

# Larry Johnson & Col. Wilkerson: Iran Just Fired at U.S.-Guided Ships: Trump REVEALS Decision

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's Friday, June 12th, 2026, and our dear friends Col. Wilkerson and Larry Johnson are here with us. Welcome back.

## #Larry

Hi there. I appreciate the show choice today.

## #Nima

It's totally the opposite, by the way. You're right.

## #Larry

You got Team Red, Team Blue. You guys choose.

## #Nima

Larry, you remember last night we were talking about what's going on in the Middle East, and you said that maybe they'd attack Iran. That could be the case. We were talking about the possibilities. One of them was negotiations or some sort of deal. One of them was the attack, new attacks coming. Right now it seems the tone is a little bit more positive than it was last night. What we've learned from the Iranian media, Mehr News—just remembering what happened last night—they tried to somehow force some tankers, oil tankers or commercial vessels, through the Strait of Hormuz, but they were attacked by Iranians.

So nothing happened last night—no total closure of the Strait of Hormuz. Then today we learned from the Iranian media about a new sort of 14-point plan or memorandum of understanding that is

going to be signed by the United States and the Iranian side. And looking at the points mentioned in this memorandum, it's basically the same 14-point plan or 10-point plan Iran prepared before. What we learned last night from the Iranian sources is that in the last two weeks, they prepared the text and sent it to the United States.

The United States tried to add some more points or modify some of the points in the Iranian plan. Then Iran said no. Then we had the attack on Lebanon, then the attack on Iran, then the Iranian response. Then the United States sent the Qatari delegation to Iran, saying that basically, we are agreeing on the same text that you sent us. We're going to remove those modifications or additional points that we tried to impose on the text. So here we are, the new—here is what Mehr News reported: the permanent and immediate ceasefire of war on all fronts, including Lebanon. The same point that we've seen in the 10-point plan.

**#Larry**

Right.

**#Nima**

Let's get started. Larry, go ahead. Your understanding of what's going on?

**#Larry**

Have you seen—did they list all 14 points? Yeah. Yeah. Do you have them there in front of you? You can read them off? Yeah. The reason I'm asking is this right-wing newspaper in Israel, Israel Hayom, is saying Iran's agreed to hand over its enriched uranium. I don't believe that for a minute.

**#Nima**

I just sent it over.

**#Larry**

On Telegram? Yeah. Oh, okay. Let me just take a look. Yeah, look, I know from friends in the military that—but I'm not sure of the timing—but yesterday, the United States was going to carry out some, described as pinprick operations, that were targeted at the Strait of Hormuz, but with strict, strict instructions not to hit what they call dual-use targets, like bridges and power plants, power lines, et cetera, so that it could have a military use or it could have a civilian use, but that this was going to go on for three to four days. Now, but then subsequent to that—or I'm not sure if it was subsequent or precedent—Trump comes out and says, oh, we're getting ready to sign this peace deal. Oh, okay. If they ordered to stand down.

It appears they were ordered to stand down because we didn't have any, from what I could see, pinprick strikes yesterday or in the early morning hours in Iran. And we'll see what happens today. It's late in the afternoon in Tehran. Let's see if anything happens tonight. Now, the signature is supposed to be—J.D. Vance is supposed to sign. He's supposed to be overseas. But Trump's leaving town tomorrow, I guess, to head for the G7 meeting. Well, as I understand it, under the Constitution, you can't have both the president and vice president out of the country at the same time. Somebody's got to stay home and mind the store. So, but, you know, apparently this thing is moving along. I'd be shocked if the U.S. actually signs this. I'll be pleasantly surprised.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. Carl, here is the first point: permanent and immediate ceasefire of war on all fronts, including Lebanon. Just moments ago, we've learned that the Israelis are issuing some sort of evacuation statement in the southern part of Lebanon. They want to bomb some cities or villages in the south. I just don't remember the names. But two of these villages or cities were supposed to be hit today by the Israelis. And looking at the plan, Colonel, there is nothing concerning the Iranian nuclear program or Iranian missile program. It says all about the aftermath of signing this memorandum of understanding. But the first point, I think, is the most important point—this cease, or this cessation, of war on all fronts. Your understanding of that?

## **#Lawrence**

Well, my understanding of a ceasefire or cessation of war on all fronts is that you stop. You know, you stop. You get the word out and you stop. We've seen in the past that they don't understand. We don't seem to understand either what ceasefire means. And Bibi Netanyahu has proven that he doesn't understand what it means. In fact, he exploits ceasefires in devious ways to do more damage than he was doing before the ceasefire occurred. So how do you do what was just suggested? And I don't have the points in front of me, but you told me what the first one is.

If Israel is not going to stop what it's doing in Lebanon, I think that's a non sequitur for Iran. I don't see how you can proceed down that list, whatever it says, to any other opportunity if you're not going to have a ceasefire, or at least one that appears to be holding and applicable to Lebanon. And it's pretty clear to me that Netanyahu, in political trouble if he does do that, is not going to do that. So how do you move from that point, unless you just ignore it? I don't think Iran will.

## **#Larry**

I think you're muted.

## **#Nima**

The second point, Larry, is about the U.S. commitment to non-interference in Iranian internal affairs and respect for its sovereignty. I think they're basically talking about – because looking at recent days, you see many, many weapons have been captured by Iranian media and by Iranian security forces. And you see that in the Iranian media a lot. By looking at the pictures, there are a lot of weapons, as Donald Trump mentioned. And I think basically they're talking about the way the United States is trying to manipulate Iraqi Kurdistan. Because you remember when the United States was attacking Iran, Iran was attacking Erbil in Iraqi Kurdistan. Go ahead.

## **#Larry**

Well, yeah, no, I was just going to say that right there explains the, you know, we had three or four consecutive—let's see, the last strike was, today's Friday—Wednesday. So Wednesday, Tuesday, Monday, you know, Iran was hitting Erbil in Kurdistan. They were targeting, I'm sure, CIA bases that the CIA was actively involved with, providing weapons, support, and training, because they were going to infiltrate those groups to carry out attacks against Iranian security forces. So I'm sure this is Iran's point. Again, I'm going to be surprised if these are these 14 points that Iran's official news agency has published. If that holds, I mean, that would be astonishing, because it would be essentially a declaration of surrender by the United States. And I just don't see how Trump, because he's under, you know, I'd say he's almost under threat from the Zionist elements, could agree to this. But it's going to take this agreement to get this war stopped. So we'll, you know, we'll see.

