Israel's war against Iran & Hezbollah and Russia's victory in Eastern Ukraine - Col. Wilkerson

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Zain Raza (ZR): Thank you for tuning in today and welcome back to another episode of The Source, I'm your host Zain Raza. If you've been watching the channel regularly, you would know that YouTube, which is owned by Google, has a long history of shadow banning and censoring content that is produced by independent and alternative media outlets such as ours. Therefore, we are asking all of our viewers to join our alternative channels on Rumble, Telegram and our podcast called Podbean. If the day ever comes that we get censored, we won't be able to reach you even with an announcement. Hence, we are asking all of our viewers to join these channels. You'll find the link to all of the channels in the description of this video below. It will only take you a few seconds to join them, and it costs you nothing. Today I'll be talking to Lawrence Wilkerson about the escalating situation between Iran, Hezbollah and Israel, as well as the war in Ukraine. Lawrence Wilkerson is a retired colonel who served in the US Army for 31 years. His last position in the US government was as Chief of Staff to then Secretary of State Colin Powell from 2000 to 2005. He's now a senior fellow at the Institute for Responsible Statecraft. Lawrence Wilkerson, welcome back to the show.

Lawrence Wilkerson (LW): Good to be with you again. It's been a while.

ZR: I would like to start this interview with breaking news. Yesterday, Iran responded to the Israeli assassinations of Hamas leader Ismail Haniyeh on Iranian soil in July, and Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah in Beirut a few days ago with a massive attack on Israel, firing 180 ballistic missiles. According to the majority of Western media and governments most of the missiles were shot down by the Israeli Iron Dome air defense system, while other media outlets such as Al-Jazeera showed that military bases and other targets were successfully hit. A total of two people were injured. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu responded by saying that Iran had made, quote, "a big mistake and will pay for it", unquote, while US President Biden called Iran's attack, quote, "failed and ineffective", unquote, and reaffirmed the US's full support behind Israel. In the Israeli media is being speculated that the Israeli Defense Force would respond strongly by either targeting Iranian oil fields, nuclear facilities, or even attempting to take out its leadership. Israel has also decided to ban United Nations

General Secretary Antonio Guterres from entering Israel, stating that he has failed to unequivocally condemn Iran's attack on Israel and that he is, quote, "an anti-Israeli secretary general who lends support to terrorism", unquote. Antonio Gutierrez released the following statement following Iran's strike on Israel, quote, "I condemn the broadening of Middle East conflict with escalation after escalation. This must stop. We absolutely need a cease fire", unquote. Can you comment on these developments and provide your assessment of the risk that confronts the region and even the globe?

LW: There is a lot to unpack, Zain. Let me start by saying something that really dismays me majorly. It's been building for the past five years, actually for the past 20 years. And that's the propaganda, the lies. Washington, London, Berlin, Paris, they all participate in the lies like everyone else does and there is no bigger liar on the face of the earth than Bibi Netanyahu. Bibi Netanyahu is in a category with that of Hitler and Benito Mussolini in terms of lies. They are a part of his quiver. They come out of his air every day. They come out in English and Hebrew. In fact, one can determine to whom he's lying most forcefully by which language he's employing when he's talking. Which is also true for the IDF spokesperson of late. That's the first thing. You can't find out what the truth is. I have people on the ground in Israel who are telling me many of those missiles hit. I also have people who were telling me that not just Iron Dome, but all of the ships the United States has positioned around Israel, who have pretty decent anti-ballistic missile capability, aided majorly in stopping some of the missiles from coming in. But with all of that, some of them hit and some of them killed people; more than Israel is reporting, which is usual for Israel. It lies. That's the first thing. The second thing, Ali Soufan said it this morning in his bottom line up front report and I have a lot of respect for Ali, knows the Arab world probably better than any other American citizen, in my view, all the rules are gone now. All the rules are out of the window. There was a careful tit for tat sort of thing that even controlled escalation. There was circumspection. Hassan Nasrallah was the most circumspect leader in the region in many respects. He didn't shoot civilian targets. He only shot when he was shot at. It was a very, very tit for tat game. Now, Ali says and I think he's right, all those rules are gone. Well, this is precisely what Bibi Netanyahu was working for, because he's losing. He's losing badly. He's losing in Gaza to Hamas. He's actually losing to the Houthis. The Houthis in Yemen because they've impacted Israel's economy significantly by their actions in the Red Sea. And fact Israel's economy, it is fair to say right now, is on the ropes. They've had 48,000 businesses that have had to close and aren't operating either because their employees are in Gaza or now in Lebanon, or because they can't stay open because they can't make money. So Israel's economy is on the ropes right now. The lies that are coming out are in part to disguise that and in part to disguise what – and, you know, I don't know how Netanyahu can feel he's disguising it now – his real purpose. We say he wants to stay out of jail. We say he wants to stay in power. Those are all true. But those are tactical objectives. The major objective is to get the United States of America to attack Iran. It's been that all along. I'm not so sure he didn't orchestrate intentionally, not up front in your face tactically, but was funding Hamas, helping Hamas in a hope that something like this would happen and then the United States would ultimately have no choice; once Israel was so mired and it is going to get mired in Lebanon, big time, just like in 72, just like in 82 and 83, just like in 2006, it's going to get handed its ass in Lebanon, in

