Iran’s Nuke Submarine BLINDSIDES Trump, Israel FURIOUS | Col. Lawrence Wilkerson & Anthony Aguilar

Iran has unveiled a new weapon as Israel furiously pushes to go back to war with American backing. Col. Lawrence Wilkerson and Lt. Col Anthony Aguilar discuss the latest developments in the myriad of wars in flux that are changing the world order immeasurably. Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis! Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong Telegram: https://t.me/DannyHaiphong Support the channel in other ways: https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: $Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: https://paypal.me/spiritofho #iranwar #nuclearwar #trump

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. As you can see, I am joined by retired Army colonel and former chief of staff Lawrence Wilkerson and former lieutenant colonel, author, analyst, and journalist Anthony Aguilar to go over the latest developments. Gentlemen, I wanted to begin with what Mohsen Rezaei said overnight. He said that Iran has completely rejected U.S. demands to remove its enriched uranium from the country because they are developing and have developed nuclear-powered ships and nuclear-powered submarines. This comes as Donald Trump appears a bit blindsided by Iran's posture and has taken to ignoring Iran, saying there's no need for a deal anymore. J.D. Vance has been pulled off any negotiations with Iran to instead address so-called corruption within the Democratic Party.

Now, Israel is pretty angry about the United States' ambivalence and ambiguous posture right now on the Iran war. Netanyahu and Trump supposedly got into a screaming match on a call in the last 48 hours, as Netanyahu has supposedly been asking Trump every day to jump in and restart major attacks on Iran. This also comes as Israel is ordering preparations for another strike. You know, Colonel Wilkerson, it looks like we might have lost Tony here. Tony, you still there? Oh, there you are. Colonel Wilkerson, let's begin with you. Your thoughts on this, because we heard that there was a two-week deadline for J.D. Vance to go and talk to the Iranians and come up with something before strikes. Now this has all been called off. What do you make of the U.S.'s posture at this time and Iran's unveiling of its development of these nuclear-powered ships and submarines?

#Lawrence Wilkerson

I've got to backdrop my answer, Danny, with the perplexing situation after November 3's resounding, historic defeat of the Republican Party by the American people and Donald Trump's initial, fairly contrite admission—not that he'd lost. If he'd been on the ticket, they wouldn't have lost, he said. But at least there was some contrition there, as close as you get to it with Donald Trump, and a recognition that he would have to rule for two years with the kinds of tools that the Constitution affords him, veto power being the biggest one. But it might be a little bit difficult for him to do a lot of things that he wanted to do, and it'd be almost impossible for the Republican Party to do them. This is incredible.

I mean, we even have the first Black congressman from Mississippi since Reconstruction, who's been confirmed as having won the election in that state. Thank God. About time Mississippi joined the 21st century. So after all of that, talking to Stephen Miller, talking to Russ Vought, talking to Pete Hegseth, talking to others, perhaps—Laura Loomer comes to mind immediately, from whom he seems to take an inordinate amount of his advice—he changed his mind. He's on another sheet of music, politically speaking, entirely.

And the most vivid, unconstitutional, and disgraceful example of that is what he's directed his Department of Justice to do, which is to go after every Democratic congressman who brings forth a subpoena, who says he's going to hold a hearing on something the Trump administration did, or who does anything else within their constitutional rights. I mean, their constitutional rights as members of the sitting Congress of the United States, but also as American citizens. It's called freedom of speech. He's going to prosecute these people. He's going to go after them. "Issue a subpoena, I'll put you in jail." And what comes to my mind immediately is what Powell used to say all the time.

Congress has no army. And I used to say, "Read Article I. They have all the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and everything else." Yeah, but they don't have it to order around. So then my question is, how much of the military, across all components, has Pete Hegseth convinced to be on Trump's side, and how much of ICE has the Secretary of Homeland Security convinced to be on Trump's side, should some of this come to an almost civil war-like situation? Why would he do this? Why would he set himself up for disaster, in my view, and the country up for disaster, if he really means it and starts doing it? And then I come to the wars.

I come to the war in Ukraine and what just happened in Abu Dhabi, where the Europeans made absolutely insane asses of themselves, talking about a European security architecture. Finally, something that needed to be talked about 15, 20 years ago. Finally getting a word in about it, and having the Europeans announce that, well, it has to maintain the possibility of Ukraine being a member of NATO and all that that entails. Are you insane? Have you not been listening? And then watching the interview with Witkoff and Kushner in a setting that was just remarkable for Putin. This setting was all white and pink and mauve. It was close. You could actually see each other across the table. It wasn't a vast distance like Putin usually wants. They were actually in an intimate setting.

And Putin had selected a translator who not only translated Putin's Russian into English, but I swear to God, watching it, he translated Putin's facial mannerisms into, you know, his own. He looked like a Putin beside Putin, delivering the translation into English. And Putin maintained his equanimity the whole time he was saying it. But it was essential to get this to Witkoff and Kushner in particular, although I don't think they'll do anything with it. And what he said was essentially, "For 14-plus years, I've been telling you what the situation demands for me to make a deal. For 14 years, I've been telling you that. And the parameters haven't changed a bit. If anything, I'm adamant, and the Russian people are more adamant than they've been in the past." You can't make this stuff up. What a show for Putin, and what a demonstration of how the scene sets the meeting.