## **#Lawrence**

I agree with Larry on that. Just thinking about what Netanyahu is facing in Lebanon, what he's facing politically, I don't see how you get this squared. I see how you could square it with the United States if we're willing to eat a lot of crow, and Donald Trump will do that by crowing. But I don't see how you square it with Bibi.

## **#Nima**

Carl, the points when it comes to the blockade, Colonel—the blockade of the United States and the Iranian blockade of the Strait of Hormuz—in this plan, as I see here, the two sides decide to withdraw or to reopen the Strait, the United States and Iran, within 30 days. But the Strait of Hormuz will remain under Iranian control, under Iranian arrangements. They call it “Iranian arrangements” in the Strait of Hormuz. This is, I think—how is that going to influence the region? Because Donald Trump said many of these countries in the region were trying to—UAE, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia. We've learned recently, just today, that one of the countries in the Persian Gulf, GCC countries, didn't let—banned—Israel from using its airspace during the fight when Israel wanted to attack Iran. I... I think it was Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia didn't let Israel use its airspace. Colonel, go ahead.

## **#Lawrence**

Well, you know, you're saying something that I think is absolutely essential if Trump is to weasel his way out of this and its most dire consequences, and those are the economic consequences. So all he's doing there is saying, I recognize that Iran can keep this trade open and ships can flow through it if I'll just stop doing what I'm doing and allow them to do it. That's the basic principle here, I think. And I can solve what might become, over the summer, my biggest problem, and that is the economic effects of the Strait being not necessarily closed, but in the hands of Iran exclusively for whatever ships it wants to pass through, or even more importantly, whatever ships it doesn't want to pass through. So this is the big deal for Trump, I think. This is what's going to haunt him all the way into September, dramatically so, if he lets it go on that long. So I can understand that that would be part of it, but I don't.

## **#Nima**

Understand the mechanics of it, I'd have to see it to see if it's going to work. Yeah, with Larry. The other point is the withdrawal of U.S. forces from around Iran. It means that GCC countries all around, all these big, beautiful bases that Donald Trump said are going to be there—how is that going to be understandable? And it already happened.

## **#Larry**

Yeah. Yeah. No, look, this has been Iran's position from the outset. And if it's true that Trump's finally going to sign off, because I understand all they're doing is signing a memorandum of understanding, this is our verbal commitment that we're going to try to do this, but it's not enforceable. And it's quite reversible if Trump comes under enough pressure. And don't discount that Israel will be trying to carry out some false flag operations to make it appear that Iran has violated this agreement in order to justify a re-ignition of the attacks on Iran. Yeah, look, I don't think we're out of the woods on that. I wish we were.

But one of the other sort of data points to look at is, and it's not publicly available, but I understand that the oil executives, the major oil companies, they told Trump, hey, you're going to have major fuel disruption if you don't get this situation with the Strait of Hormuz and the Persian Gulf sorted out. And, you know, if it goes on for another 30, 45 days, we're going to have really dramatic price hikes that are not just here in the States, but around the world. And it's going to further disrupt the economy, and this is going to be devastating for Republican hopes for the midterms. They're already bad enough as it is, but this will make it even worse.

## **#Nima**

The other point, Carl, in this 14-point plan is the suspension of U.S. sanctions on Iran, which is related to what Larry just said. And is that going to help the oil market? I think the situation with the oil market is going to be long-term damage that has been done so far. I don't see Qatar coming back anytime soon, or Saudi Arabia, or GCC countries in general.

## **#Lawrence**

I think that's probably at the root of Trump's anxiety, if you will. As I said earlier, it's the economic repercussions of this. And he's beginning to understand, being briefed, I hope, by people on it. And he wants—my problem is, is this a delaying tactic? A delaying tactic during which he will sort of circle the wagons, maybe get a little economic relief going, maybe get some ships going, maybe get a little war moving again, and then he'll return to form. I don't know. I find it very difficult to believe that politically he's going to be able to worm his way out of this in the way this memorandum suggests. Because it's mostly, as Larry said, if it's complied with even partially, it's mostly a concession to Iran. And I don't know how you, you know, put lipstick on that pig for Donald Trump.

## **#Larry**

Yeah, yeah.

## **#Lawrence**

Yeah. So I, you know, but I do understand. I had a somewhat lengthy talk with a couple of people in the oil markets business yesterday, and they were presenting a really dire picture if we don't get something going, as Larry was indicating. So I think that must be the thing that's pressuring him right now. But one wonders what the other things are that can pressure him too, foremost among which is Netanyahu in Lebanon and perhaps elsewhere too. We keep forgetting about the Palestinians, whom he has resumed his war against on a daily basis, and Iran's penchant to look at that, as well as the other Arab states, to look at that as a sine qua non of an eventual settlement, if you will, in the area. I don't see any progress in that at all.

## **#Nima**

Israel is putting, based on what CNN reported, pressure, Larry, on Donald Trump and the United States not to release \$24 billion of Iranian frozen assets, which is part of this 14-point plan.

## **#Lawrence**

Right. It says that figure explicitly? Yeah. Okay. Explicitly, yeah. Okay.

## **#Nima**

I don't know if Israel is going to have something to do with the frozen assets if Donald Trump decides to do it. So do you think, Larry, with what we've seen so far, he's going to do it, or has he already done some part of it?

## **#Larry**

No, no, actually, look, I... I don't see how Donald Trump agrees to these 14 points because it would be seen as completely humiliating. Or if he agrees to it, the neocons and Zionists, they'll probably kill him. I mean that literally. This is admitting a complete failure of U.S. policy towards Iran. And look, Iran's demands are not unreasonable, because basically they're saying, stop attacking us. Stop attacking us economically. Stop attacking us militarily. Stop attacking us diplomatically. Just leave us alone and we'll leave you alone.

And, you know, the one thing that Israel would be demanding out of this is immediate cessation of Iranian support for Hezbollah. I don't think actually that Iran's material support for Hezbollah— I think it's more, it's just political support for Hezbollah that's the issue. Hezbollah seems, you know, I think Hezbollah's got its own connections through links other than Iran, where it's been, you know, it was able to get these FPV drones that they've been using so effectively against the Israelis. So this is—look, if you want to solve the Middle East issue, for starters, tell Israel to get back in its cage.