my view. And I'm looking at it right now, it's developing that way already. So he's got to say to Joe Biden, the braindead president of the United States, that I'm in existential danger – I'm quite confident he's probably expressed that view already now with the Iranian attack – and I need you to take out Iran. And that's what the United States has been trying desperately to prevent. Lloyd Austin, Secretary of Defense by his airplane two days ago, said the only way you're going to solve this, speaking of the aftermath of a sign of Hassan Nassrallah's assassination is diplomacy. We need a 21 day cease fire. We need diplomacy. We need diplomacy. We need diplomacy. Every time someone would ask him a question, he'd revert to that. Well, Lloyd, you were the only person in the American administration, in my view, actually speaking some truth; fate truth, but nonetheless, truth. And now look what? Now you've got it. Now you've got the United States with no choice, probably, but to join Netanyahu and whatever repost. And here's Ali's point again, it isn't going to be the kind of tit for tat escalation. That's going to be a big repost that Israel decides to use against Iran, whether it's bombing their oil fields, other facilities or whatever. Because all Israel is going to do is make them angrier than they already are and unite them, some 85-90 million barely homogeneous Persians and others. Like Iran's population is about 51/52% Persian, going to put them together in a way that they've never been together again. And the only way you're going to root that out and do what needs to be done with regard to the nuclear program, which is Netanyahu's ultimate objective, is for the United States to invade. You want to see the United States fall apart completely? Do that. Do that.

ZR: There's two aspects here. First of all, Joe Biden and his party, the Democrats, are heading up, with Kamala Harris, up against Donald Trump; so the election is coming. Also the second aspect of the question would be: How would this play out on the global chessboard? To borrow Brzezinski, the former national security adviser's term. How would that play out on the global chessboard? Given behind Iran, you have Russia, China, you have that bloc. And then you have NATO, the Western alliance. Could it spin out into a Third World War, which of course, the Democrats want to avoid? So can you put this into perspective?

LW: I think to answer your last question, which is ultimately the most important of those you asked, Ukraine and Gaza have the potential to not only spread into a region-wide war, but also a global conflict. And let me backup just a little bit and give some concrete to that, in my view. What Putin's been doing on this chessboard is going around and gathering pawns, gathering knights and bishops and even gathering rooks in various places. I'm waiting to see if that rook called India winds up throwing its lot in eventually with Putin and China. Now, the biggest inhibition there, of course, is China, because India has its own grudges and fights a bloody battle every week or two on the border with China. But I could see the United States's improprieties and the war crimes in the world, devastation of the world, through sanctions and military power, becoming so much of a point of contention with all of these countries that they eventually join the chess board with Russia. And so you're sitting there looking at a chessboard, Arabian Nights pawns, rooks and bishops and queen and king and all the rest of the panoply, and you're sitting there with three or four pawns. And let me just emphasize that for a moment. Let's just say we decided that a ground invasion was the only

