflict. What is unknown is the attitude of the commander of the ground force—I mean, the commander of the aviation component and the commander of the maritime component. If they are saying, oh yeah, man, we can do anything, let's go—my understanding is that both have registered strong, I don't want to call it protests, but they say we shouldn't renew the attack.

We don't have the assets, and it's going to further deplete us, and we're not going to accomplish—there's no clear goals that we can accomplish. What remains to be seen is whether or not Admiral Cooper, who is the Joint Forces Commander, shares their sentiment and then passes it on to both Hegseth and Trump. So the way the chain of command works here is the commander of CENTCOM reports directly through the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Defense to the President. General Kane, who is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he's the President's top military advisor per legislation. But he's not a decision-maker in the chain of command. He's more like giving advice, and I don't think that's a good idea.

I wouldn't do that. Which is reportedly what happened—was it a week ago, two weeks ago now?—when they had that emergency meeting to decide how to proceed against Iran. And that's when the whole issue of using a nuclear weapon came up. Now, it was initially reported—the report I got was that he was, quote, wanting access to the codes—but that's not correct. What actually happened was Trump was beginning to raise and say, okay, we should explore the possibility of using a nuclear weapon to send a message to Iran. And General Kane said, no, and hell no. No, we're not going to do that. So that was—and that, you know, once word of that got out, Trump was

ultimately—he made a point of saying, denying, oh no, we're not going to use nukes. So that's the good news. It appears that's off the table.

## **#Nima**

I think our assessment—we talked on Friday—and our assessment was that the war is coming, and we should have had the second round of war by now. That's why I think one of the main reasons that is not happening, as we thought, is because of this sort of new attitude on the part of generals in the United States. They're trying to give their assessment now, you know, to the President of the United States. Do you think that they're getting direct access to the President, or they're sending their message through Pete Hegseth or someone like him?

## **#Larry**

Well, no, so these generals are official title. So you have the Commander of Central Command, CENTCOM. Then under him, you've got the Combined Forces Air Component Commander, which is the CFACC. That's General Derek France, I believe is his name. And then you have the Combined Forces Maritime Component Commander, the CFMCC. So they report directly to Cooper. They don't go around Cooper. They don't call up Pete Hegseth and say, well, we haven't told Admiral Cooper this yet, but no, they do follow the chain of command. So their views are presented to Cooper. It's up to Cooper then to present that to the Secretary of Defense. And then the Secretary of Defense is supposed to convey that to the President, or the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of War. We've gone from SOD to SOW, that the Secretary of War can direct the Commander of CENTCOM to communicate directly with President Trump.

## **#Nima**

Larry, the negotiations and the talks—we had the Iranian foreign minister going to Islamabad, and in his first visit, he gave them a document, then he updated that. It seems that right now the basics for the negotiations are—they're talking about the Strait of Hormuz, how to reopen the Strait of Hormuz permanently. And the other point, I think, is the case of Lebanon, which is on the table right now. It's very much related to the Strait of Hormuz as it comes to the Iranian mind. And there is no sign of negotiations on the nuclear program so far, because they're putting this forward: let's talk about these issues, then later on we're going to have the talks on the nuclear program of Iran. What is your assessment of the way that Iran is putting forward its points?

## **#Larry**

Well, Iran knows what it's doing and what it wants out of the negotiations. The United States does not. Trump keeps talking about how there is confusion on the Iranian side, that they don't know who's in charge, that they don't agree with each other. All he is doing is describing what the reality is on the U.S. side. Because on the Iranian side, it's quite clear who's in charge. Everybody has a

role to play. And it was Ghalibaf, the head of the legislature. He was the lead negotiator in the last round, but it didn't mean that Araghchi was being shoved aside. To the contrary. So Araghchi remains the foreign minister and is playing a very prominent role.

And the notion that somehow the IRGC is calling the shots and Khamenei is out of the picture, you know, that's not true. So, you know, Araghchi went first, you know, when he first went to Islamabad—was it last Thursday, Friday? The expectation was that Ghalibaf and Kushner were going to jump on a plane, go over and meet with him. But he made it clear, no, I'm not here to meet with them at all. I'm here to talk to the Pakistanis. And so, again, reviewing with Pakistan, they basically gave them the same paper, the same 10-point document that had been presented two weeks previously. Because when you read it again, it really hadn't changed anything.