And the United States, Donald Trump has the power to do that. You cut them off from all aid. They will not be happy. They'll scream and holler, but they'll have to come to grips with that, you know, without U.S. aid, they're screwed. And in conjunction with that, I mean, if Trump really wanted to play hardball, he would then send the diplomats out to talk to the Turks to say, okay, guys, you need to cut off the oil to Israel, and go to India and China and say, okay, we're going to stop trade. I mean, really, it's not just the United States that's been an enabler of Israel. It's other countries— India, and even China, even Turkey, and Russia.

## **#Nima**

Turkey, Larry. Turkey is so important.

## **#Larry**

Yeah.

## **#Nima**

Carl, go ahead. I think the combination of Iran and Turkey would put tremendous pressure on Israel, militarily and economically, if they did that.

## **#Lawrence**

Yeah. You know, I'm reaching in and grabbing a diplomatic riposte, if you will. I'm playing diplomat, and I'm saying if I were facing this situation right now, I'd have a really serious talk with Bibi and probably his likely successors. And I would say, let's test this. Let's see what happens if you withdraw from Lebanon—completely withdraw from Lebanon—under an agreement I will effect with both the Lebanese government and Hezbollah, that they not attack you if you do that. And see what happens. In other words, implement a genuine ceasefire with no immediate potential for resumption of hostilities by Israel because they're gone. Now, I don't think for a second Netanyahu would fall for that. I don't think the people replacing him—and I think he is going to be replaced—would fall for that. But if you brought the requisite pressure to bear, you could probably accomplish it.

Now, I don't know what that would mean in terms of insidiously undermining it over time, because that's Israel's tactics. But I'd present something like that and see if it would, you know, fly. There are other things I'd do diplomatically too, but that's the cynical way known, I think. You have to get some kind of settlement in Lebanon to leave Lebanon alone. And you have to have reciprocation—no more attacks on the north of Israel—so they can move back into that area and feel safe. Netanyahu thinks the only way you do that is take the whole of Lebanon. I'm convinced he thinks that. And eventually that's what he would do if he stayed in power and had the prerogative to do that as freely as he could. That's what he'd do. He'd take the whole country of Lebanon, even our embassy. And he'd incorporate that embassy in his repertoire.

## **#Larry**

And we'd let him do it. We'd sign a memorandum of agreement.

## **#Lawrence**

But, you know, there's no creative diplomacy going on at all with this group. None whatsoever.

## **#Nima**

I think, Larry, as the Colonel just mentioned, there are two ways of dealing with Benjamin Netanyahu. Following Benjamin Netanyahu with his disastrous, you know, sort of moves in the Middle East—attacking everybody, killing people, death and destruction—or trying to force him. If you're not able to force him, just leave him, let him be alone in the Middle East. You're the big guy, go ahead and fight it alone, without support from the United States. You don't have the air defense system capable of intercepting ballistic missiles. You don't have the air power. That's why the United States has to do something for you against Iran, because you're not that capable of going deep into Iranian airspace. This is the way that Donald Trump can communicate seriously with him—not by putting pressure, just by leaving him alone.

## **#Larry**

Right, right. No, he doesn't. Donald Trump doesn't have to do anything active other than just stop what we're doing. Same thing in Ukraine—just quit. Yeah, it would go a long way toward ending these. So that's why I say, actually, you know, the United States remains the great enabler of all this. So, you know, I know there's a lot of, I'm seeing in the media that, oh, now peace is at hand, you know, this is going to happen. No. Well, I don't see it happening. Like I said, I wish it would, because I think what Ron has laid out are quite reasonable positions, but the political tides... Now, let me caveat that.

We did see last night in the Congress, the House of Representatives, that they refused to renew Section 702. So that's the one section that deals with spying on Americans. So I took that as one sign that perhaps some sanity is returning. You know, a number of Republicans crossed over to vote with the Democrats to kill that thing. And it should have been killed. But, you know, I think that—I'm not sure necessarily that extends to the foreign policy side of support for Israel. But, you know, I think the Israelis have sort of worn out their welcome in the United States. The worm is definitely starting to turn against them.

## **#Lawrence**

I think we'll see some more of that, I hope, anyway. I don't know if it'll be completely effective, but with—what is it—S.622 or whatever that Cotton's putting forward? 622, I think. 622. Which essentially formalizes the intelligence relationship in a way that Jonathan Pollard would share.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. Colonel, I think the seriousness of what Israel is doing in the United States is spying on the Trump administration, which is totally, totally aligned with the Israelis so far, with what's going on in the Middle East. It seems that they're still fearing that maybe the government may do something different from the way they're negotiating or communicating with the Israeli government. What is that fear? Where does that come from? Because I don't see any sort of difference. These people around Donald Trump—Jared Kushner, Stephen Miller—they are all so connected with Benjamin Netanyahu himself, not the government in Israel.

## **#Lawrence**

Yeah, precisely. I thought that has been a major problem all along. But not only do we have the traditional relationship, we have a very, very venomous, insidious relationship because so many family members—I'll put it that way, I don't mean biologically, but Israeli family members—are ensconced in the administration, or people who are a reasonable facsimile thereof. Maybe there's some sanity happening. Maybe there are some people around the edges that realize—I'd like to think some of them are in the Pentagon, but I don't know that—who are beginning to realize how poisonous this is and trying to push a little bit on it, see what they can get out of it. It wouldn't surprise me that there are people in both the defense establishment and the intelligence

establishment who are not happy at all and who see this as an extremely dangerous process we're making.

And the tighter we get with Israel and the more intimate we get with Israel—and that's the reason I hope this rebounds against this Senate provision—is not only harmful to our national security interests, it's disastrous if it's allowed to develop any further and any deeper and become essentially a snake in the midst of our national security. And that's what it's been, I think, to a certain extent from time to time. But I go back to, I think, I don't know if it was apocryphal or it was real, but I remember Powell relating to me the story about when Reagan picked up the phone and called Begin, I think it was, and told him to get Sharon out of Lebanon, and put the phone down and looked at, I think, Cap, and said something to the effect of, "I think he listened to me." He was stunned. We haven't had that. We don't have that. And we need some of that.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. And the question is, is Donald Trump capable of delivering that? I don't see Donald Trump being—right?

