



Trump's 'New' National Security Strategy Is Just The Old Strategy In New Clothing

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

DL: Good to have you. So before we get into the national insecurity strategy, we wanted to share some interesting news or information with our audience and invite our audience to assist us in investigating this revelation further. And the background to this revelation is that a few weeks ago I was contacted by email by an audience member of ours in Australia who regularly watched our programme. And she informed me that she and her husband were seeing pro-Israel ads when they tried to watch our programme. It's very disturbing news. So I asked her to try to catch one of these ads, ads on videotape, so that we could talk about it on a programme. And she kindly did that. And so I'm just gonna share with you the video that she sent to me so you can see what people, at least down under, are having to watch sometimes when they try to tune into our programme on YouTube. Here's what she sent me.

Pro-Israel Ad: And they took her hostage for 400 days and terrifying nights. They raped her. They put guns to her head. They starved her. These are the stories of Israeli women attacked by Hamas. If you were supporting Hamas and radicalised Palestinians, this is what you are supporting. Choose freedom, not terror.

DL in video: And so that brings us to section 2C, which is the part of the legislation that contains the real nasty shit. Here it is up on the screen.

DL: Okay, so you saw there, that was an episode I recently did about the Epstein files. And the basic purpose of that episode was to explain how this legislation that Trump signed last month for the release of the Epstein files is full of holes. And one of the arguments I made in that programme was that the Trump regime was likely going to use some carve outs in that legislation to protect Israel from some damaging revelations relating to Epstein. So that programme was actually very much about Israel. And you saw what was being aired as an advertisement. This is very disturbing. We had no idea about this. We certainly do not consent to it, we object in the strongest possible way. So we're showing you this so that if you see something similar in watching our programme you see any ads that are pro-Israel, Zionist, what have you, and you're able to catch them on video, and we ask you to try to do that,

please let us know. And you can contact us if you see such ads. And even if you don't manage to capture them on video, you can just contact us and let us know what you're seeing. And you can do that through the contact form on my website, dimitrilascaris.org. And if you do banish capture on video, we appreciate you sending us that video so that we can do a more expansive analysis of what's going on here. In any case, Rami, any thoughts about that video before we move on?

RY: But I think this rings a bell because I think Netanyahu signed an agreement with like Google and YouTube to spend X amount of millions of dollars on propaganda through YouTube. I see someone in the comments said those ads are pushed by the Israel government advertising agency – most likely. But one thing's for sure is that independent media is outperforming mainstream media and any like governmental push to brainwash the people, right? I think there's no amount of propaganda at this point with what we saw and this genocide that anyone's gonna fall for this type of nonsense. And if anything, they pay for every click on these ads. So might as well click on them, make them waste some money.

DL: Okay, so let's move on then to the national insecurity strategy, as we call it, or as Trump calls it the national security strategy. So just sort of broadly speaking, many in the corporate and alternative media have tried to make the case since this thing was published a few couple of weeks ago that this national security strategy portends a dramatic, even historic shift in U.S. foreign policy. And some commentators claim that the document constitutes renunciation of the objective of U.S. global hegemony, which has been the dominant objective of U.S. foreign policy in the post-World War II period. Some have said or suggested that the document signals a future U.S. withdrawal from Europe and NATO. If not an outright withdrawal, then at least a de-emphasis on European relations with the United States. And also that it constitutes evidence of Trump's determination to bring an end to the war in Ukraine and to achieve what this document describes as strategic stability with the Russian Federation. So personally, I disagree strongly with all of those assessments. I see nothing in this document which should inspire confidence that the U.S. goal of global hegemony is being abandoned. I don't see any real evidence here that the U.S. is finally embracing the era of multipolarity, which is now upon us. And I think that all evidence, credible evidence, leads to the conclusion that the U.S. elite, foreign policy elite, and the military-industrial complex remain fanatically committed to the project of U.S. global hegemony. And before we get into the nitty-gritty of this document and show you why I take that position, I just wanna make a few general comments about the document. First of all, I think you should view this as a marketing document. And I say that for a couple of reasons. First of all, no rational government is going to tell the entire world the whole truth and nothing about the truth of its national security strategy. If you did that, you would be giving invaluable information to your perceived adversaries. So in any document like this, it's not just the US government, I think it's any major power that puts out a document like this, it is certainly going to contain significant amounts of disinformation, misdirection. And also there's gonna be a lot of vitally important information that's just not gonna be talked about at all. It's basically line by omission. And that's just sort of, you know acting in self-interest. It's not in the interest of a nation to undress and to show to the entire world what its real complete comprehensive