So that was for Pakistan to deliver that message to the West. And what was curious about that is Trump came out and said, oh yeah, they came back with a better— we've had some movement, they're moving in the right direction. And they presented basically the same document. So Trump either wasn't remembering what they had read previously, or he was wanting to portray it in more positive terms now. Then Araghchi gets on a plane, flies to Oman, and has meetings with the sheikh there. Then he gets back on the plane. Originally, they said he was going to fly from there to Moscow or to Russia, but instead, he goes back to Pakistan.

And again, the meeting between the two is described as very upbeat, very positive. But one of the things that comes out of it is Pakistan then basically downgrades security and lifts security restrictions, which many interpreters said, okay, there aren't going to be any more negotiations right now in the foreseeable future with the United States, because with those security precautions eliminated, that means the U.S. wasn't coming. And then Araghchi flew from there to St. Petersburg and literally started his meeting with Putin about an hour ago. And the opening comments were very warm and friendly between the two leaders.

## **#Nima**

Here is what Araghchi said in Moscow.

## **#Larry**

No, in St. Petersburg.

## **#Speaker 06**

Iran and Russia are strategic partners. They have always supported us. We have always supported the Russians. And our cooperation will continue.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. You're basically saying that these two countries are strategic partners and they're cooperating with each other. Yeah.

## **#Larry**

So that means it's not just a casual relationship.

## **#Nima**

No, it's getting so close, Larry. They're getting back to back. Iran is supporting Russia, Russia is supporting Iran, and they understand how important this sort of alliance is that they have. I would say partnership they have, because it's not any sort of alliance like what we've seen in NATO. And Larry, I think when it comes to the war, restarting the war, how is that going to help with what Iran right now said to Pakistan, as you mentioned? How is that going to help a new attack? Let's assume they're going to, I don't know, destroy some bridges, some power plants, and how is that going to help the position of Donald Trump in this war?

## **#Larry**

Yeah, no, all it does is make you feel good. I blew up all this stuff, and you get to claim that, you know, they're devastated. Like, he has wiped out the Air Force, except Iranian planes are still flying. He has wiped out the Navy, except Iranian ships continue to sail on the Strait of Hormuz and into the Indian Ocean. So, we've devastated their missile production—no, they haven't. So, it is further attacks that can be spun as being very effective. The number of people in the West that have bought into the lies that have been told about how effective the U.S. bombing was. And I guess I'm fascinated, maybe on sort of an intellectual basis, about when you look at the war in Ukraine and the number of air operations, missile strikes, cruise missiles, ballistic missiles, drone strikes that Russia has carried out in Ukraine over the course of the last four-plus years.

I mean, it's an enormous amount. It dwarfs anything that Iran has fired at U.S. forces or Israel, or that Israel and the United States have fired at Iran. And in this context, Ukraine is one-third the size of Iran. So I'm just, from a standpoint of applying military force and getting an achievable outcome, such as changing a government or Iran saying, "We no longer want to fight, we give up," that's just not going to happen. Because as you see, a country like Ukraine can hang on, albeit suffering greatly, but can hang on and not collapse into a fetal position after suffering a week of bombing. So this is the U.S. What this war has exposed are the limitations of U.S. military power—both air power, maritime power, and certainly no ground forces. Ground forces become an impossible task.

## **#Nima**

Larry, here is, you know, the latest news. I was checking this here, and it says that no matter the relationship between Russia and Iran, no matter what is happening in the Russia-Iran relationship,

Russian-Iranian relations will grow stronger. And we've seen the same, Larry, with the case of North Korea—Russia, North Korea, Russia, Iran. China is somehow a little bit more shy here. Look at the attitude of China. They're basically behind this, and they don't want to come forward. But we've seen how they behaved during the war in Ukraine.

They started with this: we are advocating for peace, and Russia should respect Ukraine. Then they came to the conclusion that Russia has every right to defend itself. And is that gonna help GCC countries in the Persian Gulf? Is that gonna help them understand the reality of what's going on? Because if the escalation happens—you've mentioned Iran and the size of Iran—but these countries are not gonna be able to survive that escalation, considering everything.