Because he set that up to be very different from normal meetings with Putin. It was very intimate in the sense that he was talking right to them: "Take this message back, because I'm not going to say it many more times. What I'm going to do next is destroy Kyiv, destroy Zelensky, destroy Ukraine, and then I'm going to laugh at you as I finish everything off and say, 'Okay, you want more? I'm ready.'" Disaster. And in Southwest Asia, even more disastrous. And it all revolves right now around the most bloody-minded, murderous single individual on the face of the earth. I compare him with Adolf Hitler: Bibi Netanyahu. And on top of all of that, even in the arcane, incredibly complex, demented political situation that Zionists have created in Israel, even in that system, he really is not the guy who should be making these decisions anymore.

He's been kicked out, essentially. But he's going to make this decision, and he's going to turn to Trump, and he's going to say, "You're either with me or against me," which I think is what he just said. And he's going to start this war again. And here's the remarkable thing: he's got 80, 85% of the Jewish citizens of the little statelet of Israel, which is nowhere near a liberal democracy, behind him. Not necessarily personally, but for what he wants to do, he's got them behind him, which is a condemnation of that state unparalleled in the history of states. And yet we may be leading ourselves into a disaster with the leader of that state, as he conceives himself. Sorry for going on so long.

#Danny

No, no. Great introduction, Colonel Wilkerson. Well, Anthony, same question I asked, and anything you want to follow up on.

#Anthony Aguilar

Well, I think when you look at this phone call that we've heard about between Netanyahu and Trump, what conversation with Trump doesn't involve yelling or screaming? He tweets in all caps. I can't imagine there are many conversations with Donald Trump that don't include some type of yelling or hyperbole or excitement. But in this particular case, with this discussion with Netanyahu, who still heads the caretaker government, he has convened the Israeli National Security Council. It's a nine-minister council, ten including him as the chair. Ben-Gvir, Smotrich, and Herzog are all part of

this council. And Netanyahu has instructed the IDF to begin taking steps to execute the plans that have already been laid for continued and renewed strikes against Iran.

So, back on the 10th of October, these plans were briefed to Netanyahu. On the 19th of October, Secretary Hegseth visited Israel at Ovda Air Base and received the same information, basically carrying the message from the president but also being briefed on what this plan was. And just last night, Netanyahu ordered the IDF air forces to begin preparations to conduct these strikes. And the Security Cabinet is convening this coming Sunday, the 15th, to decide which way this is going in terms of what Israel is going to do. On Sunday, the USS Theodore Roosevelt enters the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility in the Arabian Sea.

They're in the Andaman Sea right now, heading toward the Central Command AOR. They'll be there Sunday. So we're seeing these two aspects converge, in addition to what we've heard from Iran about lifting their self-imposed 2,000-kilometer range limit on their ballistic missiles. They have ballistic missiles with a range of 3,000 to 4,000 kilometers. They can reach the United Kingdom. They can reach Europe, where U.S. bases are now retracting and hiding. So, if you look at the situation between the United States, Israel, and Iran, Donald Trump said just today, "We don't need a deal." Over the last few days, he has said, "I don't need to strike Iran again."

We heard Pete Hegseth in his morning press conference before the impeachment vote, or the vote to proceed with impeachment in the House, which was defeated by Republicans, unfortunately. He even said that we don't need to fight the war anymore. We're just going to keep our eyes on Iran, and if they dare do anything, then we'll strike again. And we've heard from Iran in response that they will not give up even an ounce of their enriched uranium for their nuclear pursuits in terms of civilian nuclear capability: reactors, power generation, nuclear ships, etc. So there are no peace negotiations happening. There is no discussion of peace regarding Iran, the United States, and Israel in this conflict.

So Americans and the world need to be cognizant of that. Once again, we're being led down this path of the seven-point framework, which Marco Rubio has called unacceptable and unrealistic. And Iran has said, well, we're not budging on those conditions. So we're no closer to peace now than we were in June with the 14-point MOU, the Islamabad Accords, and we know how that went. And when you look at what Donald Trump is facing domestically, within his own cabinet, within his own party, he will become more and more authoritarian and cling to power, not just through constitutional power, but through what we're seeing now. He's now ordered his vice president to stop worrying about foreign policy and the potential pursuit of peace with Iran to avert a continued and even more catastrophic war.

He wants him to focus on basically making the Democratic Party a political enemy within the United States and putting all that energy into that effort now, undermining the constitutional process. The American people have voted. The American people have spoken overwhelmingly. And this president cannot seem to accept that. And I think the initial shock has now worn off, and he's settled back into

being the old Donald Trump: vindictive and abusive in his use of power. And he's going to make this next Congress, the 120th Congress, a vehicle for his own political pursuits and personal vendettas. And that's unfortunate. And all of this is happening against the backdrop of this ongoing war with Iran that is nowhere near over.

