

Daniel Davis: "Ceasefire Is Over" With Iran & Escalates the War With Russia

Lt. Col. Daniel Davis is a 4x combat veteran, the recipient of the Ridenhour Prize for Truth-Telling, and is the host of the Daniel Davis Deep Dive YouTube channel. Lt. Col. Davis discusses how the U. S. has returned to war against Iran and also deepens its involvement in the war against Russia. Daniel Davis Deep Dive: <https://www.youtube.com/@DanielDavisDeepDive/videos> Buy Diesen merchandise: <https://diesen-shop.fourthwall.com/en-nok> Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennDiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glennDiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glennDiesen> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We are joined again by Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Davis, a four-time combat veteran and host of the Daniel Davis Deep Dive. I'll leave a link in the description to his excellent podcast. So thank you for coming on. Now, it seems that the U.S. is going back to war against Iran, but also deepening its involvement in the war against Russia, if we're to believe some of the statements being made now at this NATO summit. I thought a good place to start might be Iran. How exactly did this happen? From what I understand, Iran attacked civilian ships that did not follow Iran's administration of the Strait of Hormuz. Anyway, now we're told by Trump that the Iranians are scum, the MOU is dead, and he's going to hit the Iranians very hard. I'm also wondering if we can unpack... Yeah, I guess none of us really believed that this would last, but nonetheless, this seems to be a very abrupt and violent end to this ceasefire.

#Daniel Davis

You know, Glenn, the bottom line here is that President Trump has no idea what he's doing, and he doesn't know. And I'm not using that as a pejorative. I'm using his own words and observing what's going on. He's trapped himself in a position he can't get out of and doesn't know how to get out. All the leverage he has previously used to be able to succeed and to bludgeon people and to coerce them and to threaten them or whatever has worked up until now, and he doesn't know how to act when all of a sudden all these things that have historically worked, not just for him but also for previous presidents, are now fizzling out.

They're not succeeding, even when we use a lot of military power. And this dynamic was caught on Air Force One last night. There was an interview he had where he was point-blank asked, are we

going back to full-scale war? Not just is the MOU dead, not just is the ceasefire dead, but are we going back to war? And his literal answer, the first word out of his mouth and the second phrase is, I don't know. I don't know. But if we did go back, it would be easy. It would be bloodier. And he goes on there. But his initial answer, as the commander in chief of the United States Armed Forces, the guy that took us into this war, doesn't know what to do now.

And when you have the guy who's calling the shots that doesn't know, and he has this whole recent experience here, this episode of trying to use military power, and he bragged about hitting them 20 to 1, and "I'll do the same if they don't learn the lesson," although he never says what the lesson is supposed to be. He doesn't even have a clear idea what this power is supposed to accomplish. And that by itself is a huge problem. But it's just not working, whatever he may think he wants them to do, which I think is, generally speaking, to just bow the knee and submit and go to ground, like what used to happen when—whether it was, I think, even, I don't remember if Obama did, but certainly Biden and Trump—they used to launch cruise missiles periodically into Syria.

Bashar al-Assad would go to ground, or he would take no action in response. And I think that's what they expected here too, that that's what would happen. Look what happened in Venezuela. Trump keeps talking about that. We had one big, splashy, made-for-TV military operation where we killed a bunch of people, had some helicopters against the backdrop of some cool videos and fires in the background, all of which were performative. It had nothing to do with the actual seizing of Maduro. That was coordinated from the inside and could have been done at a much lower level. But he wanted the for-TV splashy stuff, and he got it, and he got him, and it worked in and out clean, no casualties, etc. That's what he thinks is supposed to be the case. And so this one is not following the script because it's not working. So what is he going to do now?

He doesn't know. You ask about how we got to this point here. This really is another one of the examples of why we're in such dire straits, both here and in the Russia-Ukraine war, because we don't want to do the hard work of diplomacy. When we got this memorandum of understanding, it took whatever it was, I think from April 9th, 8th, or 10th, somewhere around there, until it was finally signed on, I think, June 17th. So just barely a month to get a 14-point thing signed up, which, by the way, was never a deal, which is the phrase President Trump kept using. But it was merely a signpost that started the negotiations to get to a deal that would have ended the war.

