



Col. Wilkerson: Trump Meets Putin & Zelensky and the Upcoming Israel–Iran War

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. Before we begin this interview, I would like to remind you to join our alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram. YouTube, which is an American corporation owned by Google, can shadow ban and censor us at any time. And if that day ever comes, we won't be able to reach you with our information, let alone with an announcement. Hence we are asking all of our viewers as a precautionary measure to join these alternative channels. And if you are watching our videos regularly, make sure to support our journalism with a donation. Journalism that does not take any money from corporations or governments and only depends on its viewers. Even though our channel has grown to 161,000 subscribers over the summer and millions have watched our videos, our donations have dipped considerably over this time period. How you can join our alternative channels or donate to our cause, you can find out in the description of this video below.

Today I'll be talking to retired Army Colonel who served in the US Army for 31 years, Lawrence Wilkerson. Lawrence Wilkerson's last position in the US government was as Chief of Staff for Secretary of State Colin Powell from 2002 to 2005. He's now a senior fellow at the Institute for Responsible Statecraft. Lawrence, welcome back to the show.

Lawrence Wilkerson (LW): Good to be with you, Zain. Well, I assume you're still in Germany.

ZR: I'm still in Germany. So let's get started. The entire summer has seen the US-Russia tensions over Ukraine going back and forth. In mid-July, for example, US President Donald Trump authorized a major increase in armed deliveries to European allies of Ukraine and threatened harsh secondary sanctions on nations that traded with Moscow if a ceasefire wasn't achieved. He even openly criticized Russian President Vladimir Putin, calling his rhetoric meaningless and accusing him of insincerity. The situation escalated further on August 1st when Trump deployed two US nuclear submarines near Russia, following a spat with

Russia's Deputy Chairman of the Security Council Dmitry Medvedev.

In a turn of events, Trump recently met with Putin in Anchorage, Alaska. Publicly, both sides shared their talks were productive and a consensus was reached on many points. However, neither a much awaited ceasefire nor a formal agreement was made official. Days later, on August 18th, Trump hosted Ukrainian President Zelensky and multiple European leaders at the White House. The summit focused on security guarantees for Ukraine and long-term conflict management. But again, no breakthrough was officially announced, but Zelensky reaffirmed that Ukraine would make no territorial concession without its full agreement. Why do you think there's so much back and forth in Washington's approach towards Moscow? And secondly, how do you assess Trump's meetings with Putin and Zelensky? Do you see any genuine prospect for peace emerging?

LW: That's a lot to unpack, Zain. I think at the center of all of it, though, is the most mercurial, vacuous, unprepared, unstudied, incompetent in many respects with diplomacy and security affairs, individual that has ever been at the head of the American Empire or even the American state, long before it was an empire, 1945 or so. So that's the crucial ingredient. He does not know what he's doing. I think he has, occasionally, some good instincts, but they come from the real estate world. They don't come from a world of high diplomacy and geopolitics and geostrategy. So he's confused all the time. Now here's a perfect example of that. The New York Times, which I rarely read anymore – it's such a rag and such a shill for the American empire – but I did take a look at the online version the other day and the very first paragraph or so encapsulated a lot of what I'm saying. The writer simply said: Look at what happened after the Alaska summit. All the European leaders, even those that were on vacation, cancel everything and rush to Washington because, and here comes the comment, because they know having dealt with Trump in the past, that the last person to get to him is often the person to whom the policy gets designed. So they wanted to rush to Washington, including Zelensky, who even wore different clothes, mind you, and was a little bit better behaved in the Oval Office in particular. So those two things, I think are characteristics that we have to take into some of the things that we think we're talking about now.

Let's take some of the critical items. I don't think for a moment that Putin agreed to security guarantees for Ukraine, other than very different ones than Trump is now talking about. There'll be no NATO countries. There'll be no European countries. There won't be anyone from the other side, as it were, who will be allowed to provide a security guarantee to Ukraine, to the rump state of Ukraine. Now, if you wanted to bring in some troops from a totally neutral country, if he will, although no one's neutral today, vis-a-vis the empire – look at what we've done, we put India and China and Russia all together. That's a beat of unprecedented proportions. But if you brought in other peacekeepers from around the world, Brazilians, for example, even Chinese, then the Russians would probably take them as border, demilitarized zone border, whatever you want to call it, to protect these. Because the Russians know, as I know, as any sane person knows, that the people who are going to disturb whatever peace agreement is achieved are the Ukrainians, not the Russians. They'll do the same thing they've done since 2002, when I had to deal with them, when I was in the state

department. They will disrupt what is happening wherever and whenever they can. And by they, I mostly mean the Nazis. Putin's right. There are Azov battalion types throughout the Ukrainian structure. In fact, I think they have Zelensky in their grasp. And that's one reason why he can't move into some better position with regard to settling this because they've got him and they will kill him if he moves away from their position, which is absolute opposition to anything Russian. So that's security guarantees.