## **#Larry**

Well, yeah, look, the actual—if you want to call it the actual—violence that's going to occur and change the face of the geopolitical state in the Persian Gulf, it's on the economic front. The full impact of the cutoff of 20% of the world's supply of oil, 25% of the world's supply of liquid natural gas—I'm not sure what the percentage is on helium and sulfuric acid—and then 35%, at least, of the world's urea. When the war started on the 28th, we didn't see an immediate cutoff because of the way liquid natural gas and helium and oil are transported—they're loaded onto tankers.

And so those tankers that were at sea, even though in theory we look and say, okay, they're not producing any more oil right now in Saudi Arabia that we can see significantly, or in Qatar or Bahrain, nonetheless, there was still oil on the high seas that was headed to destinations. And those tankers travel at the speed of somebody riding a bicycle, like 10 kilometers per hour, so it takes a while for it to get to ports. And so when it started arriving at ports around the world, the prices people had been paying before for oil—it was like, say, \$70 a barrel—well, now that oil is coming in and they're having to pay \$130, \$150. In Singapore, they had recorded, like the second week of the war, \$210 for a barrel of oil.

And people need to keep in mind, you're going to hear them talking about what the paper price is on Brent futures or WTI, which stands for West Texas Intermediate. There are futures papers saying, oh, the oil's worth, say, \$105 according to our paper. But the reality is that it doesn't matter what you're trying to bet on in the future. When the ship actually gets there and you pay for it, you've got to pay what the price is in the actual market, which is much higher—30% to 40% higher. My point is, now all of that oil that had been out there en route has been delivered, and there are no more ships left loaded up behind them.

So we're done with that. And that means now the actual impact of shortages is going to be felt, and severely felt. So now we're going to enter a stage of what we call an economic contraction, a significant economic contraction. I think that will unfold this week and into next week, which is going to put pressure on the United States from the standpoint of negotiation. Because it looks like one of the things that Iran was talking to Oman about was, we're going to be partners in controlling what

goes in and out of the Persian Gulf, and both of us will get paid for it since we're the ones that have the most at risk.

## **#Larry**

So Iran's working that out with Oman. Then it's talking to Pakistan, as well as having Pakistan convey to the United States, here's what Iran's willing to do with respect to the Strait of Hormuz to get it open so commercial traffic starts to go through on a more regular basis. And then he's now in St. Petersburg, Russia, meeting with Putin. And again, I think the status of the Strait of Hormuz is going to come up. The issue of getting out from under U.S. sanctions is going to be addressed, the release of frozen assets. All of that is going to be important because Iran is not just a strategic partner, or within being a strategic partner, of Russia. Iran is an essential economic component because of its control, its role of being the north-south corridor that's going to allow goods to flow both from Russia down through Iran to the Indian Ocean, as well as products to come in from the Indian Ocean, go up through Iran, across the Caspian into Russia.

So the economic, I guess what I'm saying is, whatever, you know, military strikes could be renewed, but they're not going to accomplish anything strategic. It's simply going to further deplete already scarce missiles, precision strike missiles or precision strike munitions that the United States has — both missiles, glide bombs, cruise missiles, et cetera. I, candidly, I think China is sort of sitting back hoping that the United States does attack again, believing that if they did so, it would further deplete U.S. military resources to such an extent that there would now be complete certainty that the United States could never attack China, at least not any time in the near to intermediate future.

## **#Nima**

And not only the North-South corridor, we have the Belt and Road Initiative.

## **#Speaker 06**

Yes.

## **#Nima**

There is a connection between Iran and China, a railroad going to China as well. That is important. And they have this communication. I don't know, I don't see any possibility for the United States to disrupt that. They can attack, they can destroy it, but it's just they're getting back to the same — they're going to rebuild it. That's why I think these GCC countries are basically mostly dependent on the Strait of Hormuz more than Iran, much more than Iran. Because, Larry, when they're talking about Saudi Arabia having an alternative, this east-west pipeline, as they're talking about, to the Red Sea — but the problem is, basically, the production of oil in these facilities is close to the Persian Gulf.

## **#Speaker 06**

Mm-hmm.

## **#Nima**

So it's not possible just to send all of this to the routes. It's impossible.

## **#Larry**

No, no, it's just a limited supply. And it can, if—this is the other thing I think is weighing on the decision whether to renew the attack. Iran has spent now the last three weeks getting ready for the next round of attacks, and it's been shoring up its air defense system. It has run, in the last five days, two full-blown exercises—let's call them live-fire exercises—testing their air defense systems in Tehran. Because initially, the other night, we got reports of drones flying over and explosions going off, and we thought, okay, here we go. But then it turned out, no, they were testing their air defense system.