And that juxtaposition and confusing of terminology is, I think, more important than just wordsmithing, because he thinks that this is a deal and he wanted to short-circuit it. He wanted to do it quickly, just get it done. So he finally agreed to something. And I think even you and I have talked about this in the past, that there wasn't even going to be an agreement until both sides had a single group of points, word for word, that everybody agreed to and would sign off on. And up until just right before this thing was signed, you had these radically different claims from the two sides about what the points were.

But then when it was signed, it nearly was all on what the Iranian side had been talking about. Well, here's the problem that we're facing right now. Point number five is the part about who's in control of the Strait of Hormuz. In that point, there is a lot of room for interpretation, and herein is your first problem, because we were going really quickly to get this done, to where we could just at least get both sides to sign it. It was left ambiguous, and this is the first friction point. In it, it says that the Iranian side will determine the safe passage for the Strait of Hormuz, and they will not charge a fee for 60 days. And then it said that going forward, it said 60 days only.

So it was a very finite period of time. And then the remainder of that paragraph said that Iran and Oman would determine the future course. And the Iranian side was unambiguous both before the thing was signed and afterwards that they would go back to charging a fee on day 61. And they never said anything different from that. Well, Iran interpreted that paragraph in number five, that they would set forth the administrative functions, that they set rules out. And they said, okay, here are our rules. You have to follow this course of action here. You have to get this authority and this approval and go through this paperwork or whatever, and then here's the path you can go.

And then they added, and this was not in the MOU, that if you don't, there's going to be enforcement, and here's what it's going to be. Well, when the Southern Passage of the U.S. tried to set up their own, in violation of the MOU—because we had no authority in the MOU—the MOU President Trump signed did not give us any authorization to determine how anything happened in the Strait. But we took it and we said, here is our path through the southern path, the southern corridor near the Omani waters. And we said, this is where it's going to be. And so ships started going through it. And the Iranian side said, no, these are the rules we set. You're going to go on this one, and you're going to go according to what we say.

And if you don't, then we're going to fire on you. And I want to say it was like two days that they were given that warning, and then on the third day, they hit the ships — they hit those three ships. And you know what happened after that. So we interpreted that, and Central Command in its first exposé on the 7th of July said that this was in response to Iran violating the ceasefire, violating the terms of the MOU, and that we were going to continue hitting them until they came back into compliance, or something to that effect. But you have two very different interpretations of the same paragraph, which was left ambiguous. Now, here's the problem with us.

That's not surprising. It's not shocking. You have a disagreement. But our response, this 20 to 1, as Trump calls it, and there were some pretty big shots that came after that. Towards what end, Glenn? What are you trying to accomplish here? Where is the value in going 20 to 1? And CENTCOM released overnight, because I think this is the second or third consecutive night that we've done something. All these targets that they're showing, you know, in these images — the black and white pictures that come out, the thermal imagery and all that kind of stuff, all the stuff blowing up, stuff on tarmacs, just buildings here and there.

Some of what looks like something on some water or something near it. What does that do? What is it? Are you just trying to be punitive and trying to harm them so that they don't do what the MOU says they can, which is to determine how the— I don't know what we're trying to accomplish, but it's having the exact opposite effect, because the Iranian side has come out and said, oh, by the way—and this is through one of their official news agencies, Fars, I believe it was— they said, hey, we have a bill on the floor in the parliament that may withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the NPT, and we may change our nuclear doctrine.

So if you keep going, we may take other measures on top of that. We're going to continue to fire back at anything that happens. And just before you and I came on the air here today, the Iranians said that they shot 10 missiles at an airbase in Jordan. Jordan claims they shot everything down. We'll find out later on what the truth of that is. But they apparently did take them under fire. So they're not backing down from anything. Not on any of this, none of these. Therefore, where is President Trump going to go? And you have his answer — I don't know. So where can this war go? I don't know either, but it ain't good.