Let's look at the prospects for Ukraine's future where we just stop it right now. It's going to be devoid of the Donbas. There's no question of that. Putin is never going to give up on that. And I saw a Swiss lawyer's paper the other day, a pretty smart guy writing this paper about the situation. And there's one section in it – he's a lawyer of diplomacy from Switzerland – there's one section where he says: why in the world would the United States feel like that Albanian Kosovars in Kosovo would want to live under Belgrade and then support them in that and create Kosovo? And you've got Russians who don't want to live under Kiev and yet we're saying they can't get away. They can't be separate. That's nonsense. What's good for the goose is good for the gander. I think what came out of Alaska is a clear indication that Trump is really not on his brief. Nor are any of his acolytes from Witkoff to Rubio, and we need to be worried about that. We need to be worried about it because one never knows as the New York Times hinted at where he's going. But I will guarantee you one thing. He's not going anywhere. Putin doesn't want to go. And he and Lavrov and for that matter, the Russian Duma in majority has been very clear about that.

ZR: Throughout August, Europe, anchored by Germany, set out a resolute and coordinated position on Ukraine's future, particularly ahead of Donald Trump's summit with Putin and Zelensky. German Chancellor Friedrich Merz made it clear that Ukraine must not be pressured into territorial concessions while EU leaders emphasize that any settlement must be Ukraine-led. Crucially, they insisted that Ukraine must retain full sovereignty over its weapons and security partnerships, rejecting any dictates from Russia. In parallel, Europe called for binding security guarantees comparable to NATO's Article 5 and expressed readiness to share the defense burden while underscoring that a ceasefire must precede negotiations. These principles were strongly reaffirmed during the August 18th meeting at the White House, where Trump, Zelensky and key European figures, including German Chancellor Friedrich Merz, French President Emmanuel Macron, UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer and EU Commissioner President Ursula von der Leyen also attended.

How do you assess this unified backing of Ukraine by Europe? And do you believe their posture, which is demanding firm security guarantees and Ukraine's complete control over its military partnerships as well as weapons transfers and insisting on a ceasefire, can generally ensure Ukraine's long term security and stability?

LW: Not in the least. And let me just parse that a little bit. Let me get to Friedrich Merz in particular, but let me say this first, if you're looking at Putin's demands in a clear headed way, you have to understand – and I hope that he was able to get Trump to appreciate a little of this in Alaska – what Putin's motivation is and what it has been since the very beginning; not of the special military operation, it certainly was then intensely so, but all the way since 2002

when I was dealing with Ukraine. And certainly since 2014, when we cheated the duplicitous hell out of him. I mean, you know, his position is sacrosanct. This is a threat to the CSTO, to Moscow, to Russia, to Belarussia, to whatever group that is in my sphere of influence, this is a threat. It's not only a threat, it's an existential threat. So anything that you mark down, Friedrich Merz, as an augmentation to that threat or a continuation of that threat is unacceptable to Russia. And it will not happen. It will not happen. There are certain little things around the edges, land swaps, for example, that have been talked about. I can understand that Putin might offer this or that little piece or parcel. Because it's not integral to what I just said, the defense of Russia, but not much.

Now let's go to Merz. Merz is a quintessential example, but Starmer and Macron and others follow in his wake, but not so quintessential as Merz of a globalist, of a deep stater, of a BlackRock CEO, for example, which was his previous occupation, who is being utterly defeated by this massive move of every kind of aspect of power, educational, intelligence, informational, military, economic, financial, trade from the West to the East. And he wants to stop that. He is a proponent par excellence of stopping China. And now we've got, we've done this in our brilliance, India and Russia together with China. And increasingly, polls are showing 60% to 70% of the rest of the world. That doesn't leave a whole lot left for the Western hemisphere. And really the only thing left in the Western Hemisphere that's containing that is the United States and portions of Western Europe. No one else really is. Brazil, certainly not much of South America, much of Central America is certainly not, and you got to question Canada from time to time. It's a real stupid battle that people like Merz are fighting.