way we could take care of Iran. We wouldn't decide that off the bat. We'd bomb, bomb, bomb, relentlessly, just like we did Vietnam, where we spent more bombs, dumb bombs, iron bombs on North Vietnam than we dropped on Germany in World War Two. Yes, check the tonnage. Didn't do much to the North Vietnamese except make them solid and ultimately defeat us. That's what it's going to be with Iran. So ultimately, you're going to have to invade. That means probably, not probably, that means conscription in the United States. That means you've got to draft at least one million, two million Americans between the ages of 18 and 24. Half of those people, when they hear about the draft, will go to Mexico or Canada. That's how lack of foundation we have in the empire today. These young people aren't going to do that. We're 2000 fighter pilots short in the Air Force, 2000. The Army just made its very reduced recruiting goals for the first time in three years by essentially taking 25% of people who are too fat and couldn't pass the entrance exam to get into the armed forces. So they taught them a test and put them on weight reduction programs, 25% of the people. Now tell me they're not going to go fat again, this time in service, in uniform. And tell me that teaching the test really tests someone's intellect. So we have got some real problems in this country. And you just illuminated more. We don't even know if we're going to get out of this election with our hide intact. We really don't. If it's a very close election, extremely close, which all the polls are looking like it might be, we are going to have a period between the election in early November and inauguration, supposedly in late January, nothing but turmoil in this country, maybe even fighting in the streets. So we got a domestic situation, now intensified by the fact that – where about my sister lives, down in the southeastern United States – we have a lot of dead people and a lot of destruction and flooding. Trillions of dollars. I mean, listening to the governors say the death toll might go up, something like Nepal. Other places where they're having these same problems with what? The climate crisis. Which everybody's ignoring because of all these tactical things that are happening in front of us. It's a mess. It's a total mess. And I don't see how we're going to get out of this. And the guy who's in charge of it is Bibi Netanyahu. And that's absolutely reprehensible that the empire, the American empire, is allowing itself like a bull in a China shop to be led around by this freton in Jerusalem.

ZR: You talked about Israel's ground invasion of Lebanon, I want to dig deeper into that. The Israeli military says the operation will be limited, localized and targeted and will take place only in southern Lebanon and will be focused on eliminating Hezbollah fighters. According to the Lebanese Ministry of Health, more than 1000 civilians in Lebanon have been killed in Israeli airstrikes in just the last two weeks alone. According to the United Nations, more than a million people, about a fifth of the population, have been displaced in Lebanon. It has been reported today that there have been clashes between the Israeli army and Hezbollah, and they have suffered casualties on both sides. Hezbollah also claims to have launched a major rocket attack on the Israeli city of Haifa. In addition, Israel has intensified its attacks on Gaza and just yesterday carried out airstrikes in schools and an orphanage in a residential area, killing at least 21 civilians. Israel claimed that it attacked a Hamas command center, which Hamas vehemently denies. Since the Israeli military began its attacks in Gaza, it has killed at least 41,500 civilians. As a former colonel in the military, can you first comment on Israel's invasion of Lebanon in detail? And secondly, is it possible for Israel to achieve its overall

goals, not only in Lebanon, but also in Gaza? In other words, will Israel, which is now facing a multi-front war with Iran, Hezbollah in Lebanon, Hamas in Gaza, and the Houthis in Yemen, be able to emerge victorious both strategically and militarily?