#Glenn

Well, this is the weird part — the measure of success, seemingly by Washington, is just, oh, look how many people we killed or how much destruction we inflicted. Because, again, this could make sense if it's a war of attrition, you're bleeding out the adversary, but... but again, the whole point there for the Iranians is they demand to have security. And again, if you undermine their security to a great extent, you do need nuclear weapons as the ultimate deterrent. You do need stronger control over the Strait of Hormuz as a way of shaping a regional security architecture. So it seems, as you said, very counterproductive.

But again, as long as this isn't challenged — that, oh, look how many people were killed and how much stuff we blew up, that this is the measure of success — it doesn't make any sense. One really has to go back to the question you said: how does this actually help us put an end to this thing? But it seems... well, if the goal here is to bleed out the other side or exhaust them, you know, it's not random stuff you have to kill. I guess it's, you know, the assets along the Strait of Hormuz. I'm not sure exactly how this would be achieved, but who is exhausting who at this point? And Trump also made the point that we might seize Karg Island.

And, you know, these kind of random comments, it seems, you know, why didn't the U.S. seize Karg Island in the two previous rounds? It seems that it would be so reckless and such a crazy escalation. But are we past that now? We go straight from ending the war to now all-out, you know, it could be total war, because the Iranians would then possibly take actions against the Gulf states, which could cease their existence. That is, if they end all their energy infrastructure, their desalination plants, a lot of these countries will go back to being deserts. I mean, where do you think this is going? Are they actually going where Trump is suggesting? Yeah.

#Daniel Davis

Listen, I mean, that's a very legitimate question you ask, because President Trump broached it. He's the one that specifically said desalination plants, that they could go after the oil on Karg Island. And I don't know, I might want to take it, says President Trump. Just, I mean, just adding even more concern on the Iranian side that this isn't a literal existential fight and that we may have to fight this to the death. And listen, time is not on our side here. And I think whereas President Trump doesn't know what he's doing, I think the Iranian side does. And I don't think that it was just any haphazard action that they were surprised turned into a kinetic response when they were firing on those ships.

I think they knew full well that it was likely we were going to do that. But I think they also recognize that if President Trump does that and goes too far, then that gives the Iranians all the justification they would ever need to hit all of those targets in the GCC countries and Israel, which they have again specified they would do if we hit those kinds of targets. They've never changed any of that. And for President Trump to go back and say, well, yeah, we might do it—I don't know if he thinks he's going to scare them into submission. I don't know, but I mean, that should be long since in the dustbin of history. They're never going to submit to words, and they've shown that they will sit tight and suffer a lot because we can.

I think I saw—it was either President Trump or somebody from the Department of Defense yesterday—leaked out that the United States is considering, if these message strikes here haven't worked these first few rounds, the next one might be to Iranian cities. And listen, that's just a war crime. I mean, that's straight up. You cannot say, all right, we're going to now go on a punitive raid and we're going to start hitting Iranian cities. That has nothing to do with military capability, has nothing to do with control of the Strait of Hormuz. It's just harming the population and putting pain on the government by hitting their people. That is a literal war crime, point blank, black and white.

And are we considering going down that path? And of course, I used to think, well, we wouldn't do that. They might find some, oh, well, you know, like that bridge that we hit in Tehran before the end of the 40 days, right at the end of that, which clearly had no military utility at all, had nothing to do with the conflict in the Persian Gulf or the Strait of Hormuz. It was just a punitive thing, and Trump hit that, and now he's saying, I can take them all out, etc., which is, again, a war crime. And given what we have done on that bridge, given what we did in the Caribbean Ocean, given what we did in Venezuela, given what we're talking about doing in Cuba, what we might even be doing, for God's sake, in Greenland, for crying out loud, how can you say that he might not do this, too?

Where are the constraints? Where is the balance of power within the U.S. government? Where are the guardrails? They're gone. It used to be the Constitution, separation of powers between Article 1, Article 2, the executive branch, and the judicial and legislative branch. That used to exist. That's gone. It used to be the 1973 War Powers Act. That's gone, too. It used to be morality. That's gone,

too. So I can't put it past him that he would do that. And listen, you tell me what you think. I can't even imagine a scenario where we expand this and just start a punitive raid killing civilians in cities throughout Iran that have no relation to the war at all.