And Netanyahu and Trump are both the type of leaders who would use the conflict to incite further war to salvage their own political careers, or at least maintain power. That's why Netanyahu is doing this: to undermine the process of forming a government under Eisenkot, to put Israel back into a state of war, to maintain power. And Trump and Netanyahu have that same evil mindset. And it's unfortunate that the world is now having to be the victim of this. We're all being lied to in terms of diplomatic pursuits. I think that the United States will end up supporting Israel's strikes on Iran. We may push back and say, "Oh, we don't support it. We don't want them to." And then, as soon as they do, we go with them. Those plans are already laid. Those plans have already been discussed. This president is, again, lying to the American people.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

Great points, Tony. Benny, I just want to amend one thing there. I haven't looked at the numbers yet. I have them here, but I haven't gone over them thoroughly. There were also some Democrats who contributed to the impeachment proceedings not going ahead, and they should all be taken out as well.

#Anthony Aguilar

Yes, sir. Absolutely. I was looking at this the other day because the new Congress, the 120th Congress that resulted from these elections, doesn't convene until January 3rd. They don't get sworn in until then. So we're really looking at these articles of impeachment under the current Congress. What happened this past week was not the vote to impeach. It was the vote on whether or not to have a vote to impeach. Meaning, this first vote was: are we going to send this to committee, or are we going to send this to a vote on the floor for impeachment proceedings?

So a yes vote was the negative, meaning voting yes was to send it to committee, which is essentially Congress's way of burying something. And to your point, sir, we had 211 members of the House of Representatives vote yes—all Republicans except for one independent. And then we had 204 vote no—all Democrats except for one Republican, Massie. But then we had 18 who did not vote. And out of those 18, 11 were Democrats. So we needed seven more votes to tie and eight to win on the "no" vote—meaning no to sending it to the Judiciary Committee and yes to an impeachment vote. Where were those 11 Democrats?

#Lawrence Wilkerson

Hmm.

#Anthony Aguilar

By not voting, they voted. And with their votes, we could have easily had a no on sending it to the Judiciary Committee and then followed on with the impeachment proceedings. So you're exactly correct, sir, that those Democrats who did not vote are just as guilty of this as the Republicans who did.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

I've got to say, too, that I don't think it would have been successful ultimately, because we've had two cases in our history, I think: Belknap, Secretary of War for Lincoln, which failed, and then the recent one for Biden's Secretary of Homeland Security, I think it was.

#Anthony Aguilar

Yeah, Belknap's impeachment proceedings were for corruption—personal corruption within the office—not necessarily war crimes or high crimes, but corruption. And he resigned before the impeachment went forward. They impeached him anyway in the House, and it did not pass in the Senate. And then Mayorkas was the last other cabinet official under Biden who faced impeachment proceedings. So, to your point, it's very unlikely it would have succeeded anyway, past the House and into the Senate, under the 119th Congress. But it would still have been symbolic in terms of a rebuke of this conflict and of Pete Hegseth's behavior. And I think anybody, whether Democrat or Republican, should get behind the fact that this is not how a Secretary of Defense should behave in any regard, including the latest antics of disrespecting the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

The founders' intentions, Danny, with impeachment, I think, have been diluted to the point where it's a meaningless process. I don't think a single one of the instrumental founders—and I mean there, of course, Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, maybe Washington and others—would have thought that we wouldn't impeach and, by impeachment, remove from office at least one scoundrel every generation, including the president. And we haven't done it successfully at all. You might say that Nixon's was successful because the articles of impeachment were so powerful that when leaders of his own party marched over to the White House, he decided to resign rather than be the first president removed by the process of impeachment. But we just don't seem to think that's a constitutional process. And I think the founders, the instrumental founders, would have said, "That's bull. We meant people to be thrown out. We understand Socrates' criticism of democracy."

#Danny

Yeah, great points. Colonel Wilkerson, on the Iranian side of this disastrous war, as you put it, what do you make of what seem like attempts to establish deterrence? Mohsen Rezaei said they're

building nuclear-powered submarines and ships. They've re-engineered up to seven drones. Given all that you just said, if you can't impeach political scoundrels, as you call them, as they're committing war crimes and taking the United States into endless wars, then it seems like Iran is tasked with establishing real deterrence. I'm wondering what you think of these efforts and the public statements being made. What are your thoughts on the Iranian side?

#Lawrence Wilkerson

They don't surprise me, and they don't surprise me in a sense that perhaps you wouldn't recognize unless I elaborated on it, which I will do. When we were working on the A.Q. Khan network, when I was chief of staff at the State Department, we were stunned by several things that we uncovered. One was how many countries were participating, either wittingly or unwittingly in terms of their governments, as best we could determine. I can name the countries, but I won't. This was the first stunning thing we saw.