LW: Let me start by disabusing your listeners of the casualty count in Gaza. If they know an individual in America by the name of Ralph Nader, who has quite a reputation in America for truth telling, and they know the magazine Lancet, which has a decent reputation for reporting on health issues, battlefield things like that, and me, who knows the calculations you used, the template you used to look at bomb, aircraft, artillery, terrain, buildings, roads, density, all those things and say, how many Gazans have the Israelis really killed, you come up with 200,000 plus. And I think Ralph Nader is right. When the rubble is moved, they are so deeply buried, some of them, you're not going to find the exact total, but I think the total will be north of 150,000 and close to Ralph's 200,000 and Lancet's prediction, that it was much, much, much more, three times what was being told by the Hamas authorities and the Israeli authorities and the US is backing up. So, five times more casualties in Gaza than are being reported. Second, very tired IDF, in terms of those who are still waging the conflict in Gaza. Tremendous battle went on just a week or so ago between Netanyahu, the Chief of Staff of the IDF, the Minister of Defense, Yoav Gallant, and other leadership in the IDF who were telling Netanyahu through their intermediaries and in one case, I'm told straight to Netanyahu's face: This is stupid. We have no strategy. We have no objective. We're just killing people. We need to stop. Well, he wanted to replace people. So far, he's not been able to do that. And I suspect it's because of Gallant and probably because of the coalition that he's got and problems within the coalition, if he fires the whole leadership of the IDF. So you got that problem. 41,000, I'm told, went into Lebanon with 340 Merkava tanks, and equivalent artillery, 155s, multiple launch rocket systems, the 7th Armored, the Paras, and they've got about 10 to 12,000 in reserve of that. I'm waiting to see when they commit that because I'm being told they're already meeting stiff resistance. Now, if this happens like it unfolded in 2006, I won't go back to the '82 or the earlier one, but if it unfolds like it did in '06, which is the most recent example we can look at, then what you just said is going to take place. There is going to be a lot more fighting Israel in Lebanon than just Hezbollah. It's going to be a lot of people. I wouldn't even be surprised at all if some Syrians come in and, you know, they are having a past and began to help Hezbollah and other people who are trying to fight back. Netanyahu's propaganda speech about, you know, Oh, Lebanese, we're not after you. We're not after you, we're after the terrorists. He just went to hell, as soon as he uttered the words because they'd already killed, as you pointed out, so many Lebanese. And they have absolutely no compunction about killing more Lebanese. And after all, Hezbollah was part of the Lebanese government, actually. They forget that. They've been assassinating people left and right who were part of governments. And the United States just started that off, following Israel's example, of course, by killing Qasem Soleimani in a targeted strike, a member of the Iranian government. This is a dangerous precedent, we in Israel have said about killing leaders because we're as vulnerable as anybody in the world, and we're going to suffer from this, I think, in the very near future. But this force that's in Lebanon right now is going to get into the same kind of situation they did in 2006. Is Netanyahu then going to say, Okay, I'm going to reinforce you – and it's going to be questionable where those reinforcements are

going to come from, they're scraping the bottom of the barrel now – I'm going to let you go ahead and I'm going to let you go to ahead, not all the way to Beirut, but I'm going to let you really clean up Lebanon and especially the southern part and reinforce you to the extent that I can. And they're going to get even more mired down in that situation. So what does he do then? Because his objective, tactical objective now, his objective is getting the United States to attack Iran. Tactical objective is to get the Israelis who are really on his back and are leaving Israel in unprecedented numbers – and that's a refutation of the whole state of Israel. It is supposed to be a safe haven. Come on, come all, safe haven. It is not a safe haven, if he can't move the Jewish citizens back into the northern part of Israel, back into the area next to Hezbollah, where they had to evacuate. And I've got a very strong feeling he won't be able to do that. So then does he push harder and take more casualties and get more mired into Lebanon? Because he's not going to accomplish that objective. But he's hoping that in all of this it will look so dire to the United States of America, the situation Netanyahu has put the state of Israel in, that we will intervene and we will save his ass and get him out of the mess he is in, and at the same time, the camouflage created by all of that will keep him out of jail and keep him from having to go through an investigation about October the 7th, which he fears probably as much as he fears going to jail.