But because of the political systems in countries like Germany and France and England and Great Britain at large and so forth, they're not thrown out yet. Because the majority of their people do not agree with them. And when you start sending troops into Ukraine, Friedrich Merz, or funding Ukraine with lots of German dollars, which I don't think will ever happen really, not substantially, then you're going to get thrown out of office. You're already tottering in terms of your coalition. Macron is a dead man walking. Starmer's a dead man walking too, once people wake up. And I think they're going to wake up all across Europe. I've told you this before. I was there in 2002 when we started the programs. We bought the governments in Europe. We bought Jens Stoltenberg. We bought his replacement, Mark Rutte. We bought many of the governments in Europe that suddenly changed decades of policy of neutrality, for example, and moved into NATO. And then we cemented it by scaring them by calling Putin and Biden did this per excellence, a man who would emulate Hitler and invade Europe, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, and other places.

Now there are people in all of these countries who are going to understand what a lie that was eventually. It was a CIA, Mossad, MI6 manufactured lie, but they took it and they swallowed it and they got the government selected who were exponents of it on our behalf. That's how we reestablished political hegemony over Europe in about a decade, period. And we're now trying to do it in Romania, in Georgia, in Azerbaijan, in Armenia, we're trying to do it all around the periphery of Russia. It's not going to work. And these politicians will be gone.

Mark my words, they'd be gone within a year, if not less, they'll be gone. And then Europe's going to be in turmoil. Because as Colin Powell said in 1989, when the guys are gone and the gals are gone, like Maggie Thatcher, François Mitterrand, Helmut Kohl, John Major, when they're gone, people who had their feet in World War II, at least their baby feet, in World War II, and we have an entirely new group of leaders in Europe, watch out, it'll fall back to the 1930s. It'll be fighting among itself and stuff, and the EU will just collapse, all right, that autocratic organization probably ought to collapse and von der Leyen along with it. But that's what the future of Europe is, chaos. And it's partly there, if not largely there, because we created it to be there in our attempt to regime change in Moscow, regime change in Beijing and regime change in Tehran. Those are our three principal objectives with regard to arresting this flow of power back to China, because those three things are integral to that.

And Russia is now significantly integral to it. If you've looked at anything in terms of China and Russia sharing their economic situations, because of the sanctions, they're beating the hell out of our sanctions. Just ripping them apart in terms of any kind of real effect. And you're going to get other countries doing that too. Because they're figuring out that OFAC, the Office of Financial Assets Control in our treasury which looks over the sanctions, can't handle it. They simply can't handle it, it's too much and it's creating all kinds of angst in the world. So we're looking at some major changes all across the face of the globe, except in that area, which is really the new power center of the world. We have to face one reality: China is the number one economy in the world now. Look at any of the stats they are the number one economy in the world. Look at EVs, look at batteries, look at rare earth and the finished product, look at anything that the defense department in the United States needs in order to function. It's China. You got to have China and wait until these tariffs ricochet back. If Xi Jinping really wants to bring some heat to bear on the empire. We're going to suffer greatly. We're not going to be able to fly our airplanes. They have more EVs than we do and better EVs by a factor of something like seven to one. They're putting more money even into oil exploration because they understand that they're dependent on overseas sources for a lot of their oil. So they want to go ahead and do some of the things like we've done in the empire, fracking, for example, and they want to spend a lot of money on looking for, \$38 billion I believe was the figure they spent, which is more than ExxonMobil and Chevron together spent. China is the number one country in the world. And that's what these people are fighting. That's what the empire is fighting. And it's using its vassals in Europe to help it. It is not going to work.

ZR: I want to return to the issue of security guarantees that you outlined in the first answer. Security guarantees for Ukraine have become one of the most contentious issues in diplomatic negotiations, especially given that Russia has long cited NATO's eastward expansion as a key justification for its war. On August 17th, US special envoy, Steve Witkoff, told CNN State of the Union, and let me quote him here, quote, "We were able to win the falling concession: that the United States could offer Article 5 like protection, which is one of the real reasons why Ukraine wants to be in NATO. It was the first time we had ever heard the Russians agree to that", unquote. This, if it's true, signals a major shift. The US and Europe are also ready to offer NATO style security guarantees. However, without US troops

deployment or former membership, which would naturally raise a number of questions. How do you assess this emergence of Article 5 like security guarantees for Ukraine as outlined by Witkoff? And why would Russia even agree to that given that in their perspective, this was one of the key reasons why they went to war in Ukraine, according to their own reasoning?