The second stunning thing we saw was how much the North Koreans were helping Iran and others in the network, but we were really looking hard at Iran. This was taken into consideration in the six-party talks, actually, and used in the six-party talks—not to positive effect, because we didn't have really good talks due to Dick Cheney putting the quietus on them. He would not even let us talk to the North Koreans. We had to talk through the Chinese, the Japanese, the Russians, or someone else. We couldn't talk. Think of Trump now and some of his diplomats not even meeting face to face with any Iranian diplomats.

No criticism of Iran is intended here, even though maybe we would want to offer some. We were just watching what they were doing in terms of learning from the North Koreans about how to work deep underneath the earth in really impervious rock—granite, most of it, or some form of rock like granite—and how they were learning everything from warhead technology to booster technology to, you name it, anything that the North Koreans had learned principally, I think—and I think we had evidence for this—from Russian scientists who were disgruntled at the end of the Cold War because they'd gone from owning dachas and being fairly well off to being, in some cases at least, pariahs within their own society, or outcasts, or having no future. And they moved to Korea, or they moved somewhere else in this network, to help other countries develop nuclear weapons and to get paid quite well. That was another feature of it. Another feature was how much of that lingered in terms of expertise. And that expertise was not just North Korean.

It was also Chinese and Russian. So one of the reasons I think the Iranians are way ahead today is that China has become a real helpmate for them—a significant security helpmate. Russia too, but Russia's a little beleaguered in Europe right now. Still, it's a helpmate. And that help is codified in security agreements, one between Russia and Tehran and one between Beijing and Tehran. All that is to say that the things the North Koreans are doing right now mirror what he just said. They mirror what that general just said. I think that was Rezaei, wasn't it, the IRGC guy? And that goes to the whole list of what he was saying there. The North Koreans are working on firing now.

They already have nuclear weapons they can fire from their submarines. They're working on submerging the submarines and firing them. And there's no doubt in my mind that they're going to achieve that because they also have China and Russia to help them. And the other things that Kim Jong-un and the Kim dynasty in general have done—though Kim Jong-un has really brought this to fruition—echo what he just said. In other words, they're doing all that or have done it already. So the old adage that Qaddafi got killed because he said no, while Kim Jong-un is alive because he said yes, is operative. And it's operative for Iran, which brings me to my point. Iran already has a nuclear weapon, and we will be surprised when they deploy it.

#Danny

Yeah, Tony, same question to you. Your thoughts on the Iranian side?

#Anthony Aguilar

Yes, I certainly agree with the Colonel in terms of what Iran has gleaned from North Korea. This was a problem set that I worked on when I was still on active duty: the subterranean threat, the subterranean capabilities within North Korea. You recall years ago when there were threats that North Korea was going to attack. It seemed almost imminent back in the days when Trump was calling Kim Jong-un "Rocket Man." We were looking at what ground combat would look like on the Korean Peninsula. And we were not going to be successful in defeating North Korea's capabilities through an air campaign because of these subterranean complexes.

It's called hard target defeat—defeating these subterranean, what we call sub-T complexes, which are vast. We saw a recent revelation of the newest complex that's been built in Iran, which is over 100 kilometers in depth and breadth and is interconnected with other facilities, not only to generate missile military power but to supply the logistics. It's an underground city, an underground missile city. That very much came from the lessons learned from North Korea because they have, I would say, mastered that skill in terms of subterranean complexes. And then, looking at what Iran is pursuing now, we've heard all of that since 1992 from Netanyahu: Iran is three weeks away from the bomb, is three weeks away from the bomb.

Well, at this point, they're either no closer to having a bomb than they ever were, or they already have one. I'm leaning more toward the idea that they likely already have one. It's no longer a matter of them being two weeks away or three weeks away. As I said, they're either as far away as they've ever been, or they actually already have it. And my assumption would be that they already have it, because look at what we've forced upon them in terms of, you know, if you don't have a nuclear weapon, you get attacked. I mean, North Korea has threatened the United States to the point where, you know, years ago we were on lockdown in Hawaii and other West Coast states in the United States because of a potential strike.

And we have not initiated military action against North Korea because of their allies and because of their capabilities. So Iran is also taking a lesson from that. And, you know, what Mohsen Rezaei also recently stated in this new revelation was that, you know, we're not going to give up even a gram of our nuclear weapons capability, including material enriched up to 60%. We're keeping all of it. We're not going to give it to Russia. We're not going to give it to China. We're not going to give it to the United States. We're keeping all of it, and we're going to use it. And, you know, he talked about using the enriched uranium for the submarine fleet.

And some people may scoff at that and say, "What submarines?" Well, Iran does maintain a fleet of submarines. They have the Kilo-class submarines, which were Russian-built. They have multiple submarines in that class, one of them being the Tareq, which is probably their most advanced submarine. They have their domestically designed Fateh-class submarines, which are semi-heavy, or medium-sized. And then they have these smaller Ghadir-class midget submarines for intracoastal and coastal operations. But each of these classes—the Ghadir, the Fateh, and the Kilo—is capable of firing ballistic missiles. Even these midget Ghadir-class submarines can fire ballistic missiles.