ZR: The Western media have by and large, aligned themselves with the position of the US government. In much of the German media, for example, as soon as a news program begins, all the militias who, in their own worldview, engage in armed resistance against what they call, quote, "Zionist aggression, apartheid or expansionism", unquote, are immediately labeled as terror militias or Islamic terrorists. The weighted designation of terrorist and non-terrorist seems to be aligned with how the US State Department categorizes it on its foreign terrorist organization list. As someone who has seen the inner workings of the US government, especially the foreign policy aspect, can you talk about what makes the State Department conclude that a group is a terrorist organization? And could the same criteria be applied to its own allies such as Saudi Arabia and Israel?

LW: The same sort of logic, Zain, that applies to Tony Blinken lying to the Congress and telling them that there is no humanitarian disaster taking place in Gaza and that no laws are being broken in the United States. The same kind of logic. I used to sit there and look at the state sponsors of terrorism list and the wider terrorism list that we would pass through state over to the White House. And I would just mark all the things in there that were lies, just blatant lies, and some of them not blatant lies, but really stretching the truth, and I would say to myself, okay, I'll make a list. The White House is going to take this out, this out, this out, add this, add this and add this, because it had nothing to do with the definition of terrorism. It had nothing to do with states that probably should have been designated as state sponsors of terrorism, one of which was the United States of America. I looked at Cuba particularly because Cuba had not sponsored terrorism in 30 years, if they ever did. And there they were. And I would ask the question of the Deputy Chief of Staff at the White House who looked after the State Department from a cabinet perspective. I'd say: Okay, why don't you change this? I quit asking after a while because I knew why they changed it: for political reasons. We designate a state, a state sponsor of terrorism if we don't like them or if they're doing

something we consider in our disinterests, we don't designate them for doing terrorism, as it were, we designate for political purposes. And when it comes to calling Hezbollah a terrorist, for example, a terrorist group, or it comes to calling Hamas a terrorist group or Iran a terrorist sponsoring state, they are all fabrications to fit the needs of the empire, the political and strategic needs of the empire. They are not in classical senses: I'm getting you on this list because you use military or other power to kill civilians indiscriminately. No, you just named Israel. How about some pagers? How about some cell phones blowing up in your face? Three year olds or terrorists, whatever?! They blow up in your face in the marketplace. How about some real terrorism? How about the United States sponsoring what it did at Abu Ghraib? Sponsoring what it did at Guantanamo? Real terrorism, in a sense. We don't put ourselves on the list. No, because we're sacrosanct. The list is absurd and the designation is absurd.

ZR: Let us now turn to the war in Ukraine. In August, Ukraine launched an incursion into Russia's Kursk Oblast and according to the German media, made considerable progress, capturing around 1250km² of territory with 90 localities. According to Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky, the main goal of the surprise attack was to weaken the Russian defense lines in eastern Ukraine by forcing the Russian military to retreat from there in order to defend Russian territory. In recent months, Ukraine has also increased its drone strikes, targeting weapons depo deep into Russian territory up to 1800 kilometers, most recently in the city of Toropets in the Russian Tver region, which is about 470km from the Ukrainian border. Ukraine President Volodymyr Zelensky also visited US President Joe Biden in Washington just recently. During the visit, the US announced another 7.5 billion military aid package for Ukraine and Germany followed suit with a $447 million aid package. Zelensky also presented Biden with the so-called Victory Plan, which outlines the continuation of Western military support for Ukraine, ask permission to deploy long range missiles produced by Western countries to strike deep into Russian territory, as well as security guarantees such as NATO accession and financial support for the reconstruction of his country. However, it appears that no consensus has been reached on the question whether Ukraine can gain permission to deploy Western made long range missiles to strike deep into Russian territory. Despite these developments, Russia has made notable progress on the eastern front in Ukraine. Today, it was reported that Russia has taken full control of the eastern city of Vuhledar in the Donetsk region. Vuhledar has been fiercely contested since the war began two and a half years ago, as it is a gateway to regional transportation hubs such as Kurakhove and Pokrovsk. Russian soldiers with flags on the roofs of various buildings were seen in the city there. In your view, given these developments, do you think the Ukrainian incursion into Russia backfired? And should the West now step up its military support for Ukraine and allow it to use long range missiles given that Russia is making notable gains?