## **#Lawrence**

Well, we're seeing a more and more incoherent president, I think, to the extent that if you watch him carefully—and I don't pretend to have watched him every minute—but he seems to be in a different world from time to time and not connected with reality, which is something you could say about his whole presidency. But at the same time, you find some kind of coherence, especially in the first one and in the beginning of the second one, with some of the things that, for example, even I wanted, like a rapprochement with Moscow. Now you don't see anything except haphazard second-guessing and tweeting. And it appears to have gone downhill really rapidly with him. And I don't know what you do about that because I'm not sure he's coherent anymore.

## **#Larry**

Yeah, in fact, if he signs off on this agreement that Iran has proposed, they will use that as—the Zionist lobby will use that as justification to insist that he's no longer *compas mentis*. That's the other irony here.

## **#Nima**

Each and every point, Larry, in this plan is problematic, you know. I haven't even seen it, though—I sense that. Because it says \$300 billion worth of reconstruction plans in Iran. The United States, together with allies—basically they're talking about GCC countries, in my opinion—and releasing frozen Iranian assets, \$24 billion, and lifting the sanctions on the Iranian energy sector, not only oil and gas but petrochemical and all these sorts of products.

## **#Larry**

Well, that \$300 billion, that's part of the Donald Trump–Jared Kushner enrichment program. They're basically setting up a fund that will give favored U.S. investors a chance to make some money in Iran. But it's dressed up as reconstruction plans, but that's what that is. So, you know, the Iranians are going to sign off and say, hey, we promise, we pinky swear not to produce nuclear weapons. Well, you know, that's been their position all along, and Israel insists for the last 40 years that they're just a week away. So, you know, that'll be, again, sort of a rejection of the Israeli fear-mongering. And then, you know, implementing a monitoring.

They've got to come up with, as they call it, a monitoring mechanism to implement the agreement. So that's what's important. This is just them agreeing on an outline for how they're going to try to work on these issues. That doesn't actually mean they've got an actual agreement to suspend U.S. sanctions on oil and to turn over \$24 billion. There will be a delay, and the longer that delay, the more unhappy the Iranians will become, recognizing that the U.S. isn't to be trusted. And then, in the midst of that, we're going to see Israel working on false flags frantically to try to light the fuse again to keep this war going.

## **#Lawrence**

The idea that Israel is going to be content under any leadership that we can envision—to go back to just killing Hamas and Gazans, annexing the West Bank, and consolidating East Jerusalem, and forget about everything else, including Iran—is, I think, preposterous.

## **#Larry**

Yeah.

## **#Nima**

It says, Colonel, that 60 days of negotiations to reach a final agreement based on nuclear issues and the complete lifting of sanctions. I don't know how you can negotiate for 60 days and reach some sort of agreement. It's just mind-boggling. With the Trump administration, it's going to take 60 years of negotiations because they're not seriously negotiating. They're back and forth.

## **#Lawrence**

Bingo. And I think that has been the essence of Trump's, quote-unquote, I hate to use the word, diplomacy. Whether it's Wilkoff and Kushner expounding it, or whether it's the Pakistanis being fooled into expounding it, or the Qataris, or the Omanis, or whomever, it's delay. Delay, delay, delay. The inevitable is that you have not licked Iran. And how do you deal with that? How do you deal with that and come out of it with at least your pants still on, economically and otherwise, and

sell it? I think that's the problem. So what do you do? And this is not unusual in great power confrontations. You delay, you delay, and you delay, and you delay, and you never really accomplish anything. And in our case, all you have to do, if your eye is not on some nefarious domestic development—and I don't discount that—but all you have to do is delay until you're done. That's part of our system. Right. Turn it over to your successor, whomever it might be. Yeah.

## **#Nima**

Larry, the only possible opportunity, in my opinion, that this sort of memorandum of understanding may make for the two sides is going to be some sort of off-ramp to just leave the region for Donald Trump, and just leave the region without committing anything to the Iranian side. I think the whole point could be that.

## **#Larry**

Well, yeah, but the U.S. is not going to leave quietly because there's too much money at stake for investments in Dubai in particular, to a lesser extent Qatar, but also Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. So this is, you know, they're going to have to figure out a way to bridge that — that the U.S. will cease being involved militarily but will remain heavily involved economically. Because right now I don't see any way to disengage. You know, there are too many wealthy people in the United States with financial stakes there in the Gulf countries.

## **#Lawrence**

There's one way to begin to ameliorate that situation somewhat, and that's to look back at what Dick Cheney wanted to do when he was CEO of Halliburton. Halliburton had a massive plan for going back into Iran, and Cheney was advocating for it—to attract more U.S. entrepreneurship, investment, and so forth into Iran, and to actually turn the situation on its head, so to speak, and make Iran again a major instrument of at least American economic success in the region. One wonders how that would settle with the Arabs ultimately, but if it were shared, it probably could. But this is creative stuff.

I'm not sure that this administration, I'm not sure any administration in the United States anymore, infected by Israel, is capable of doing this sort of thing. But it flies in the face of what they want to do, which is ultimately have the region essentially to themselves. And when I say that, I mean they want the territory too. I really believe that. I think they covet Jordan. They covet portions, if not all, of Iraq. They covet Lebanon. And it's a real thing for them. And as long as it is, this is a very different Israel, I think, from what we've dealt with, obstreperous though it's been for so long, arguably since '48. But this is a very different issue.

This is not even Arik Sharon in the Oval Office looking at George W. Bush like a deer caught in the headlights when Bush tells him, "It's over to you. You can take it all over now." Well, there was an

element of Sharon that was gleeful about that, and you've got to look at him as sort of the precursor for what Netanyahu is doing and has done now. But still, this is not the Israel we knew, as treacherous and as horrible as it was at times—in '73 in particular, '67 in particular. It's a very different Israel. It's an Israel that is, how do you put it, wants a lot in the region—everything it can get its hands on—and still wants Iran to be not an object of resistance to that. And the only way you do that is carve them up into pieces and leave them in chaos.

## **#Nima**

Larry, I think the concept of Greater Israel is still there, and it will be forever for Israelis because that's the main agenda. They're not going to give up on this plan. And it depends on the region—how the region, how the changes in the region would impose pressure on Israelis. And with Section 224 that you've just mentioned, merging the two militaries, the U.S. military and the Israeli military, it means that Israel is somehow concerned about what's going on in the United States. That's why these sort of Zionists in the United States are trying to formalize this cooperation between the two militaries, because they're afraid of the internal move in the United States, the shift that is happening.