national security strategy actually is.

But in the case of Donald Trump, there's another reason to distrust this document, and that is that Donald Trump is a pathological, demonstrable liar, and his word means very little. And you know what matters at the end of the day, especially when you're dealing with somebody like Trump, is to look at his actions. And as we've said many times on this programme, you are what your record says you are. So a far better indicator of how the Trump regime is likely to act in the future is its past behaviour, not some rhetoric in a document, a 33-page document like this one. And the record of Donald Trump, frankly, is one of unrestrained domination and aggression. So I suggest to you that no one should take this document at face value. Its primary utility is it tells us what Donald Trump wants us to believe about the goals of his administration, not necessarily what those goals are. And second, also a general point I want to make about this, much of the strategy laid out in this document, particularly its prescriptions for dealing with the Western Hemisphere and China are likely to make Americans less secure, not more secure. And that's why we call it the national insecurity strategy. So, on the question of whether or not this is a document that you can take at face value and trust, I'd like to point out that there are some pretty damn audacious lies in this document. So let's take a look at a few of them. I mean, the document is basically jam-packed with demonstrable falsehoods. But here's the opening statement from Trump himself. He says in the very first sentence: "Over the past nine months, we have brought our nation and the world back from the brink of catastrophe and disaster." No, Mr. Trump, we've actually moved closer to catastrophe and disaster. Trump, in the 10 months that he's been in office, attacked Iran, bombed its nuclear facilities, something which none of his predecessors had done. He imposed severe secondary sanctions on Russia and China for buying Russian oil, something which his predecessors had not done. He continued the genocide in Gaza. Now, to be fair to him, I suppose he wasn't on duty when the genocide began, but he has certainly continued it and continues to this very day. And you see what he's doing now, just a stone's throw from where Rami is situated in Panama. The man is, you know, engaging in the most barbaric behaviour imaginable. No prior president was just openly murdering people in the Caribbean Sea based upon some unsubstantiated claim that they were narco-terrorists and now they're seizing Venezuelan tankers or tankers that are carrying Venezuela oil. They're just boarding them and stealing them. So we're gonna come back to that in a moment. For these and other reasons, we are closer to catastrophe and disaster particularly in this part of the world than we were before Trump came into office. Certainly he hasn't pulled us from the brink. And then you go down to the bottom there in the paragraph I've highlighted he talks about these wars that he stopped; actually he hasn't stopped any of these wars, to the extent that they've been stopped at all – it's largely for reasons or entirely for reasons that had nothing to do with Trump. And then he says at the very end, "America is strong and respected again." Excuse me, I think America's less respected today than it has been at any time in my lifetime because of Trump's – I mean certainly not it's not only Trump who's to blame for this, Biden bears a lot of the blame, Obama and so forth, but really I think America's credibility in the world today, in no small part due to Donald Trump's excesses and insanities is at a low point. So this is just incredibly propagandistic to make these claims with a straight face and it doesn't stop there. So this one was an eye popper for me. The document says: "The United States is