LW: Manufactured, manufactured interpretations, if you will, of what they heard. And even to a certain extent, exaggerated interpretations of what they heard, especially with Witkoff. And I think that's one reason you heard yesterday, and I heard this morning too, Lavrov and Putin knocking down some of these things. I don't think you're going to get any kind of Article 5 – an attack on one is an attack on all of them and the nuclear umbrella is over it all – out of Russia with regard to Ukraine. It's just not in the cards in my view. I'll go back to what I said before, if there are security guarantees for Ukraine, whatever remains of Ukraine, and that's becoming a big question too, because the battlefield – one thing's Trump had, I should have said this earlier, one thing Trump had to agree to, even in his dotage, he understands this, I think, if you've got two powers fighting with one another and one of them is ultimately and categorically victorious and the other is justice as ultimately and categorically defeated, why would the one winning want a ceasefire? Especially in this circumstance, because we've already cheated them. We cheated them after minutes, big time. We used the time that was gained by Minsk and the agreement there – Angela Merkel essentially said this – in order to get Ukraine up to fighting speed as it were. And that's what Ukraine would do, and maybe some of the European States, if we gave them another surcease and that's where the ceasefire would be. So that's why Trump, I think finally understood one side winning, one side losing badly. I understand why you don't want a ceasefire, especially with the duplicitous past.

That said, I don't think that Putin and Lavrov and the Duma and others in Russia who were involved in the decision-making process about this situation are going to accept anything even remotely resembling Article 5 or NATO. And they're not going to accept any NATO forces. And here's how much I think we misunderstand this. One of the things we should be doing right now for a number of reasons other than Ukraine, but it impacts on Ukraine and the situation there and how the Europeans understand our position is withdrawing every single US soldier, sailor, airman, Marine, space guardian, you name it, every uniformed American, and I'd say the un-uniform one like CIA, Mossad and MI6 too, but that'll never happen from that territory. From Poland, from Lithuania, from everywhere that the US has any kind of installation that is forward of the old NATO lines, we should withdraw the troops; now, yesterday, last week. That's the kind of security guarantee that Putin is looking for. And Trump should with Putin and Lavrov and with Merz and with Macron and Starmer say, I know that you will not put a single troop inside Ukraine without my security guarantee. You do not have it. Read my lips. You do not have it. You put troops there, you're on your own. That would stop them cold. That would stop them cold. Starmer has even said, at the end of all of his pronouncements, about putting British troops on the ground in Ukraine, only if they have a US backup. Of course, of course, because you don't have anything. Neither do you Merz, neither do you Macron. In fact, if you put all the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, that the Europeans have together, you might have a division. I mean, that's how powerless they really are without us. And let me hasten to add us, us, the empire isn't very powerful either.

Which is why we're fighting all these proxy wars through Israel in Levant and through Ukraine in central Europe.

ZR: Let us switch our developments in and around Gaza. As of mid August 2025, Gaza's death toll has risen to above 62,000 civilians with famine and malnutrition spreading rapidly. Israel's security cabinet recently made a plan to seize Gaza City, which drew sharp international condemnation with many warning it could violate international law. At the same time, Israel faces unprecedented domestic pressure. Just on August 17th, hundreds of thousands joined protests across Israel, calling for an end to the war in Gaza and the return of the hostages. Right extreme Finance Minister Bezalel Smotrich criticized these protests by stating, quote, "They are a bad and harmful campaign that plays right into the hands of Hamas", unquote. Meanwhile, it's being reported that Hamas has accepted a ceasefire proposal brokered by Qatar and Egypt, including a 60 day truce, phased hostage releases, prison exchanges and humanitarian aid, though Israel has not yet agreed. What is your assessment of Netanyahu's plans to take over Gaza City? Do you believe, as he claims, that such a move would guarantee Israel's security or do you think it could backfire?