And to think that they're not going to do everything they can to likewise hit similar targets in Israel, in Saudi Arabia, in Qatar, in the UAE, etc., or that they wouldn't make good on that last threat and get rid of the NPT and go race to a bomb somewhere. And from what I'm told from technical people I've talked to, if they made that decision, even with the damage from the Midnight Hammer, that's not the only place they can do business. Throughout their country, they could literally have a bomb within a month or so of a decision, and then we could just get a nuclear detonation somewhere in the middle of an Iranian desert and say, hey, the next one is going to be falling on one of your countries if you want to go down that path. That's where we're pushing them if we continue on with this immoral, unethical, and illegal path to just try and force them by death to do what we want.

#Glenn

No, I agree. I think the Iranians see this as an existential threat, so they will go all the way up that escalation ladder. And I think that's one of the things they communicated clearly in this war as well — that they weren't going to be like the Syrians or the Iraqis, sitting by and being hit, hoping that if they don't respond, perhaps the U.S. won't bomb them so hard. And again, they see this as an existential threat. I think the restraint is simply that they don't want the U.S. to go up the escalation ladder either — that is, to start punitive bombing of city centers.

But of course, if the U.S. goes up the escalation ladder and does this, there's no reason for restraint on the Iranians either. And I think this is why it's very dangerous. But I think you're correct as well about that — the assumptions by Trump. I think for him, diplomacy means a little bit of sweet talk, that is, "Oh, the Iranians are good people, we're actually friends, we get along." And then, well, he didn't use those words with the Iranians, but that's usually what he says — and then actually delivering nothing. You know, it worked on the Russians in 2020 at least, but the Iranians, it seems, won't have any of it. But overall, this NATO summit, this is where all these comments were made.

And it was just weird, very hawkish comments that were coming. Trump was going to remove Syria from the list of state sponsors of terrorism, which is a strange point in time now that the U.S. installed Al-Qaeda leaders in Syria. This is apparently the time to have them removed from the sponsorship of terrorism. He called the Spanish terrible people. He wanted an economic blockade of them. The Danes, of course, making threats, seizing their territory, continuous fighting with Meloni, essentially calling her a stalker, you know, this squabble with Starmer. All these people, it seems so reckless and pointless.

But I did want to ask about the NATO Secretary General, Mark Rutte, because he essentially made the Europeans now complicit in the attacks on Iran, because he said, oh, the U.S. efforts, you know, bombing, are completely understandable of Iran because the Iranians aren't following the ceasefire.

So, of course, America should bomb them a little bit. Again, he also came out almost in the same breath, also telling the Russians that, you know, they're crazy because they attacked another country. He called this a playbook of the 19th century, you know, and he says the West doesn't do that because we are grown-up democracies. How do you make— I mean, do these people not hear themselves talk?

#Daniel Davis

Yeah. No, they don't. Or they do. They don't care. The European elite—and really, just say the Western elite, because I can't exclude our side from this conversation either—we have jettisoned any actual moral foundation. I mean, just to cut to the chase, we no longer have a moral basis for what we do. We used to claim it, and we never fully applied it to ourselves, of course. But we kind of tried to, and in large parts, sometimes more, sometimes less, we kind of held to these moral foundations and boundaries to our actions. We were limited in how far we would go in something. We would do a lot of stuff that was always dark and whatever, covertly and small scale. Now that facade has come off.

And now what we used to do in the shadows and on a small scale, we now do out in the open. And so there are no longer any moral guardrails. I'm not talking about any specific religion. I'm just talking about normal human morality—of, you know, do unto others as you would have them do unto you—and just rule of law, standard rule of law. We have jettisoned all that, not just the United States, but Europe too. And so what we have put in its place is pure power politics. And we have also—because many, or a majority, I would argue, of our populations in the West are still moral people, and they do use moral guardrails in their normal conduct of business—we do have rule of law. If you don't follow it, you'll go to jail.