by every measure the most generous nation in history." Now it behoves me to point out here that – and by the way, what I'm about to say is also very true of Canada, where Rami and I reside, okay?! So it's not just the United States. The United States and Canada were both founded on a theft, a theft of the resources of an indigenous peoples who lived here long before, centuries before Europeans arrived. Their land and resources were stolen by means of a genocide. Not only that, but the United States was built upon slavery, the institution of slavery. Millions of blacks were forced to come to this land and their labour was stolen from them, and in many cases, so too were their lives. And the United States government has never paid reparations to indigenous peoples or to Black African Americans for these acts of genocidal theft. Now you can make the argument that well, why should my generation pay reparations for things that were done by prior generations? I personally believe that we do owe reparations to indigenous peoples. And the United States owes them as well to African Americans for the crime of slavery. But even if you take the position that reparations shouldn't be paid for whatever reason, the fact is they haven't been paid. There was never compensation given. So how can you say that the United States is the most generous nation in history? And I'm not even talking about all the other acts of thievery that US governments have employed, engaged in over the years, you know, stealing resources from West Asia. They're basically stealing today oil from Syria and from Iraq or countries of the African continent. I mean, what do you make of this claim, Rami, that this is the most generous nation in history?

RY: It's generous to the people that run the United States. Who's benefiting off of the war of Ukraine? There's billions of dollars worth of contracts being sent across the oligarchs of Europe that are benefiting off of the instability in Europe, the downfall of their economies. And I mean, we've been doing a bit of research lately on these security companies, cybersecurity companies and IT security companies, and there's huge backdoors being paid off by the American governments straight to the American billionaire class, the oligarchs. So it is generous, but just not towards the people. But most importantly is that first of all, you've mentioned the list of countries that Trump supposedly brought peace to. First of all, Thailand and Cambodia are still fighting a war right now. India and Pakistan, this might trigger at any moment. There's no ceasefire in Gaza. Ukraine and Russia, I mean, I think Russia is entertaining the 20 point peace plan that America is bringing forward, but they know damn well that it's not gonna bring anything. That's why they're doubling down on the front lines. But alternatively, there's currently a rise in the Global South of new governments that are taking over the instability that America has created. I think right after our live stream last week, there was a coup d'etat attempt in Benin. I don't think that coup d'etat is anywhere near completed or like a shot down. I think it's still going on in some way. I don't think the people that triggered the coup d'etat have been arrested. People are speculating that the president of Benin is hiding somewhere in France or in Ivory Coast. And this is the entire world right now. I mean we cannot look at what's going on in the world without being under the concept of some great war that is happening, right? There's like a world war and the Global South is taking advantage of this instability behind these great powers to rise up and to cut their ties with their former colonial powers. So I hope we're gonna have a bit more time to speak about what happened in Benin. But this confederation of African states in the Sahel with Benin

joining them it'll finally give them access to the sea, to the ocean. And if they're able to get Gabon it will actually create like some form of umbrella around Ivory Coast, Senegal and that will push more revolutions across the African continent. So to say that the world is now more at peace or America is a much more respected country in the world, it's a blatant lie. But as you said, this is just a propaganda tool. This is a marketing gimmick, a bit like the 20 point peace plan, a bit like Trump Gaza, his whole video that he did using AI to promote peace in the Middle East.

DL: We don't want to spend too much time on this just because it'll take us off topic, but I heard reports that the French military was bombing the army barracks in Benin when this coup was attempted. Is that true, Rami? Do you think that they actually did launch airstrikes against Benin army positions?

RY: But not just France. France was playing some information gathering in Benin and then they were coordinating with Nigeria to bomb border posts because the coup was able to take control over certain critical ports of entry, such as the airport and the land borders. But with the help of Nigeria they were able to crack down on any form of control that the coup was able to take advantage of. But then again, right, the people in Nigeria are noticing the contradictions behind Nigeria being able to bomb Benin, but not their own terrorists that are taking control of their lands.