LW: Again, you've given me a lot to unpack. I'll start by saying David Ignatius, a real cheerleader for the war in Ukraine, to this post, in the Washington Post has an editorial. Yesterday, I believe it was. And David is backing up a bit, a lot for David. That's an indicator that at least some of the propagandists in the United States are beginning to regret their own propaganda. But to take your points in serial form, Kursk was a disaster for Ukraine. First of all, Russia has eleven time zones. The square footage that the incursion into Russia

represented by Kursk was a drop in the bucket, like a stray pin dropping vertically in the Pacific Ocean. Russia knew that. The reason that nuclear reactor is there in that area is because they put it there. There's nobody around. There's nothing there to be affected should they have a Chernobyl type event at that reactor. So they took nothing. And what did they do? They took it with their most powerful and accomplished strategic reserve, the best fighters they had. Now, Russia has cheered them up. They're sitting there waiting to be evacuated, taken prisoner or murdered. Killed. So that's Kursk. It was a movement away from the main point of contact. Russia was frustrated by it because they didn't expect it, but they took care of it. And they could have taken care of it by simply ignoring it totally. Borovsk they would have had to go through to get anything meaningful or overwhelming. So the main line is folding, as you pointed out, it's folding. The Ukrainians are losing, and it's just going to be casualties after casualties, P.O.W.s and others, from here on out. The deep strikes into Russia, President Biden very, very reluctantly – I watched the look on his face when he was doing this with Stamer, the prime minister from Britain, I think he came with the plans in his briefcase, he had the templates in his briefcase where they weren't allowed to shoot missiles and everything, Germany, London and probably Paris. I don't know if Macron was in on it or not. I think he's got better sense than that. But Biden said no. And then everyone was sitting on tenterhooks in the United States like me, waiting to see if he reversed himself because he got a lot of pushback for doing that. But I don't think he's stupid enough to allow that to happen because the warnings, as Ignatius says in his op ed, very, very reluctantly points out in his op ed, I'm not sure I would challenge Putin. Putin has said categorically that he is going to consider NATO in the war if you allow this to happen. Which he well should, because all of these missiles would be using US or NATO, mostly US intelligence and technology to steer them, to guide them, to target them, and else, which has been happening before. Which brings me to a point. Putin sent one of his faster missiles, which we cannot shoot down, we can't touch it, into Ukraine recently and hit a NATO training facility in Ukraine. Those were the first Swedish casualties in 75 years, I'm told by my friends in Sweden. First casualties. They got body bags back in Sweden. That's how serious Putin is. And those are the kind of weapons he has. He has missiles that travel at 30,000km/h. Do the math there. That's about 15,000 miles an hour. There is nothing on God's green earth today that can hit that missile. And that missile has such a colossal warhead on it. It's not nuclear. It can be. They call them the Avangard. The kinetic capability of that missile with an HE, high explosive warhead, non-nuclear warhead, two or three of them in Kyiv, Kyiv would be dysfunctional for a week, maybe longer. They are so powerful. And he said, targets could be elsewhere. Targets could be in NATO countries, if I feel like NATO is truly backing Ukraine to the extent that it's enhancing their capabilities to continue this war. I don't doubt him for a moment. So he'd start there and then perhaps he'd, as he's insinuated, he might even go further and use a small yield nuclear weapon. That in essence is the doctrine that I've seen evolve out of Russia. If they feel like they're existentially threatened by NATO incursions or NATO actions, they will contemplate using small yield nuclear weapons. They sort of call it escalate to de-escalate, which seems a little bit counterintuitive, but nonetheless, I understand that's part of the doctrine they've developed. With regard to the money from the US that's just going into Zelensky and the oligarchs bags so they can run away with it. Zelensky is short lived. I think one of the reasons he's traveling so much now is he knows he's short lived. A bullet between