## **#Larry**

Well, no, that's true. I mean, they see that the political winds are moving against them, which is why the purpose behind 224, as I interpret it, is that it takes it out—it basically puts it behind a curtain for Defense Department appropriations that normally, if it was being handled by the State Department, would have a higher political profile, would be open to debate, would be more easily subjected to sanctions. Whereas if it's hidden behind the Department of War curtain—or the old DOD, you know, old habits die hard for me—the DOD curtain, then they've got some insulation.

I mean, they recognize they're going to have a tough row to hoe, or a tough road to drive on, coming down in the next year or two because of the shift in the political winds, with a growing number of people under the age of 50 who think they favor the Palestinians, who think Israel has too much influence. And, you know, Israel's done it to itself because they're so damn obnoxious and arrogant. There's not an ounce of humility in that at all. And so they sort of celebrate how much they can take advantage of the United States, and that is not sitting well with a growing number of Americans.

## **#Lawrence**

And, Nima, we forget about another thing, too, that I think is a dimension of Israel as much as it is a dimension of us. And Julia Glatfelter, in her testimony before Congress yesterday or the day before, was indicative of this. Had she been able to go into great depth on some of her issues, she would have seen just how bad it is now. And there are a number of reports out there that are in detail about just how bad it is right now. All to say that this allows Israelis to share in the slop in the U.S.

system. And we're talking about, with Lockheed alone, but certainly with the big six, a hell of a lot of slop—like maybe about one or two trillion dollars over the next decade. That's a hell of a lot of pot money to steal. And I don't put it past them at all to be looking at that prospect, too. And Lockheed salivating over it because they'll take their share, too. Thank you very much.

## **#Larry**

I just got this flash out of Scott Bessent, the Secretary of the Treasury, doing everything in his power to sabotage this deal. He just put out, he said, any tolls paid to the Persian Gulf Strait Authority will be offset by funds extracted from their accounts. So, in other words, the United States says, we're going to take your Iranian assets, and whatever fees you collect, we're going to recapture that. So, you know, Iran's not going to put up with this for a minute. And, you know, I think we're going to be looking at an extended war here.

## **#Lawrence**

Yeah.

## **#Larry**

Stillborn, yeah.

## **#Lawrence**

Yeah. Yeah.

## **#Nima**

Which we know the GCC countries are so desperate for. I think with the case of the energy market, Larry, as you've mentioned, it's so important to be considered, and how they're capable of putting pressure on Donald Trump. That's real. That's real.

## **#Larry**

Right.

## **#Nima**

And the second one is the GCC countries. And the GCC countries are so desperate. Their economy was just destroyed during the war. And the third, I would say, is the fragility of Israel to defend itself. If it decides—because Israel, look at this—let's assume these Zionists are running the show in Washington. So what would Trump do for Israel to defend Israel if Israel continues with these attacks? Let's assume they attack Beirut.

## **#Larry**

Yeah, yeah, no, it is.

## **#Nima**

He has no good option, by the way. Just putting it out there. There is no good option for Donald Trump.

## **#Lawrence**

And what do you think the G7 countries are going to say to him behind the curtains too, other than the U.S.?

## **#Larry**

Yeah, the U.S. isn't entering the G7 talks in a strong position economically at all. But, you know, today, Friday, is the big day for the Musk IPO for SpaceX. And there have been lots of indicators that you've got a tech bubble developing with the whole AI industry. So again, what looks to be a positive, some movements in the right direction with the economy, are just false warnings. And that economic power is important when it comes to being able to back up diplomatic pressure in the Middle East. Yeah.

## **#Nima**

In the case of Elon Musk, Iranian media published yesterday that the new targets of Iran in the GCC countries are going to be the SpaceX facilities in those countries.

## **#Larry**

Yeah. Hey, listen, I apologize. I'm going to have to bail out. I've got to head to the airport.

## **#Nima**

Yeah, we know that, Larry.

## **#Larry**

But I'll leave you in good hands.

## **#Nima**

All right, guys.

## **#Lawrence**

Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Larry. We'll talk later. Where are you going, to the G7?

## **#Larry**

No, actually, I'm going to Russia Day at the UN Mission in New York. Okay. Good for you. All right, guys. Later. See you soon.

## **#Nima**

Bye-bye. Colonel, I think what is important right now with the case of the negotiation is that if GCC countries decide to, as I said, Saudi Arabia said no to Israel, my understanding is that it was Saudi Arabia because the only country that is on the way to attack Iran is Saudi Arabia, because they're using Iraqi airspace freely without having any sort of problem. So that must be Saudi Arabia banning Israel from using its airspace. This is... Looking at the region for Donald Trump, these countries, these GCC countries, don't see Israel the way it was before the war started. This is the reality.

## **#Lawrence**

No, I think you're right. I think it's been a sea change, a sea change. We've gone from the Abraham Accords and what looked like a takeover by Bibi to absolutely no possibility. And if that pipeline is shifted, if it actually goes ahead the way I'm hearing it's planned now and goes through Syria rather than through Haifa, he's lost a huge economic boon. Not just transshipment fees, but he would be getting fuel from it.

## **#Nima**

You've mentioned something so important, Larry, with the case of when Larry Johnson was talking about how these other countries can cooperate. You mentioned Turkey. I think Turkey is the key here. And the way that Turkey behaves today is part of their sort of understanding, the mutual understanding between Turkey and the United States. They try to get closer to the United States. That's why they're sending gas and oil to Israel. I don't see any sort of good relationship between the two, Israel and Turkey, but they want to be part of, you know, they want to be close to the United States. That's why they're behaving this way. It's not because of the quality of the relationship between Turkey and Israel. Do you think at some point the United States gives the green light to Turkey to go do something, put some pressure on Israel?

## **#Lawrence**

Not with Trump, I don't think. And not with Hegseth and Vance and Rubio. I could see it happening with another president, another administration. But, you know, I think Turkey is looking for its future. It's doing a lot of things that are economically in its favor, or they think it is. But it's looking for its future, and it's looking north and seeing that NATO is disintegrating. I would, frankly, I would have put 50-50 chances on Erdogan himself making a decision to announce a departure from NATO. And then I got to thinking about it and saying, no, he's going to wait, and he's going to see just how bad the disintegration is before he does that.