So you have to, whether you want to or not. But by and large, less today than it has been because of what our leaders are doing. But still, by and large, we are still moral people. But these folks are now using us as tools, and so they're using language as a tool to control us. They condescend to us. They mock us with stuff like what Mark Rutte said. I shouldn't have been, but I was shocked when I first saw that clip, because on the one hand, he's saying everything that we did against Iran is perfectly just, even though it violated every kind of law you can imagine, even common sense. And then you turn around at the same time and point a finger over in Moscow and say, well, they can't. Then they're evil people for doing this.

The Iranian people are evil. Everybody's evil except for Iran. Us and whatever we want to do is therefore right by definition. And whether there was a law or not, whether there was separation of powers or not, it doesn't matter. If we want to do this, we can. And I'm going to lie to you, and I'm going to try to convince you that we're actually right and that they are evil, therefore they deserve it. Whatever the laws may be, we, by our actions, by definition, are right, and theirs, by definition,

are wrong. It doesn't matter what it was, or if they happen to contradict each other. Don't look under the curtain. Don't think about that. Just listen to the words coming out of my mouth. Believe it and act on it. Because, Glenn, here's the thing.

They are mocking us by saying, I have such low regard for you as a body. You're just a bunch of sheep. All I want to do is keep you controlled, and so I'll tell you whatever I think you need to hear to make you happy. I'm going to block information that I don't want you to have, and I'm going to prevent some people from talking here, so the only thing you hear is my voice. Just pay attention to my voice. And that way, they don't get people rising up, they don't get people voting them out of office, or at least that's the theory. And then they'll keep on doing whatever they want to. And I can't imagine that these intelligent, educated people are not fully aware of these contradictions and could care less about them.

It's about power, and so they want to do what they want to do, and they don't want the people to get in the way. So they're going to keep them in the dark, and they're going to keep them like sheep, just fed a bunch of crap, and then just ignore them and try to block them from being able to do anything. That is why what Mark Rutte says is logical, because if you take the morality out of it, then words are just tools for me to control the population. We're not doing anything for the people. We're doing things in spite of the people. And we're trying to keep them in the dark as much as we can and keep them content or focused on something else so they're not focused on what we're trying to do.

Here's the big problem with that, aside from just the surface of it itself — by the immorality you're leading a population into — historically it just doesn't work, and you end up collapsing and causing tremendous harm to yourself. But the bigger issue at stake right now is that it's not going to work because the Iranians are fed up with it. And now, because they had about a 20-year preparation period, they can endure militarily, and now they're no longer following instructions. And God help us, over in Russia, they were late coming to the recognition here. They still thought there was a chance for diplomacy and logic and reason to avoid the war in 2022, 2021, up until that point. And now I think they, too, even after four years of war, they still thought, as of 2025 in Anchorage, I think, they still thought no.

And actually, throughout '25, they thought maybe we'll still make this work. And I think now, finally, they too have come to realize and adopted our view that only power is going to work here. And that is why it is catastrophically dangerous for all of us right now, because if Iran's holding on here and they're not going to give in to any more of these strikes, and they're going to issue their own, and if the Russians firmly go over to the side that says we're going to recognize now the new rules — it's no longer rule of law or the international rules-based order that we used to kind of keep to — now it's just power. Okay, that's the rules. Then we're going to play according to those rules. And that means we're going to start using power in ways that we never had before either. And that's how you get World War III.

#Glenn

Well, Trump used to warn about this. I mean, when he met with Zelensky in the Oval Office, he told Zelensky exactly what you said. He said, you're playing with World War III. But now, fast forward, you know, the following year, we see at the NATO summit he's arguing that Ukraine can get, you know, a manufacturing license for the Patriot missiles. He casually threw out that, well, we could implement a no-fly zone. You had Marco Rubio making the point that, well, there are these deep strikes on Russia, deep into its territory, by the way, with NATO weapons based on targeting from NATO intelligence. This will help to facilitate peace. You have, yeah, these constant comments about Article 5, because I think they know Russia will retaliate. And, well, then they need this reassurance that Americans will come to the aid of the Europeans.