So that right there tells you they're getting ready. And they made it clear, if attacked, they're not going to wait until the missiles impact in Tehran. As soon as the United States and Israel go airborne and launch missiles and such, Iran's going to be immediately firing. And they've got the targets preselected. They know where the U.S. assets are. They're going to hit those. In the Persian Gulf, they're going to hit at Muwaffaq al-Salti Air Base in Jordan. And then they're going to decimate Israel. They're ready to do that, but they're only going to do that if the West attacks.

And I think that's one of the considerations that's weighing heavily, or should weigh heavily anyway, on Donald Trump and Pete Hegseth, is that if they do launch this new round of attacks, it could be very devastating to U.S. assets and further worsen the situation, to put the United States in the position of having to use weapons that can now not easily be replaced. And one of the reasons they can't easily be replaced is some of the key components that go into those precision missiles come from China. And so if China's not providing that, then all of a sudden the United States, even if they want to operate their factory 24/7, they don't have the materials to produce new precision-guided munitions.

## **#Nima**

Larry, what do you make of the new reports on CBS News, which point out that Iran has used F-5s to attack American bases in Kuwait? They're basically used. We had previous reports about Su-24s. Right, and the Su-24s have been used. But we haven't seen any evidence that Iran used Su-35s or any Chinese fighter jets. It seems that they have a lot that haven't shown up so far.

## **#Larry**

Well, I take all those reports with a grain of salt. I noticed there are now on YouTube several sites with fake Doug McGregors, fake Scott Ritters, fake Larry Johnsons, where they have us saying things and reporting on things that never happened before. One that came out had me saying that the Iranians successfully sank three aircraft carriers. You can always tell that these AI are fake. All you've got to do is look at the eyes and the face. The face is not normal. They've done the same with Professor Morandi.

## **#Nima**

They have it with Colonel Wilkerson too.

## **#Larry**

Yeah, they got one with Colonel Wilkerson too. So people just need to be cautious out there. If you're seeing a video where myself or any of the other gents that I've mentioned are saying something that seems completely off base, double-check it, because it probably is. But this is, you know, again, I take it as a backhanded compliment.

## **#Nima**

They want to discredit, by the way, the analysts. I think the whole mission is about that.

## **#Larry**

Yeah, because we're being effective, they then want to try to shut us down. And so I take comfort in that, that they recognize we're enough of a threat that they've got to try to discredit us. But that, I think, only enhances our credibility.

## **#Nima**

Larry, you remember when this war in Ukraine started, we all were talking about how Ukraine could be like Austria, for example, something like Austria, and be neutral and just enjoy neutrality. I think that case can be translated to the Middle East, to West Asia, with the case of Oman. Look at what Oman is today. They're not dependent on Iran. They're not dependent on the West. They're not dependent on anybody in the region. They're an independent state. And that's... Is that going to help other GCC countries understand that they can be like Oman? They can survive these sorts of continuous wars in the Middle East without participating in or helping the United States or Israel, by the way. Because we've learned that Israel was sending air defense systems together with forces to the UAE to defend them before this war started.

## **#Larry**

Yeah, and it turned out those air defense systems were ineffective, if not useless. The two countries that seem to get it, that understand that really the future now of the Persian Gulf is with Iran, are Qatar and Oman. And they're looking to work, collaborate with, and get the relationships with Iran in the proper condition. The Saudis are starting to come around. You know, they're still fearful of having to take a backseat to Iran, but they also recognize that U.S. promises to protect them have failed and that the U.S. weapons systems are, frankly, not necessarily as good as they were presented or advertised. The big losers will be Kuwait. Then Bahrain is really in trouble. And last, and probably in the most trouble, is the United Arab Emirates, because their entire business model has collapsed, coupled with the blockade and the fact that the financing is moving away from the dollar in the direction of the yuan — the Chinese yuan.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. Larry, we know that the case of Lebanon is so important for Iran. And whatever happens with the negotiations with the United States, Lebanon is going to be part of that deal, part of that agreement. And looking at what is happening right now in the southern part of Lebanon and the way that Hezbollah is fighting back, literally they're talking about if Israel continues with this occupation in the southern part of Lebanon, they're not going to let Israeli people get back to the northern part of Israel.