So all of these submarines that Iran currently has are diesel-electric. Now Iran is pursuing the capability to make them nuclear-powered, along with nuclear energy, nuclear power plants, and modular nuclear reactors for different regions. We have all of those same things here in the United States. So, you know, it seems that in this seven-point framework, Iran has really put its foot down firmly: "All the talks that we've had before about potentially giving up some of our energy or enriched uranium for this—no more. We're not giving up a single ounce. And not only are we not giving it up, we're going to use it. And we're going to use it for this, this, and this." And they've conveyed that to Russia.

So there's already at least some tacit buy-in by Russia because they've been informed of this. So, yeah, the irony in this is just dripping. What we intended, or what we said we were trying to do in this war, has now had nearly the opposite effect. In each of these categories where we said we're going to destroy their ballistic missile capability, they're now producing more ballistic missiles than they were before because they now see the value and the utility in having that capability. You know, trying to isolate Iran—well, in a way, we've kind of connected them more and made them more attractive as an ally to Russia, China, and their regional neighbors because they've stood up against the United States.

They have not fallen. They're still in this. And their neighbors know that, well, Iran's going to be here a lot longer than a U.S. partnership. So maybe we need to start looking toward the future. So in each of these categories that Marco Rubio and Donald Trump and Pete Hegseth have given us as reasons why we're fighting this war, we've had almost the entirely opposite effect. That goes back to what I've been talking about since February 28th, when we started this. We're going into this without a coherent, achievable strategy. And it reminded me of my years in the Middle East—in Afghanistan and Iraq and Syria—when I constantly felt like, you know, the U.S. military was just chasing policy around the desert.

What's our policy? What are we trying to achieve? What's the end state of this? And each year in Afghanistan and Iraq and Syria, that strategy changed. Oh, now it's this. This is going to win. This is going to be the winning formula. And then, sure enough, the very next year, a new commander, a new U.S. commander, a new regional commander. Well, this is now the formula to win. It's like, okay, well, the reason we keep going down these various rabbit holes is because—what's the clearly defined strategy? What are we trying to achieve above all else? And that wasn't clearly defined. And it's not clearly defined in this conflict. And for Donald Trump to say, "We don't need a deal, and we're just going to walk away from this"—he doesn't get that choice.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

Let me hammer home for just a second what Tony just said. If you look back at the JCPOA and the deliberations that took place, look at the people who were on, so to speak, the other side of the table, adhering to sanctions and other things that they are no longer doing. You look at China, you look at Germany, you look at the EU, you look at all the people who were involved with Moniz and with the other negotiators. But I give Moniz most of the credit for the details of this negotiation. Of all things, we actually put a nuclear scientist in the negotiations because he was a cabinet officer.

The things we got from that were largely based on the fact that we had such unanimity among these two now-ardent allies of Iran, who didn't want nuclear weapons there either and therefore joined the crowd, so to speak, to produce this seminal diplomatic achievement of the Obama administration. And what did Trump do? Negated it. A total, total violation of international law. I don't care whether it was a treaty or an executive agreement. International law says such agreements exist and are to be honored, and he violated it. And now he's saying that the purpose of this war is to bring about a better situation than the JCPOA would have created for 25 years, which is a pretty good time period if you think about it. This is an irony of the greatest proportion, as Tony said.

#Danny

Yeah, well, Colonel Wilkerson, maybe to follow up on that, Donald Trump, from his first administration up to the present day, has torn up a lot of agreements.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

The Constitution being the leading one.

#Danny

Oh, yeah. Well, that's a great point. But maybe you can talk about that, because I guess maybe people shouldn't be surprised that every other day Donald Trump is saying something different about talks with Iran, and Iran consistently says, “Well, there are no talks.” And maybe you can

connect it to what just happened in Abu Dhabi, because it seems like the Trump team came with another set of Minsk-like demands. I've said this on another show: it's almost like a circular loop where the Trump administration pretends it's talking but ultimately presents options that are just a nonstarter, generally. But your thoughts on this?

#Lawrence Wilkerson

Well, I think Sergey Lavrov and Vladimir Putin would agree with you 100 percent. And that meeting I described briefly, that Putin just had with Witkoff and Kushner—it's odd that he should meet with non-diplomats, but he didn't seem to be irritated by that. I think he knew he was speaking to the real power structure in the Trump administration. And I'm surprised that they didn't pull out their checkbooks too and hand them to Putin and ask him to put some cash in them. That's their real purpose in life, I think. But if you look at this from the perspective of Abu Dhabi being a breakthrough to a certain extent—and Anatol Lieven has a piece on that at Quincy and is going to do a webinar, I think, not too far into the future on it.

I think there was some territory marched over, if you will, that was a little bit different. And the most salient territory that was marched over, I think, was European security architecture. Now, the EU has swiftly shot that down, brain-dead, insane people that they are. But that at least was broached, and it was broached under that sort of title, ESA, if you will. We called it the European Security Identity in 1990, '91, '92. And we, of course, had the Joint Staff, which had become the best military staff in the world, in my view, under Goldwater-Nichols, taking the top 10 percent of the officers in each of the services rather than the bottom 10 percent.