He's checking his six and his flanks, and he's looking around and he's saying, but I don't want to disturb my relationship with the empire across the Atlantic because that's really the only choice I have other than folding myself into this inexorable development of Russia, China, India. Maybe ultimately he will go that way. I don't think neutrality as neutrality is a real option for him anymore. I don't think he thinks that anyway. I don't know about Fidan or the foreign minister. I don't know him that well. So I've always said we're... always.

I mean, I was saying this to Powell in 2002, 2003: where Turkey goes, so goes our future in many respects—not just because of their incredibly geostrategic location, but also because of the size and capabilities of their army and the fact that they tilt the balance, if you will. Yeah, you could even say they tilt the balance between Asia and the West. And it's critical they make the right decision not only for themselves, but also, I think, for the security and the somewhat robustness—if it's to be at all robust—of the remaining transatlantic relationship, all of which Ukraine is destroying. And it's destroying it because of us more than anything else.

The Europeans are helping too, but because we won't back off this business of supporting Zelensky to the hilt as much as we can, and in clandestine fashion, if you will, which isn't clandestine to people like Putin at all. So Turkey's caught in the middle of this, and it's really got to be careful about what kind of decisions it makes that are more or less foreclosing the past, if you will, and opening a new future. And it's not very brave about doing that, so it may wait too late to make a decision. What does that mean? It means Turkey probably is in some kind of bastardized neutrality and looking for a place to hide. But it is key, and watching Turkey over the next decade or so is going to be a key indicator of where this is all going to boil down. Do we have a war with Europe? Russia and Europe.

Do we have a war that spreads out of Southwest Asia? Does Turkey get involved? Does Israel get ultimately checked big time, maybe even existentially checked, even to the point where they can't even have a Jewish state in the Levant that is a democratic state and accepts all comers? They're just gone. They disappear. All of these things are going to happen over the next decade, decade and a half, I think. And Turkey will be in there in the middle of it, I believe. And if we don't show a better ability to manage diplomatically the world that we face and back away from sanctions and military force in a significant way, we're going to be in this mess too.

And all of us are going to come out looking very bad when it's settled a bit. And I just hope the settling is not inclusive of nuclear war, because we're painting a very dire-looking road, especially in Ukraine, to at least Putin attacking outside Ukraine, NATO assets outside Ukraine, and then Brussels invoking Article 5, and the United States, essentially Trump, essentially saying, are you kidding me? I'm not coming. Then what do the Europeans do? They have a minuscule nuclear arsenal. And that's just it. It is minuscule. Russia has, you know, probably the largest nuclear arsenal in the world. That's a lot of weight to be tossing around or to be defying if you're Europe.

Anyway, I think it's a difficult, difficult situation, and we're making it even more difficult with this more or less delaying tactic with regard to this war we should never have started in Southwest Asia. It's taken Trump's eye off of Ukraine too. I don't think he pays any attention to Ukraine now. When he goes to the G7, I'm sure he'll have to answer questions about it. I would love to hear how he answers the questions. Are they going to be flippant answers like he normally gives? "Well, I could end it in 24 hours if I wanted to. It's not really that important anymore. It'll wind itself down. They'll have a ceasefire pretty soon." I would be very concerned about developments in Ukraine for anyone in Western Europe, but certainly in the G7 countries. I would be very, very concerned.

## **#Nima**

Larry, here is what First News said. It says the claims made by Donald Trump and some foreign media that the agreement has been finalized and is to be signed on Sunday in Geneva are absolutely not true. Essentially, the review and... are not true?

## **#Lawrence**

Are not true. Are not true? Okay, yeah.

## **#Nima**

And essentially, the review and decision-making process in Iran has not yet been finalized. And therefore, both the announcement of Sunday and the location of Geneva are completely denied. This is the latest news from Iran. Lies?

## **#Lawrence**

Lies, did you say?

## **#Nima**

No, they're completely denied.

## **#Lawrence**

I was going to ask you what the Persian word for lying was. That's pretty strong language. But that tells you that we haven't closed the loops, you know.

## **#Nima**

Yeah.

## **#Lawrence**

This is an interesting development. I said this to, I think it was my daughter the other day. I said, you know, if you look at this situation, as horrible as it is for the empire, as stupid as this war of choice was for Trump to enter, there is one party in this that you can trust to, by and large, tell you the truth about what's happening pretty much all the time — Tehran.

## **#Lawrence**

I mean, I'm not saying that that's a great quality. I'm just saying that that's their position. Maybe it's all a warp and move for their position. They know where they are. They know their resolution. They know that they've got the stick-to-itiveness or whatever. But they're the ones you listen to for a contradiction of what Trump says or what anybody else says, and you understand that you're probably hearing the truth about that particular situation anyway.

## **#Nima**

I think for me, they haven't lied so far. Everything I followed, they knew. It's not in their interest. It's just the way it is.

## **#Lawrence**

Yeah, I think that's probably a Persian characteristic. I've always thought that. But I also think they have nothing to gain from cheating or lying.

## **#Nima**

Well, what's the point of that? The truth shall set you free. How is that going to help them? Yeah, exactly. Here's what the Financial Times reported, Larry — that Iran's missile cities shocked the United States and Israel during the war. For 40 days, the United States and Israeli aircraft bombed the mountains around the missile city of Yazd, and all the munitions proved ineffective against the granite rocks of the mountain. It says that Iran kept launching missiles until the final moments before the ceasefire from Yazd, from that particular city. So this is the reality, I think — the way that

Donald Trump has finally decided, what is the point of continuation of this war? Are we gonna attack more civilian infrastructure? Are we gonna kill more people? Because if the attacks are not effective on these missile cities, the production of drones and missiles — so what's the point?

## **#Lawrence**

You know, the depth of his war crimes alone, but the depths of his killing are reaching proportions that might rival some of our past wars, where we just kept bombing and kept bombing and kept bombing. I think about Vietnam, of course, and just killing people left and right, most of whom were innocent civilians. You know, you think about those B-52 strikes, those arc-like strikes and so forth, the Rolling Thunder and such — we killed a shitload of civilians. These are all, you know, we don't seem to think about this much anymore. I don't think we think about it at all. Look at the 200-plus people we've killed on the high seas in the Caribbean and the Pacific — black mark on the American military, like the black mark on the American military that came out of the Philippines when we machine-gunned people in ditches. We don't care. We don't seem to care anymore.