## **#Larry**

That's right. Yeah, well, I saw a report just before logging on to chat with you today that, in fact, Israeli forces, while they're intensifying the bombing, the Israeli ground forces are withdrawing. They're starting to withdraw, which is what happened back in 2006, because they got into a ground operation that they couldn't sustain before. We just saw as well this morning a film that Hezbollah took. There was an Israeli helicopter that had landed and was receiving casualties. They had quite a group, probably about 25 Israeli soldiers milling about, and they got hit. Then they got hit with a drone that exploded, and as it was exploding, the helicopter took off and got out of the area.

So Israel continues to suffer significant casualties on the ground in southern Lebanon. What they're trying to do is create, I'll call it, a Gaza Strip. Literally, every village that's located along the border, they want to level it, destroy it. The problem is they may create sort of a no-man's-land, but they're not going to root out Hezbollah. But that's, again, another one of the ploys — to get the Lebanese government, which is run by Christians, on board to go attack Hezbollah with the Lebanese army. So far, there has been some collaboration between the Lebanese government and Israel on the military front, but the Lebanese government is not in a position at all to take on Hezbollah. Hezbollah is still quite strong and quite capable.

## **#Nima**

You feel that, Larry, Israel today, as we talk—let's assume Iran and the United States reach some sort of agreement—that agreement is going to include a ceasefire between Lebanon and Israel, since we know that the ceasefire doesn't exist, by the way.

**#Larry**

Right.

**#Nima**

But after all, how do you see the capabilities of the Israeli government today compared to what they were before this war started? Or what were the influences of this war on Israeli capabilities?

**#Larry**

Yeah, well, I think it's exposed the limitations and weakness of the Israeli military. I've made this point repeatedly, but we're now literally two and a half years since the start of the retaliation against Hamas for the October 7th attacks. And, you know, Israel mobilized 300,000 troops, its reservists. They had the entire Gaza Strip surrounded, which means that Hamas had no easy means of resupply. You know, they had to be smuggled through Israeli lines if that's possible, but I guess it is possible.

But the Israelis, with tanks and with armored personnel carriers and with artillery and with bombs from fixed-wing aircraft, have been able to devastate most of the buildings in Gaza, and yet Hamas, who's underground in a variety of bunkers and tunnels that are interconnected, has held off the Israelis. So, you know, what would present the Israelis as the most powerful military force, but here they get stifled by Hamas, which is not considered a modern military by any stretch. Then Israel goes into southern Lebanon and says, oh, we're going to go all the way to the Litani River and set up a buffer zone. They can't get past about 5 to 10 kilometers inside the southern part of Lebanon.

Because Hezbollah has got them pinned down and is stopping them and inflicting significant casualties. So this will be another situation in which the Israelis are going to have to retire, retreat, refit, replenish. But in the meantime, there will be elections. And I think it is, we're now increasingly likely that a new government will be formed that will exclude the radical settlers and Bibi Netanyahu, that will actually try to work out a ceasefire and a legitimate peace deal with Iran, with Hamas. So this is what has happened over the course of both the war in Gaza and the war now in Lebanon. It's weakened Israel, not strengthened it.

**#Nima**

Larry, whatever happens between Iran and the United States is going to be between these two countries, and Europe is not going to be part of this. Europe was part of the JCPOA and those

snapback sanctions, and they just failed to deliver on their promises they had during the JCPOA. They didn't do it. They didn't do anything, in my opinion, when it comes to the sanctions on Iran because they did everything that Washington asked them to do. And here is Ursula von der Leyen talking about lifting sanctions on Iran, because the Strait of Hormuz is bringing a new reality to the relationship between Iran and the Europeans. If they want to have some sort of understanding, mutual understanding, they have to understand that the new leverage Iran has could hit them, and could hit them hard. Here is what Ursula von der Leyen said.

## **#Speaker 07**

We think the dropping of sanctions would be too early because there's a reason why the sanctions are imposed on Iran. And this reason is their behavior towards their own population. Seventeen thousand young people have been killed just this year, at the beginning of this year, by the regime. It's the suppression of human rights and specifically women's rights in Iran, and many other issues that triggered the sanctions. We first have to see a change, a fundamental change in Iran, before dropping the sanctions, and therefore we think it's too early to drop them.