DL: So returning to the subject of lies, you already brought this up, but I just want to show people what this mendacious document says about Gaza. Here it is the inevitable claim that they "ended the war in Gaza with all living hostages returned to their families." Apparently Palestinians, thousands of Palestinians who have been convicted of nothing, languishing in the tortured dungeons of Israel, they don't count. They don't count as living hostages in the minds of Trump. No, they have not been returned to their families, and they continue to suffer appalling abuse in detention. And then he goes on and he says, you know, "a world on fire where wars come to our shores is bad for American interests". Sure, that's why the United States is setting the Gulf of Mexico on fire. "President Trump uses unconventional diplomacy, America's military might and economic leverage to surgically extinguish embers of division between nuclear capable nations and violent wars caused by centuries-long hatred." Man, if you believe that, we have some swampland in Florida to sell to you. So that's just some of the reason why we say you shouldn't take at face value anything in this document. It is literally jam-packed with outrageous lies, which is exactly what you would expect from the Donald. So let's get into the meat of this document, and it starts by telling us what the Trump regime considers to be America's core vital interests. And this is section two. So, number one, there's five of them listed here: "We want to ensure that the Western hemisphere remains reasonably stable" – again, is what Trump is doing in the Caribbean likely to lead to reasonable stability? "And well governed enough to prevent and discourage mass migration." So, you know, basically destroying the Venezuelan economy, bombing boats in the Caribbean, and stealing tankers is going to discourage mass migration. If anything, a land invasion in particular or the bombardment of Venezuela is going to cause millions of Venezuelans to flee the country, many more than have already fled. And a lot of

them are going to head north. So, in fact, the Trump regime's policies in this region are likely to provoke further waves of mass migration. Then the second he goes on and says, you know, "We want to ensure our continued access to key strategic locations. In other words, we will assert and enforce a Trump corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. The second point, we want to halt and reverse the ongoing damage that foreign actors inflict on the American economy." I don't know what the hell he's talking about there. I suppose maybe he's talking about China's rises in economic power. "While keeping the Indo Pacific free and open, preserving freedom of navigation in all crucial sea lanes, and maintaining secure and reliable supply chains and access to critical materials." This concept of freedom of navigation is one that looms large in this document, and we're gonna come back to that in a moment; I mean, this is one of the most outrageous falsehoods in the entire document that the United States is preserving freedom of navigation.

RY: Just specific to the Indo-Pacific, for China to get access to international markets, it was under the condition that America has control of the island chain link. So basically from South Korea down to basically Vietnam, China does not really have direct strategic access to the Pacific Ocean because all of the islands encircling China are basically under control of America. So there's no freedom of navigation for the Chinese. Freedom of navigation always belongs to America first and no one else.

DL: Exactly. Point three, "We want to support our allies in preserving the freedom and security of Europe while restoring Europe's civilizational self-confidence and Western identity." Does that sound to you like Trump is giving up on NATO? I don't think so. And there's more on NATO in this document. We'll come back to that in a second. Four, "We want to prevent an adversarial power from dominating the Middle East." Well, there's only one power that has military bases all over the Middle East, and that's the United States. And the document expresses concerns for choke points through which, you know, shipping in the Middle East passes, "while avoiding the forever wars that bogged us down in the region at great cost." As you know, as we speak, Israel is basically bombing the hell out of the region with U.S. weaponry. So can anybody take seriously Trump's claim to want to end forever wars in the region?

RY: He's pointing out a correlation between oil and gas supplies to forever wars, as if it's basically a military doctrine of the United States that the forever wars are tied to oil and gas supplies.

DL: Right. So the final point, "We want to ensure that U.S. technology and U.S standards, particularly in AI, biotech, and quantum computing drive the world forward." Yeah, to the extent the U.S. excels in these categories, these technologies will be used to enrich the U.S. elite. It won't even be used for the benefit of the American people. And so they say these are the United States' core and vital interests. So then none of this we would say constitutes a major or even significant shift in U.S. foreign policy. In fact, Trump here is doubling down on the U.S. government's fake pretext for maintaining a huge military footprint in the Indo-Pacific region, which is freedom of navigation. So Rami just touched on this, and let me just drive home this point. As we said already, in the Caribbean, the United States is bombing