And Powell had put that into motion swiftly and effectively. We had a really terrific staff. And that staff came up with this solution for the problem at the end of the Cold War, in essence, and it was a European security identity. And it would be separate from NATO, et cetera, et cetera. Well, what they are talking about—what they broached, at least, in Abu Dhabi, even though it's been shot down by the EU big time and would probably be shot down by Zelensky, were he party to it—was just that on a wider scale: a European security architecture, which would include Russia and include accommodation of the situation in Ukraine until Russia could be fully brought on board.

And that would not mean anything for Ukraine in terms of NATO or the EU. It would be neutrality. It might be a rump state, but it would be neutrality—clear and understood neutrality for the foreseeable future. That was positive, I think, but it's been turned into a negative by those who, as I said, have received it in the EU. And I'm sure Zelensky probably turned it into a negative too. If we don't do something like that, if we don't start to talk about a European security architecture and include Russia in that European security architecture—or at least, geographically, Russia from the Urals to the west—I think Russia has already made a decision, not unchangeable but rapidly becoming so, to throw its weight in with the greatest economic power in the world, China.

And I think two-thirds of the world has made this decision to throw its weight in with that group too—two-thirds in GDP and two-thirds in population, if not more. And we're fighting a losing battle against that. But that is underlying everything we're doing, I think. All to say that if we proceeded along those lines, then what was discussed briefly at Abu Dhabi could be a starting point for real negotiations. I don't expect it to be, because of the things I said, but it could be. And it could open the door to what we need to open the door to, which is an accommodation of Russia's desire, one, not to be existentially threatened by any power or by any alliance like NATO, and two, since Catherine, to be a reasonably sane and sound participant in European security. Because if you look at Rand McNally, Russia is in Europe.

#Danny

Well, important points, Colonel Wilkerson. You know, Tony, I wanted to ask you this question to follow up on what Colonel Wilkerson just said. I've seen this pattern develop, and I'm curious about your reasoning and analysis of why this looks the way it does. You have Europe acting as the spoiler during the Trump administration when it comes to this conflict with Russia. It's Europe that's coming in, completely rejecting any resolution and being even more warmongering toward Russia than Washington is. So nothing can really get done in terms of a resolution to the war. And then you have Israel on the other side.

When it comes to Iran, you have, you know, the Trump administration engaging in mediated talks, direct talks, even like what happened in Islamabad. But then oftentimes we hear, well, Israel wants the war to continue, so it continues. Why? How is it that the United States, especially under Trump, presents itself as this all-powerful hegemon that can do whatever it wants, but yet you have entities like the EU and Israel that oftentimes seem to wield influence, at least optically, in ways that maybe far exceed their actual capabilities vis-à-vis the United States? What do you think explains this?

#Anthony Aguilar

Well, first, I want to preface that with what Colonel Wilkerson said concerning Russia. And, you know, when you break out the Rand McNally, you look at the map. Yes, you know, Russia is very much in Europe. In fact, it is a very critical part of the European existence. And when you look at how the United States considers Russia, the United States has European Command, a geographic combatant command much like U.S. Central Command. And U.S. European Command, EUCOM, which is commanded by an Air Force four-star general, Alex Grynkewich, includes Russia. It includes the Central Asian states—Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan—and Russia in the EUCOM architecture. So what we've seen, you know, just since January of 2026, is that Donald Trump has pulled the U.S. out of 66 international bodies. That's just since January.

And if you go back to 2020, you know, right around that time before the transition to the Biden administration, he signed a whole bunch of things pulling us out of things, too. But some of those

things include, you know, the Paris Climate Agreement, the UNFCCC, the World Health Organization. Donald Trump has pulled us out of 31 U.N. entities and 35 non-U.N. entities. Back in 2020, he pulled us out of NAFTA and replaced that with the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or the USMCA. He's pulled us out of UNESCO. He's pulled us out of the Human Rights Council. He's pulled us out of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the AGOA. So, looking at all these things that this president has pulled us out of, in his mind, it's a position of strength: we don't have to be part of these organizations because we tell you what to do.

We don't join these organizations and determine things by committee. We decide. The United States decides. So Donald Trump has this 1980s mindset of the world in a 2026 reality, whereas the United States and Europe should be looking at ways to pursue normalization of relations with Russia, as opposed to being at war with Russia. They should respect certain conditions that Russia has put forth to say, "This is what we see as an existential threat." And the same thing can be said about Iran, in Central Command's area of responsibility in Western Asia: normalizing relations with Iran rather than continuing to make them a pariah and wage war, because we see that the opposite effect can be true and can be the reality that we now face.

But the reason we see this from the Trump administration is that he has this strongman mentality that we don't have to be a part of this. We've seen how he's turned his back on NATO with, "Well, you're not contributing enough, so we're just not going to play anymore. We're going to take our toys and go home." And, you know, consistently making these threats from seemingly a position of strength is not a position of strength. This president doesn't have the discipline and the maturity to interact with these other nations as a foreign policy agent for our country, which the president is, and to act responsibly—not necessarily for what's politically appealing at the time, but for what's better going into the future, 5, 10, 15, 25 years from now.