the eyes could be his in the very near future. So I suspect there will be either a runaway and he'll go to one of his dachas with his pound of cash, or they will succeed in getting rid of him. And then they're going to put in place a government, whether it's democratically elected or not, is going to be irrelevant to the oligarchs who will back this, just as it was in 2014 when we backed the coup there, they'll get rid of him and they'll sue for peace and a ceasefire and they'll go to negotiations and whatever they elect, if they even go back to some Democratic apparatus to elect, will pursue that, and do it as speedily as possible. That's where we're headed in Ukraine. NATO accession, of course, is going to be off the table completely. I dare say, and his Victory Plan was a joke, I dare say that one of the things Putin can be tested on in the negotiations is: What do we do, say, a decade down the road, with those oblasts that are more or less invested by Russia? Do we hold referenda? Those referenda, ten years from now, would probably go in Russia's favor and Russia would have not only what I would say battlefield accession to those places, but they'd have legal possession of those places by plebiscite. Just like they have in Crimea. And there's no NATO in the future for Ukraine. Maybe a few years down the road, a decade, decade and a half EU membership. But if I were Ukraine, I wouldn't want to be a member of the EU. Probably Germany wouldn't want to be a member of the EU. A bunch of nuts who are not democratic at all. They're autocrat. Europe needs to get its political act together. I'm sorry, but they really do; something for me to be saying that, when the United States's political act is like a dog show all across the world. But Europe needs to get its act together because NATO is gone and they need a European security identity, which is what we called it in '93 and '94. They need to start standing up on their own feet and they need to have their own capability. The elections are going to take place over the next three to five years in Europe are going to determine that. Think about this for a moment, Zain. When we had a small NATO and we were even inviting Russia into observer status with the full intention that membership was down the road in both the political and the military alliance, bringing Europe together to include the Russians, they are European, at least from the Urals in, they are European. And that small NATO would be tenable. It would be dealable with. It'd be manageable. It'd go away eventually because it wouldn't have a threat to make it exist, but it might become a political shop. It is already a political shop. It could shed the military part. Let the Europeans take care of their own security, build their own militaries, and keep the political shop like an OSCE or something like that. It could have stayed. It could have been very manageable. We expanded it and we made it disappear. We destroyed NATO. I'm hoping we didn't destroy the transatlantic link. I think that is strong enough to survive NATO's demise. But NATO is gone, as far as I'm concerned. Turkey is going to leave. It's already left for all practical purposes. It unanchored the southern flank. And Finland, Norway and Sweden anchoring the northern flank, makes no difference, if the southern flank is completely unanchored. And Turkey would make it that way or it to leave completely. So we're in a real mess. A real mess. And Ukraine and Gaza are perfect indicators of the stupidity of the empire's leadership. Both of them, for different reasons, but both of them at the same time. And both risk escalation to a possible nuclear exchange and both risks, in a real sense, the kind of sobriety and sense and peace that we were building up during the Cold War, especially for Europe and now in the period of unipolarity we have sundered and there's no more unipolarity, I'll guarantee you. Wang Yi said the other day, I

have great respect for Wang Yi, he said the other day: Gone are the days when one or two powers dictated to the world. They are gone forever. He's right.

ZR: Colonel Wilkerson, former Army colonel and former Chief of Staff to Secretary of State Colin Powell, thank you so much for your time today.

LW: Thank you, Zain. Take care.

ZR: And thank you for tuning in today. If you're watching our videos regularly, make sure to support our journalism with a standing order via Patreon, Betterplace, PayPal or directly to our bank account. We are an independent journalistic media outlet that does not take any money from corporations or governments. We don't even allow advertisements, all with the goal of providing you with information that is free from any external influence. Please also take into consideration that there's an entire team working behind the scenes, whether it's camera, light, translation, voice-over, and editing, that are committed to providing you with information that you just wouldn't find in the mainstream media. I thank you for your support and for tuning in today. I'm Zain Raza and see you next time.

END