## **#Larry**

Who cares what she says? She is irrelevant. She doesn't control an army. She has control over a budget, but she has no power. I mean, it's like listening to a squirrel chirp — you know, just background noise. No, look, Europe is no longer relevant. So for the past almost 1,600 years — go back to 1492, Columbus sailed the ocean blue — now from 1492 on, and maybe a little bit before that, Europe became the start of the colonial era, where Europe was moving out. They were fighting amongst themselves, but they were busy conquering others, taking control of other countries around the world, trying to exploit their resources for their own consumption. And Europe was the center. It was the center of music, the center of philosophy, the center of industry, the center of science.

Particularly during the 19th century is when really that all came to a head, culminated. And the beginning of the erosion of the colonial powers, you know, because look at what Germany did in Africa along with what France did in Africa and the Sahel. Germany with its concentration camps down in southern Africa. The Dutch as well were involved. So, you know, these Europeans were all competing with each other over different colonies around the world. Then comes World War I, and that is the beginning of the collapse of the British Empire. The British Empire was global. It was the biggest. It was the most important. The sun, as they said, never set on the British Empire.

But the loss, the cost — physical cost, economic cost — of World War I, coupled with the loss of so many, of an entire generation, really, of young men, that they were no longer alive to reproduce, build families. They were gone, wiped out. That began this contraction, if you will, of the British Empire. And again, when World War II comes around, that's sort of the final, you know, pull the pin, blow up the grenade, and blow up colonialism. Because coming out of that, you then had the emergence of all these different independence movements. India gets its independence. Countries

that had been under the control of Germans — that was taken away as a result, one of the consequences of losing the war.

And we've seen ever since then, over the course of the last 80 years, the continued erosion and decline of Europe as both a military power and as an economic power, no longer really relevant. Center of industry? Nope, not at all. That's shifted. You know, China is now that. How about, you know, their navies are just a shadow of what they used to be. Their armed forces, you know, the Brits, they got like a total of 70,000. Hell, they can't even fill a soccer stadium with their entire military. So, you know, this kind of nonsense from Ursula — oh, we're going to be in control and dictate. Iran is now emerging as a more powerful economic player by just controlling that Strait of Hormuz. Europe is going to be screaming, screaming for mercy within the next two to three weeks. Mark my words.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. Larry, before wrapping up, Zelensky came out and said Europe does need to start producing munitions in Europe and together. He's considering Ukraine as part of Europe. I don't know if they're going to be part of Europe and if they're going to be a state called Ukraine as it was before the war started. But how about the capability of production, the military-industrial complex in Europe without energy? How is that possible?

## **#Larry**

Right. Yeah, no, that's the truth that they're going to have to be confronted with. The global economic crisis that hit in 2008 was significant. But what lies before us right now dwarfs that. What happened in 2008 could be viewed as a short, small rain shower, and what we're facing now is a hurricane of just devastating consequences. And people look at me and say, oh, you're crazy, you're just exaggerating. Look, if you recall the images out of Thailand when they had the tsunamis—was that back in 2012? Yeah. People sitting on the beach, they're just sitting there, and they see all the water running away. It moves out. Hey, look, it's calm. This is great. Look at all the beach. Hey, let's go out and inspect the fish.

Not realizing that that was the sign that something terrible was getting ready to happen. That's what these last seven weeks, now eight weeks, have been—the water running away. Because there is a tsunami that's coming in that will crush us economically. Everybody. It's not going to be just one country or two countries. But Europe is going to be one of the biggest ones to suffer because they're out of oil. And there is not another alternative. It's not like they can say, oh, we just have to go pay a higher price. No. The actual supplies are down. Now, the only thing that's going to make supplies come back, apart from opening the Strait of Hormuz, is if there's such an economic collapse that people stop driving. And that has its own terrible implications.

## **#Nima**

Yeah, thank you so much, Larry.

**#Larry**

Yeah, on that cheery note, let's start the week.

**#Nima**

Yeah, exactly.

**#Larry**

All right, my friend. We'll see you later this week.

**#Nima**

Exactly.

**#Larry**

Behave yourself, but nice shirt today. Sure.

**#Nima**

Thank you. All right, my friend. See you soon. Bye bye.