And overall, Zelensky, you know, has every reason in the world to sell all this optimism, wishful thinking, delusion. But NATO seems so eager to buy it as well. So, yes, of course, we're defeating the Russians, the world's largest nuclear power, which sees itself fighting an existential war. Yes, we're defeating it. This is going to end perfectly. No problem. I mean, no real discussions, just sloganeering. Where is Trump headed here, though? Because I saw a Kremlin spokesperson, Dmitry Peskov, argue that the special military operation is now a war. And we see Trump essentially making this war his own. I mean, he can't seriously say this is Biden's war anymore. This is Trump's war as well. So is the U.S. going back into war with Russia? Or it was already fighting, but deeper, I guess.

#Daniel Davis

Now, I'll give you an authoritative answer from no less an authority than the President of the United States: I don't know. He doesn't know what he's going to do in the Iran war. He doesn't know what he's going to do in the Russia war because there's no rational way out that doesn't see him being a loser. And that seems to animate him more than almost anything else, because he doesn't want to walk away from the ransom, which has been my argument all the way through. And still to this day, even with all the stuff that's happened since, that's still the most—I won't say best, because that's not an accurate term—the least worst of all the options on the table right now is to just walk away and take the heat that's going to come with that. And then in the Russia situation, it's like the least worst there is to just say, you know what, this can't be solved militarily.

And for us to continue trying is going to potentially escalate this into Europe. And therefore, Article Five or any—no matter what happens, even if it's a quasi-Article Five—then we could be in a continental conflict that we can't win there either. So the only thing that we can do is just bring this to an end. And I'm going to stop all my support for the Ukraine side if—and I know this is, to many of the supporters, this is like heresy—but hear me out, because it's the rational, logical thing to do by saying, I'm going to give you X amount of time: a month, three months, six months, whatever, pick a number. And we're going to maintain our current level of support, and then at that point it's going to go down to 40%, and then it's going to go down another 40%, and then a month later it's going to be zero.

So you're going to get weaned off of it, but that gives you time with the current situation to make the best negotiated deal you can with Moscow, and it will be bad for you. It will definitely be on the plus side of Moscow because they have the leverage, but then the war will come to an end. The killing of your people will stop. You'll still maintain whatever you can negotiate in terms of control from your side. And it may not include Volodymyr Zelensky. That may be part of the requirement, and you have to be willing to accept that. But that's something that they've got to figure out. President Trump can say we're out of this and therefore signal also to Brussels and to Berlin and Paris and London, et cetera, that, hey folks, this is undoable.

Obviously, he'll be saying all this behind the scenes too, before anything is set out publicly, and just say, listen, it doesn't make any difference what we want. It only matters what we can do and what we can't do. And what we can't do is win on our terms. So let's not get ourselves into a war we can't win. And it could be catastrophic. It could be nuclear. We could lose millions of people, and everyone will lose whatever you think the cost would be for doing this war. Kind of the European walk-away plan here, however bad it would be—and it would be, it would be a lot of bad things—it is nothing compared to ignoring all that and continuing to go down this path, which will lead to potential catastrophic destruction for us all.

That's logical. That's what he should do. But that's not what he's going to do, because I don't think he has the capacity. Just like he's now just foundering here in Tehran, trying to figure out what to do and just throwing some missiles down to buy some time, hoping something else emerges that can allow him to win without admitting defeat. I think he's doing the same thing over here, because I think they still have this mentality that we'll just kick the can down the road and punt this until I'm out of office. I don't know, something like that, because he doesn't recognize that the conditions have changed and that Iran and Russia and everybody else is paying attention to this, too.

China is paying attention to it. Other adversaries are paying attention to it, too. And they realize how limited our power is, as we exposed it in Iran by itself in the first 40 days of what we couldn't make happen because of all of our air and naval power. That has exposed our weakness and our industrial capacity, etc. That's all been exposed, so there's no good way out of any of this, Glenn, none. We just have to find the least destructive way to escape and pray that we can live to fight and rebuild and retool ourselves for another day that can sustain us going forward. If we don't, we're probably going to stumble into World War III.