vessels in international waters, murdering people, claiming that it's doing so because Venezuela, it says, is a major source of narcotics coming to the United States. The US government itself does not make that claim. The portions of the government, the bureaucracy that deal with drug enforcement. Ecuador, Mexico, Colombia are far bigger sources of drugs. Venezuela counts for a very small proportion of them. But more importantly, Trump just released from prison Juan Orlando Hernández, the former narco-dictator of Honduras, who was convicted last year for importing huge quantities of cocaine into the United States and had just begun serving a prison sentence, a long prison sentence, Trump freed him as he's claiming that drug interdiction is the reason for him blowing up boats and killing people in the Caribbean. So it's almost as if he's like showing us the middle finger and laughing at us, thinking that we're stupid enough to buy the explanation that this is not about Venezuelan oil, it's about drugs. But as I mentioned also, they are now seizing tankers that are carrying Venezuelan oil and stealing the oil. So the United States government is launching a frontal assault on the principle of freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Venezuela – frontal assault. You couldn't possibly conduct yourself in a manner that is more violative of the principle of freedom of navigation. The primary offender of that principle today is the United States government itself. And I should also point out that its proxy, Ukraine, is blowing up tankers that are believed to be part of Russia's so-called shadow fleet, just blowing them up in international waters. Again, a frontal assault on the principle of freedom of navigation. Now, if China adopted the reasoning of the US government, which is to say that it can use its massive naval forces to enforce freedom of navigation in any important sort of strategic part of the world, what would China do? China would send a huge naval armada right now to the Gulf of Mexico, which is right where the Panama Canal is, a major choke point for maritime transportation in the world, vitally important to the global economy. What would the Americans do if the Chinese adopted the U.S. government's aggressive approach to protecting freedom of navigation and sent a naval armada to the Gulf of Mexico? We'd probably be in a shooting war between nuclear powers in a heartbeat. But the Chinese don't do that. Just applying the logic of the Trump regime, they have every justification to send a massive naval armada right into the Gulf of Mexico, and they're not doing that. And just as a footnote, I want to point out, I received an email a couple of days ago from a friend of mine who's passionately anti imperialist, and she said, you know, you should watch this docuseries that has just come out on Netflix called The Marines. Have you heard about this thing, Rami?

RY: I haven't.

DL: So it basically is a multi episode expose on the US forces that are stationed in Okinawa. And it explains in some detail with interviews and footage from naval vessels and in training grounds how these combat ready forces are used basically to – they don't use this language – but to threaten the Chinese naval forces in the region off the coast of China, and sabre rattle against them. And every interview of the Marines – I actually watched it and she recommended it to me because she thought she thought it was chilling, and it is chilling. I mean, the Marines are jam-packed with psychopaths based on what I've seen thus far in this thing. But, they're constantly saying we're out here defending the United States. We're ready

to lay down our lives to protect America. But they never ask a simple question in this docuseries, and that is: Why do you need to send naval forces off the coast of China in order to defend America? Doesn't it make more sense for you to repatriate your naval forces and keep them off the coast of the United States if your goal is to actually protect the territory of the United States?! By putting your naval forces out there, you're actually making America less secure because this is heightening the risk of a military confrontation between two nuclear armed states. That is what the US application – quite apart from its hypocrisy, you know, saying you're protecting freedom of navigation there while you're violating it six ways from Sunday in the Caribbean and in the Black Sea, quite apart from its hypocrisy, this is making the American people less secure.