## **#Nima**

Here is what Donald Trump tweeted moments ago: "The terms that Iran leaked out to the fake news have nothing to do with the terms that were agreed to in writing. What they said, including their weak and pathetic statement on having a deal, bears no relation to the truth. Very dishonorable people to deal with. With them, there is no such thing as dealing in good faith. Amazing. Also, their totally rebuffed drone attack last night against Indian ships leaving the Strait of Hormuz is totally unacceptable. It's totally unacceptable, the Iranian attack on the Indian ships," he said. "And they better get their act together, and fast."

## **#Lawrence**

This sounds like, you know, I thought this when you first started reading that paper. It sounds like a kabuki game again. It sounds like Trump's setting up straw men, knocking down the straw men, and as he knocks down the straw men, he's knocking down the perfidy, the lying, the dishonesty of the Persians. What he's doing is creating his own situation where he can do that. I imagine Ron's probably going, what the hell did he say? And the fact that there's no direct talks going on just boggles my mind. I had to live through this, as I've told you before, with the North Koreans. But even that was more direct than what's happening now with the Iranians. We could at least sit in the room with the North Koreans in China or wherever, and they could interpret for us, if you will.

We couldn't talk directly to the North Koreans. Cheney wouldn't allow us to do that, but we could talk through those interlocutors — the Russians, the Chinese, and others. You don't even have that here. You don't have anybody in the room with the Iranians, period. At least I've heard nothing in Islamabad or Dubai or wherever — Muscat. And I've heard nothing about anybody sitting down face to face with the Iranians, even if it required translation by a third party or passing through a third

party, as it was with the six-party talks. Nothing. So how in the world do you ever develop a diplomatic solution? I just don't see it. This looks to me like stalling tactics.

## **#Nima**

I think the sign that you're not serious in the negotiation was the point that you just mentioned. You don't need to send the Pakistani government. There is a report that the Biden government, behind the scenes, was doing some sort of secret negotiations. You don't need to do that. You just go and talk. You want to talk? You go and talk.

## **#Lawrence**

That's the essence of diplomacy. And that's what, when Powell got on Air Force One without anybody else but the president — I think they were flying to Africa — Powell took advantage of that and talked the president into allowing us direct talks with the North Koreans. Jim Kelly was headed over to Beijing, as I recall, and he got to Hawaii to refuel. And Cheney had come back from fishing in Wyoming or wherever, got in with the president, found out what had happened, and reversed it. So we couldn't talk directly. What happened with all of that diplomacy? The North Koreans got a nuclear weapon.

## **#Nima**

I think with the situation right now we're witnessing, they're somehow putting pressure on Iran in a way that Iran sees there's no way to put an end to the war permanently. So they have two options: stay in the fight, sort of tit for tat — ISIS attacking, Israel attacking — or do something about it. I don't see that solution being together with the United States, maybe with China, with Russia, with the region. But the United States is not going to be part of this because there's so much influence. The Trump administration is so influenced by the Israelis. It's impossible.

## **#Lawrence**

I'm afraid you're right. I'm afraid you're right. And it's not just Trump himself, it's the legislature too. When you've got people like Cotton and Graham and others who are just die-hard Zionists themselves, it's very difficult to have two aspects of a three-tiered government. I'm not going to put the Supreme Court in there, but if there were any legal decisions to be made, I'd probably put them in there if they referred to Israel, and they'd make the right decisions if they're infected. And they're all infected. They're infected by, as Mearsheimer and Walt pointed out, the Israel lobby.

And despite the American people and Charlie Kirk's assassination, I think, put a pinpoint on this — departing from liking this relationship, even being opposed to this relationship, especially younger Americans — it takes a long time for that to evolve into political action, into actual changes in the legislature, for example. A lot of damage can be done in the interim. And Israel knows that. Israel

knows that. That's why Bibi is striking hard. That's why his congressmen wrote Section 224. That's why he's doing this. He wants to grab as much as he possibly can before that momentum grows and winds up kicking him out of the United States.

## **#Nima**

Carl, what do you make of the latest comment from Keith Kellogg? He's basically suggesting the use of nuclear weapons against Iran. Here's what he said.

## **#Speaker 04**

Finish the job. Having a protracted war is not the American way of war. It's a war we've been conditioned to in the last few decades, where we've done things in Afghanistan or Iraq. We ought to go back to the way we did it in World War II or World War I, and we just finish the job — total war, obliterate them — and say, when you need to come to the table and you want to talk to us, you've got our phone number, but until then we're done. Because right now we're playing their game, not our game. Let's play our game and force them to come to us.

## **#Lawrence**

Sounds like Jonathan Pollard. He sounds just like Jonathan Pollard. You know, he sat there in his big fat Jabba the Hutt room and essentially said nuclear weapons are not such bad things. We ought to use them. This is the kind of thing that you have to deal with sometimes. And, you know, I would say it recurs frequently. But recurring in the age of nuclear weapons is really a new dimension. It's scary. It's frightening. Nima, I think we're going to use them. I really think we're going to use them. I don't mean here in Iran. I hope not. But I think, in one or the other place — Ukraine or Southwest Asia — I think we're going to see the use of nuclear weapons.

My inclination is it'll be Bibi. But I invite everyone to read the chapter on Jonathan Pollard in Sy Hersh's book and then come away from that thinking that there's a chance for non-nuclear use eventually in this relationship between Jerusalem and Washington. I mean, why did they get it in the first place? Well, we wanted it as a deterrent. Well, no one else has the weapon. What do you mean a deterrent? No one else has the weapon. No one else is, unless you include Iran in this, and I think that's preposterous because they have said for 20 years that they weren't building a nuclear weapon, and I believe them. Why did they have the weapon then? And you go back and look at the times when they actually moved weapons that we know about now. They were in conventional wars.