#Glenn

Yeah, I think the Europeans saw this as a success — that is, to get Trump to become more hawkish on Russia, get deeper involved. It's very much like, to what ends? A bit like you said with Iran. They haven't thought this one through — exactly how this is going to end. I mean, which side wins? I think all of this will be kind of pointless by the time nuclear war would arrive. All of it would be pointless. As you said, we're kicking the can down the road while moving towards World War III.

And I think that's a good point. The assumption is that we can just continue the current status quo. But I think what's evident with these conflicts is they keep escalating. And also the messages that are sent — because now that Trump says the MOU with Iran is dead, that's what the Iranian hawks said.

That's why they said, "Don't sign this," because the Americans will never implement it. Well, they were proven right. Now they're going to have wind in their sails. The next time around, it's going to be very hard to get a similar deal in place. Same as Russia. I think they watched what happened in Iran. They've seen their own deals continuously being violated. And, of course, China's probably making the same conclusions. But on the Russian issue, just the last question — since World War III — I think the most likely place that will break out would be the war against Russia. What is the significance, you think, of Dmitry Peskov making this comment that the special military operation has now, because of the involvement of NATO, become a war?

#Daniel Davis

Because this is the... I've asked a number of Russian speakers, and I've got a lot of different answers. My assessment, from really paying a lot of attention to all the things that the Russians have been doing and saying for— I mean, actually for decades, but certainly during the four and a half years of this war— I perceive, because they made such a big issue of it earlier and even as recently as a year ago. You may recall last year, I think it was late last year, President Putin himself said, hey, listen, y'all need to understand this is not a war. This is a special military operation, because if it's a war, he said, that's going to mean a bunch more things.

He said that. And so now that Peskov has used that language and nobody in the Kremlin that I saw contradicted him, then I think that that has set that door. We're now opening it — not open, but opening it. And I think that they're saying, all right, we're going to now explore where we're going and what we can do here. And we may be in the process of changing things. And I think that mentally, for the Russian public, they're saying, hey, we don't want to hit this from zero to 100 in one move. So we're going to start slowly getting the idea in that some things may be changing, because you can't do mobilization.

You can't bring, you know, mobilize the reserves, et cetera, until you have a war. You can't fully mobilize the economy unless you have a war, et cetera, because that's what Putin said is the difference between it. So I think that by saying that, they're now opening the doors that if something doesn't happen with diplomacy that we can live with, this is where we're going. So I think that we can look for more signs coming out, more statements, and then maybe some more action. And I think that that's where it's going to head if we don't do something different. And of course, I don't think we will. So I'm really worried about it.

#Glenn

Yeah, another sign could be Maria Zakharova. She was making the point that the Estonians were essentially caught for being involved in the strikes on St. Petersburg. I find this to be very interesting. I mean, everyone knew this, but as soon as the Russians confirm it, that they know it, then that puts a lot of pressure on the government to actually do something about it. Why would you admit that tiny Estonia is attacking you? Why would you admit this if you're not prepared to do something about it? So the fact that they're now recognizing publicly the deep involvement of NATO in attacking Russia, destroying Russian territory, infrastructure, killing Russians — that NATO is involved in this.

Now they have to do something. So I think, yeah, I think they also have to prepare their own public for the fact that we are going up that escalation ladder. It's gone too far. And I just wish some of this would be reflected in any of the Western media, or at least a comment by any politician. But we have nothing. As you said, we have Rutte making the point that, oh, this is the Russians attacking other countries. How 19th century. I mean, it's sad that this is where we are. Any final thoughts before we wrap up?

#Daniel Davis

No, I got nothing to add to what you just said and what I ended with a minute ago. We are just... If it was said that the world sleepwalked into World War I, we are now more like zombies heading into World War III, and somebody better damn wake up pretty quick from this malaise, or we're all going to stumble right into it, and it won't be anywhere near as limited as it was in World War I. This could be catastrophic.

#Glenn

Well, Lieutenant Colonel Davis, thank you so much for your time, and let's hope for a better day.

#Daniel Davis

Let's hope.

#Daniel Davis

Thanks very much, Glenn Diesen.