Case in point: the JCPOA. "Well, this isn't everything I want right now. I'm getting pushback for it. This is attached to Obama. I'm going to pull out of it." Whereas now he's saying that we're hoping, at the end of this war, to go back to something that was better than that. But it looks like we'll be lucky to even get to anything that's close to what the JCPOA was in terms of our relations or our nuclear policy with Iran. So it's the classic strongman type of attitude: "We don't need you. We'll do it alone."

"You need us more than we need you. We don't sit at the table; we are the table." That's Donald Trump's type of attitude. And that's just not the case. That's just not reality, especially when you look at how the world has become so much more interconnected and how much nations rely on one another to normalize relations, rather than saying, "You're my sworn enemy. You're my sworn enemy. You're bad. We're good. You're blue. We're white. This is where the sides lie." That's no longer the reality of the world. And Donald Trump is not at that level. He's still living in the '80s.

#Danny

Yeah, great points. And Colonel Wilkerson, I know that you only have about five minutes left, so I wanted to ask you: Isn't it so interesting that someone the West, especially the United States establishment, calls a strongman, like Vladimir Putin, tends to show far more, I guess, grace and effort in trying to negotiate and actually engage in diplomacy, while Donald Trump and his administration do exactly what Tony just described, which is, you know, behave in this manner?

#Lawrence Wilkerson

I go back to Garry Kasparov's remark: "What would Trump be doing differently if he were a Russian agent?" Emphasis in the original remarks. I think there's some truth to that. I don't think "agent" is the right word, but "agency" could be the right word. And it's all about money. With Trump, everything's about money, ultimately.

#Danny

Yeah, well, maybe you could give your final thoughts on where we are and what you think is most important to take away from this past week. I guess it's been a week since we last had you on.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

Well, domestically, we are at a new point, I think. But I'm wondering—and I'm hoping I stay alive a little bit longer so I can see—if it'll make any difference, because I frankly think our system is broken. And I don't mean broken in the sense that many people do, although they're right in a minor way—maybe not such a minor way—that money has polluted it. It has. That we don't have really competent people anymore who run for public office. That's largely true. That we don't have a public that's educated well enough. Socrates' old criticism: you can't have a democracy because you can't have educated people over an extended period of time. And other things like that. But I think our time is running out. And I've said this before in other venues.

I think China's time is here. And the time for those allied with China is here. And I think this is the great warp and woof of the geopolitical, geostrategic struggle in the world. And you have two approaches to it if you're America. One is accommodation in a cooperative, collaborative way that breeds harmony and comity and takes on the two existential challenges we all confront. Climate change—I don't know if you saw the latest report. The Guardian had the only piece I saw on it. But it is really grim. Twenty years ago, when I joined the Climate Security Working Group—we were DOD, DHS, NOAA, NASA—we didn't predict, by any stretch of the imagination, this temperature rise that we've got.

We have a temperature rise right now, established this year and last year, that is far in excess of what we said was survivable by 2050, 2060. So that's a challenge, a tremendous challenge. And then there are nuclear weapons, without any treaties, and people building them out, including us. Those are things we should be dealing with. So let's admit we're not the number one power in the

world anymore. We aren't. We simply aren't. There are other people allied with the number one power in the world, too, that are far more powerful than we are collectively. So let's meet this challenge by being sensible and wise and smart, and governing ourselves accordingly, as well as dealing with the world. Let's not cast international law on the trash heap, for example. Let's restore it. I don't for a minute think that's going to happen. So I'm going out of this world at a time when my country is falling apart. This is not very invigorating.

#Danny

Well, we certainly appreciate your voice, Colonel Wilkerson, for bringing some actual sanity and a real analysis of the truth of the matter. But I know you had another appointment, so thanks so much for coming on. We'll close out here and look forward to seeing you again soon.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

Sure. Let me go to the judge. Here I go. All right. Take care. Good seeing you, Tony.

#Danny

Guilty as charged.

#Lawrence Wilkerson

Keep up the good work you're doing over there.

#Anthony Aguilar

Tragic. Gaza gets worse every day. They killed 30 yesterday. Yes, and recently Hamilton, the F1 driver, was in Gaza and has been posting quite a bit about what he saw. So, with his fame and his platform, I hope that the word continues to spread to those who will listen about the true nature of what's happening there. Yeah.

#Danny

Take care, everybody. Take care. Thank you. Well, Tony, maybe we can get your final words and follow up on that. I mean, yeah, up to 30 killed in Gaza in just a day. And Colonel Wilkerson brought up a great point about the, you know, political, I guess, regime right now in Washington. And yes, this American exceptionalism problem persists. And I, for one, am also not hopeful about this new Democratic Party regime coming into Congress. I'm hearing $15 billion for Ukraine. I'm not hearing a lot of concrete steps on how to actually reflect the will of the vast majority of people who vote Democrat, which is to completely end that genocide in Gaza and, of course, end the war on Iran. Your thoughts on this as we head into the last five minutes or so here?