LW: I think it will do the exact opposite, if that's what you mean by backfire. Well, I can't say I think; it will, because Israel's security is already in major jeopardy – already in major jeopardy. But let me take a couple of points you made there. 60,000 by the health ministry is nonsense. Nonsense. The total casualties in Gaza alone – I'm not counting the West Bank, I'm not counting Syria – Gaza alone is well over 100,000. 50% of whom are children, women and older people. I know from sources that tell me about the topography and the ordinance and other things, the military has a tool for doing this, that some people think it's as high as 150, 160,000, but it's well double the official figure. Both entities, Israel and Hamas have an interest in holding the civilian casualty count down. Horrendous as it is, and they're not recognizing even that 60,000 or so is [already] horrendous, that's a comment on them but it's much more than that. That's the first thing.

The second thing; I understand the agreement that was worked out and I may be wrong on this, but I don't think so, has been okayed by Hamas and is being looked at by Israel, I don't know if that's the case, but I think what we're looking at is another case where Netanyahu will screw it, if that is the case. If Hamas has agreed, then Netanyahu is going to screw it. He's going to say no. Because that's an essential part of his repertoire now, is not having a ceasefire. He does not want to ceasefire. If he has a cease fire, he showed what he'd do. He has not honored a day of the ceasefire in Lebanon. He's going on and trying to take land in Lebanon, trying to take water in Lebanon, he's across the river, he's threatening the integrity of the Lebanese state right now. He's doing a little less about that kind of threat, but enough to make me be very concerned in Syria. And his plan for Gaza looks to me like if he does go ahead with the total destruction of Ramallah and Gaza city, like he says he's going to, and his cabinet has approved that, I think his generals who now are his right hand people. He fired all the generals who had a brain. Now he's got his right-hand people in there and even they are objecting because they don't want to be responsible for the atrocity that's going to occur and the death that's gonna occur for the IDF as a result of it. I mean, their casualties are off the

chart. Their post-traumatic stress numbers are off the chart. Their suicide numbers are off the chart. These are data you can get from the IDF. You won't get them from Bibi, he doesn't want to talk about it, but the IDF headquarters will tell you what these statistics are. The reservists who aren't showing up for duty are off the charts. Some of them have even gone, what we would call AWOL in the US. They're gone, they can't be contacted. Plus you've got lots of Israelis who are going to the shore. Netanyahu has forbidden them to leave the country, but the Jewish Israelis are going to the shore, ridden boats and leaving.

So he, and his economy is just collapsed. It's collapsed. It's not just the port of Eilat, because of Ansar Allah and Houthis, it's the whole economy in Israel. If it weren't for us and it weren't for Turkey and a couple of other duplicitous countries that are continuing to trade with them, they wouldn't have any commerce at all. They wouldn't have any economy at all. What does all this mean? Last point. He's going to war with Iran. He is going to be so desperate when he realizes if he doesn't already, and I suspect he does, the straights that he's in the dire straights that Israel is in, the existential state that Israel is in, he's going to war with Iran because that's his last card. Well, I shouldn't say that, his last card is demona and a nuclear weapon and what they call the Samson option. But his penultimate card is the United States. He's going to go to war with Iran. He's gonna get in a pickle because Iran is ready to shellac him again. And they will shellac them. They're ready now. They've been bringing in Russian gear, Chinese gear, day and night. They're ready to go. They've got their own missiles, of course, and they're not going to start with the cheap ones this time, they're going to start with the ones that get through 90% of the time and have hellacious warheads on them. And they're going to devastate Israel. So he's going to have to have Trump back him up and come in. And if that happens, you heard it here, that's the end of the empire. That's the end of America. If we get involved in a ground war in Iran, it's the end of us.

ZR: I want to expand on Israel's upcoming war with Iran. Trita Parsi, Executive Vice President of the Quincy Institute, wrote in Foreign Policy recently, arguing that Israel is likely to launch another war with Iran before December and possibly as early as late August. His core argument is that the June war ended only in a partial victory for Israel with some of his objectives unfinished and that both Israel and Iran are now preparing for an even bloodier round of conflict. Parsi cites Israel Defense Minister Israel Katz, who has said openly that Israel is, quote, "preparing for the next phase", unquote, and Chief of Staff Eyal Zamir, who declared that the country is now, quote, "now entering a new chapter", unquote, of its confrontation with Iran.

Here are some key points that Trita makes in his article: Israel failed to achieve this main goal in June, which was number one, collapsing the Iranian regime. Number two, drawing the US fully into a war, and number three, establishing uncontested regional dominance by crippling Iran's defenses and gaining air superiority.