They were going to be used on the Egyptian Third Army, for example. How are they a deterrent, and what are they a deterrent to? Are they a deterrent to conventional might? Well, Israel, you've shown that by preemptive strikes, mostly, you can handle conventional stuff, particularly if the United States has given you the F-16s, F-15s, the 250- and 500-pound bombs, and everything else. You can handle all that. So why do you need nuclear weapons? Well, ultimately, we need them so we can

execute the Samson Option. Because one day in the future, we might be up against a real coalition of power. Or maybe we might be up against a single state like Iran that is preponderantly far more powerful than we are. And we might have to use it. They scare me. They scare me. They scare me because of their nature.

And when I say they, I mean people like Smotrich and Ben-Gvir. Anyone who doubts, having listened to Smotrich and Ben-Gvir at the beginning of the period after October the 7th and the remarks they made, doubts that they would have any, any compunction about using a nuclear weapon is smoking some cheap stuff. These guys would. So it still frightens me. It still leaves me cold when I think about the potential for this little pipsqueak state on the eastern end of the Mediterranean to be the only country in the environment, other than Pakistan, possessing nuclear weapons. And I try to figure out why. Well, I know ultimately why, because they realized that ultimately they really might have to use them. That's not a deterrent. That's an insurance policy for when you're going down, you take them out.

## **#Nima**

There are two sorts of bombs, atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs. Yeah. I was making it. The atomic just divides the atom, it breaks the atom, but the hydrogen just combines two atoms, and it's going to be much bigger.

## **#Lawrence**

Just look at the difference between what you're usually looking at when you look at Alamogordo, the test, or you're looking at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and look at Bikini Atoll, which was the new kind, the thermonuclear. Devastatingly different. I think, if I remember right, that was a thousand times—Bikini Atoll was a thousand times more powerful than Nagasaki and Hiroshima. A thousand times. So what do you need with that? You want to commit harakiri in your region?

## **#Nima**

Exactly. I think before wrapping up, let me play a message from Margaret Thatcher to Iranians. Here's what she said.

## **#Speaker 05**

Winston Churchill said in the '30s, if you give in to aggression, there will be no end to the humiliation you will have to suffer. Some people suggest there should be negotiations. What is there to negotiate about? You don't negotiate with someone who marches into another country, devastates it, killing whoever stands in his way. You get him out. You make him pay and see that he is never in a position to do these things again.

## **#Lawrence**

Wow. Describing Donald Trump. In fact, describing George W. Bush in 2003 as well. Yeah. We have become death. I mean, you know, I watched that Oppenheimer documentary the other night. I just watched the movie itself, and the documentary with Kai Bird and others commenting on Oppenheimer is quite interesting too, particularly the latter part of his life when he really kind of went off the deep end and then regained his composure and came back. But, uh, you know, the whole process of developing a nuclear weapon was a process that probably affected people differently and fundamentally. But overall, I think the people were of a caliber that they realized this is probably one of the most dangerous things humankind has ever done.

Oppenheimer himself potentially realized that. I think it haunted him, particularly when he went to bat for stopping that transition to the thermonuclear weapon from the original atomic weapon, and he lost. And he lost essentially—and this is my understanding of it—and McCullough in his book, and now to a certain extent others, I think, have accepted this. It takes Truman about a second or two when he's briefed thoroughly on what it means to go from the current bomb to the new bomb. "Do it." You know, there's no reflection. There's no pretense of understanding exactly what your decision might mean. There's no pushback. There are no questions. And there's no way you could convince me that Harry Truman understood. And I like Truman.

I think he was a good president, all in all. And he certainly was the power behind the committee that investigated all the freaking treason during World War II by big contractors—big contractors who were cheating the people in the field, cheating the American taxpayer—and his committee did a lot of good. But to sit there, as he was wont to do, Missouri's stony face, and say, "Do it," you know, when presented with that decision. Now, he could say, well, the Soviets are how far away? They're going to do it. They may have already done it. They stole everything, so they may have already done it. Still, to be the country that did that and did it so cavalierly, I would not want that in my biography. I mean, the difference in these bombs is orders of magnitude.

## **#Nima**

Unbelievable. The hydrogen bomb is much, much more powerful than the atomic bomb.

## **#Lawrence**

You bet. You bet. I had a good friend, my boss in the Pacific, whose brother—I think he was in his late forties—a Navy captain who actually went on some of the ships that were, you can see if you watch the mushroom cloud, which is just incredible. You can see the ships as the mushroom cloud expands and the blast wave expands and comes over them. Well, three or four days afterward—they didn't know so much about radioactivity and other things—three or four days afterward, they went aboard these ships with clipboards and everything to assess the damage and so forth.

Well, he died of cancer a few years later, and they sued the Navy because, you know, I don't think anything ever came out of it. But he lost his brother to cancer that was clearly caused by his going on those ships that early. There are just so many heinous things about these weapons. I invite everyone to watch the Ellsberg documentary that's out right now. And there's going to be a much longer one out in probably about six or seven months. And Dan Ellsberg is eloquent in his, and probably no one was closer to the phenomenon other than the scientists who actually worked on it then. And when I say phenomenon, I mean the potential to use them.

**#Nima**

Yeah.

**#Lawrence**

And he made his whole, the whole rest of his life was dedicated to stopping that. You know, he got in a Jeep with a driver and drove out to ground zero when Ronald Reagan was about to make a final test before the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty went into effect or whatever. We had it scheduled, so we were going to do it out in Nevada. And he drove through the fences and everything else and made it to ground zero in order to stop them from doing it. I mean, this was a real courageous guy and turned around completely because, of course, before he was working deeply and ran deeply with the Pentagon on all of this stuff—nuclear strategy, nuclear weapons, everything. And he saw what he was working on, and he said, holy shit, how can I do this?

**#Nima**

Thank you so much, Col. Wilkerson, for being with us today.

**#Lawrence**

Let's see what happens with this diplomacy.

**#Nima**

But you're leaving us. You're going to be out for two weeks, yeah?

**#Lawrence**

Yeah, I'm going to be gone. Without internet, without any... No, I probably won't even have cell phone coverage, because when you get up on the mountain, there's no cell phone coverage at all.

**#Nima**

Yeah.

**#Lawrence**

Come down into Superior, Montana.

**#Nima**

Just check the news, check the news.

**#Lawrence**

We'll come down periodically and check our cell phones.

**#Nima**

Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Larry.

**#Lawrence**

Take care.

**#Nima**

See you soon.

**#Lawrence**

See you in a couple of weeks, maybe.

**#Nima**

Yeah, see you.

**#Lawrence**

Take care. Bye-bye.