#Anthony Aguilar

Yeah, I am not overwhelmingly confident in the 120th Congress. I think the Americans who came out to vote and voted this new Congress in didn't do so because they wanted Democratic policies. It was a rebuke to the war and a rebuke to what the Republican Party has been doing, but it wasn't necessarily an endorsement of Democratic Party policies. Americans want a change in the most critical aspect of what's happening right now, and that's this war. And in the first test of rebuking this conflict, even though it may have been symbolic, where the numbers were there, it was the Democrats who sabotaged this effort for an impeachment vote for Hegseth.

So America should not be fooled into thinking that the Democratic Party takeover in the House and the Senate is automatically going to yield everything that we want and bring about change. If you look across the board at Democrats who have received money from AIPAC or other sources of foreign influence, they actually take more money from AIPAC than Republicans do. And then when you look at, you know, who's in whose pocket, look at Hakeem Jeffries. I think there were signatures on a petition for Hakeem Jeffries not to be put back in as Speaker of the House.

Over a million signatures, and that number is growing. And Hakeem Jeffries said, "Nope, I'm not going to back out of it. I'm still going to run." And, you know, it's likely that he will be Speaker. So the Democratic Party isn't listening to the American people either. So, you know, we are at a point now where, internationally or globally, yes, China's star is rising. China is a rising power, while the United States is a declining power. And had we recognized that earlier, it wouldn't necessarily have been a matter of superior or inferior, or a greater power or a lesser power.

There could have been parity. There could have been economic normalcy, economic parity in terms of how the United States interacts and operates in the global space. But we've chosen to make China a foe and say, you know, "Well, no, they're the bad guy. We're the good guy." Well, now, looking at what China is becoming, it is clear that China's star is rising and the United States is declining. There's no lack of understanding, and it's because of our politics and our domestic governance under the Republican and Democratic parties. I've always said this, and I do see it this way: they are two sides of the same coin.

They are two wings of the same bird. They may look a little different, but in actuality, they're the exact same thing when it comes to the things that they want to fund or the things that they don't want to stand up against. Over the past two and a half years, I traveled to the Capitol one week out of every month and spoke to hundreds of members of the House and nearly every senator. I got just as much of the "Well, it's complicated" or, you know, "Well, we stand by Israel" from the Democrats as I did from the Republicans. So thinking that this election is yielding a new dawn in American politics or governance is simply not true.

And again, the Democrats failed their first test of that, even though it was symbolic. Those 11 didn't fail to vote because they didn't know there was a vote that day or because they didn't set their

alarm clocks. They intentionally chose to be present and not vote because it's, you know, politics instead of doing what's right. But yes, I agree with Colonel Wilkerson in that aspect. And looking at what's coming for the United States, you know, as we approach Sunday, remember that on Sunday, the USS Roosevelt enters the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility.

And Israel is convening its national security cabinet to decide whether to give the green light for strikes on Iran. And that will obviously pull the United States right back into this. These are things that the United States needs to be paying attention to. As much as Donald Trump wants to tell America, "We're done with this. We don't need it. We don't need a deal. We've got the Strait of Hormuz. We've got billions of Iranian dollars. They're destroyed. They're done," it's not true. And Americans need to start paying attention to this, because if you think the Democratic Party and the 120th Congress are going to save us, you're sorely mistaken.

#Danny

Yeah, those are great points. We're already seeing creative new ways of framing this. AOC has this "our hands are tied" narrative now, with "Hakeem Jeffries can't do it. This is just how it works." And I'll go on record saying we have to look out for a huge attempt by the Democrats, when it comes to Iran—especially the war in Iran and everything that's happening in West Asia in general—to frame Trump as this unstoppable, you know, maniac who is going to flout Congress, and therefore there's nothing they can do. And now you need to vote for them for president in 2028. That's kind of how I'm looking at it. No, you're right.

#Anthony Aguilar

The Democrats are very much in the mindset that they would much rather see the nation fail as opposed to exercising their powers and standing up to make those changes, because they want Donald Trump and the Republican Party leadership to look like an abject failure for political purposes, for a Democratic candidate in 2028. It's sad that our Congress would much rather have our nation fail for, you know, political optics, when, with all the powers they have, there are a lot of changes they can now make with a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate, with overwhelming numbers.

They have a lot of power. So it's very discouraging to see that many of these outspoken figures in the Democratic Party in Congress are now saying things like, "Well, our hands are tied," or, "We can't." Or, you know, this vote that was conducted this week—I still think it's a travesty that we have any member of Congress ever not vote, unless they're on their deathbed or incapacitated. That's your job. That's why you're there. I find that to be a complete travesty and a betrayal of the trust Americans place in those we vote into office.

#Danny

On that note, Tony, we can close here. Everybody, hit the like button before you go. That helps boost the program in YouTube's algorithm. All the places to support this show are in the video description below. We always look forward to having you back, Tony. So we'll end the stream here. Again, everyone, hit the like button. And see you all tomorrow at 1 p.m. Eastern time with Larry Johnson. Bye-bye.