Do you agree with Trita's assessment? You talked about the domestic incentive that Netanyahu has, do you agree with his geopolitical argument that he's making? And you've already told us that it will be the end of the US empire, but how do you think this conflict would work out for the entire region? Could we see a refugee crisis, the collapse of the Israeli

state? How do you see the implications of this upcoming war if it happens?

LW: I've known Trita for a long time. And I trust Trita's views on Iran more than I do my own, because he knows Iran much better than I. I think he's right. And I just said a little bit about why I think he's right. And I think it is probably more apt to happen earlier than later, as he says it could happen as late as late August or in September. I would put it somewhere in the September, October timeframe. And there are military reasons for that, too. Here's what he didn't talk about. He did indirectly, but in the litany of things that you described there, he didn't, and you didn't explicitly say we didn't get their nuclear program. We did not. I have that on real authority that we did not get their nuclear program. Partly because they're not stupid. In fact, the Persians are probably some of the smartest people on the earth. They're playing chess and we're playing checkers. They moved. They knew this was coming. And they particularly knew the B2s were coming. So they moved a lot of the more critical items. And I could go through some of that, but I won't bore you with it.

And second, those that had to remain because they weren't portable enough to be moved instantly or near instantly, really didn't get much damage. And I know this for a fact in terms of the North Koreans and how deeply they went underground and how the North Koreans in 2001 and 2002 and before were working with the Iranians to show them how to do things underground. When the North Koreans tested their first nuclear weapon, we didn't even know it. They were so deeply underground, we didn't even know it. So those things all combined to say that I think the Iranians would be truly unwise, I don't like this at all, but they would be truly unwise not to build a weapon. And I think they could do it fairly swiftly. And with computer technology, the way it is now, you don't even really have to test. You can get a 90% or so assurance from just computer simulations. Now, they could test just like the North Koreans did. They've got terrain where they can go deeply enough as the North Korean's did to where... Actually, what happened was the Swiss Institute, I think it's Swiss, I was there when we were talking about it in the North Korea working group in the US government. It was a seismic activity, I believe it is, for the world. In Switzerland, they told us they had detected as they put out the data to everyone, that listenings, a seismic activity they couldn't explain. So we looked at where that activity was pinpointed and we said, uh oh, I think something happened that we didn't register.

So what did we do? We put all of our equipment pointed at that to include sniffers in the air for radio activity and things like that, we pointed at them and they conducted the second one. And so we picked up that one. But the Iranians could do it and then just present it as a fait accompli. Now we've got a really dangerous situation there because Israel says, it doesn't say explicitly, but we say, Israel says that they have a couple of hundred or so nuclear weapons. I don't even know if they do, but based on my experience in the 73' war, I would not want to say they didn't and be on the other end. I mean, I don't want to say they don't have a nuclear weapon and I'm the one that's going to suffer for that. And that would be the case with Iran and vice versa for Israel, if Iran goes ahead and does this. We have a whole new situation then, because then we have the ingredients of the start of a nuclear war. And that's extremely dangerous I think, and no matter who starts it, Pakistan, India, Israel, Iran, whatever. But all

of those dimensions play into this. And Netanyahu's got to consider this. I think right now it's fair to say this is just as you can say about Japan and you can say about Japan and spades, they could be a full up nuclear power with a triad, submarines, ballistic missiles, and air delivered bombs in six months if they wanted to. And they could have a nuclear weapon in a week if they wanted to. I mean, it's all there. They're a threshold state. I think Iran is now a threshold state. And that's a very dangerous situation because we get to the point where we got two nuclear armed powers that are now going to fight each other. That's not good.

ZR: Lawrence Wilkerson, retired Army Colonel and Former Chief of Staff of former Secretary of State Colin Powell. Thank you so much for your time today.

LW: Thanks for having me, Zain. Say hello to Friedrich Merz for me.

ZR: And thank you for tuning in today. Please don't forget to subscribe to our channel before leaving by clicking on the subscription button below. It costs you nothing and takes you only a few moments. And if you're watching our videos regularly, make sure to support our journalism with a donation. Our journalism takes no money from corporations or governments and doesn't even allow advertisement at all with the goal of providing you with information that you just won't hear in the corporate media. I thank you for your support and for tuning in. I'm your host Zain Raza. See you next time.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:
E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:
<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:
Link: [Click here](#)