RY: But just to come back to what you were talking related to Venezuela being accused of being a narco trafficking state. But this is not the first time we hear such an accusation. I mean, Trump used it against Canada to justify the trade war that we're going through, right? That Canada was this big exporter of drugs towards the United States. And we understood that as soon as we use accusations of drug infiltration or or basically being narco traffickants, it allows us to break away from any form of agreements, because it basically declares that we're in some state of war with these exporters of drugs. So that's the case for Venezuela, right? They need to find a reason to go to war with Venezuela. And also the United States has been using these trade wars along with Canada and Mexico to push us against China, right? So there was an announcement last week by the President of Mexico, Sheinbaum, to put 50% tariffs on Chinese imports. And this is probably just to win a better favour from the Americans; and Canada as well, all agreed to restrict trade with China. So it's more about bullying our neighbour. For Trump to bully his neighbours, that's basically part of his insecurity doctrine that you've been showing. It's to leverage drugs as an act of war against others and then to push the neighbouring countries to put sanctions on China. And sadly we're falling for this trick.

DL: Yeah. That's really disappointing that Mexico did that. But you know, one can sympathise with their position, given their relations, economic relations with the United States. So that's the vital core interests set forth in this document. Now, I'd like to show you some verbiage which to my mind reinforces that the United States government remains committed to the project of U.S. global hegemony. So here's what I would describe as the language of supremacy. On pages three to four of the document, I've highlighted the relevant language. "No adversary or danger should be able to hold America at risk." And then it says that it "wants to recruit, train, equip, and field the world's most powerful lethal and technologically advanced military to protect our interests, deter wars, and if necessary, win them quickly and decisively with the lowest possible casualties." We want the world's – sorry, go ahead, Rami.

RY: Lowest possible casualties to our forces.

DL: Correct.

RY: Not the civilians impacted. Or Iranians that were killed just not too long ago.

DL: And then it says: "We want the world's most robust, credible and modern nuclear deterrent. We want the world's strongest, most dynamic, most innovative, and most advanced economy." And then at the bottom: "We want the world's most robust industrial base. American national power depends on a strong industrial sector capable of meeting both peacetime and wartime production", blah, blah, blah. So the point here is that the United States has to be number one in everything. That is the attitude of the Trump administration. The idea that any state might be the equal, or God forbid, you know, better than the United States in one of these categories is completely intolerable to the Trump administration. So I say that this is entirely consistent with the attitude of the U.S. government throughout the post-World War II period, and particularly since the dismantling of the Soviet Union; that the United States has to be number one in every category, and that it will not tolerate anybody being the equal of the United States in any category of strategic importance. So then we go on, and there's more language here, there's plenty of language like this, which you know indicates the aspiration of supremacy. The document says: "We want to maintain the U.S. unrivalled soft power through which we exercise positive influence throughout the world that furthers our interests. In doing so, we will be unapologetic about our country's past and present, while respectful of other countries' differing religions, cultures, and governing systems." So that word really struck a chord with me, unapologetic. The Trump administration is clearly saying we don't have anything to apologise for. Whatever crimes we may have committed, whatever aggressions we may have engaged in, screw you. And if we want to engage in more of them, screw you too. So I just don't see anything in this language which suggests that the United States is embracing the era of multipolarity and is prepared to treat any state respectfully and as an equal of the United States. What it's looking for here, and we'll see this in other parts of the document, is the preservation of U.S. global hegemony.

So this brings us to the subject of NATO. What does this document have to say about NATO? It says: "Over the longer term, it is more than plausible that when a few decades at the latest, certain NATO members will become majority non-European." You know, what they're saying is some countries are going to become majority non-white. That's what Trump means by non-European. And what happens if one of them becomes majority non-white, a NATO member? The document says: "As such, it is an open question whether they will view their place in the world or their allegiance with the United States in the same way as those who sign the NATO charter." So, what this is suggesting is that if they become majority non-white, then maybe they should be expelled from NATO, or maybe they will themselves choose to withdraw from NATO. But there's nothing in here about the US withdrawing from NATO or disengaging or distancing itself from NATO. Now it goes on to say: "Our broad policy for Europe should prioritise re-establishing conditions of stability within Europe and strategic stability with Russia." I don't know what the hell that means. It doesn't necessarily mean, by the way, treating Russia as an equal or you know, treating it as entering into a situation of durable peace with Russia. Strategic stability might just mean we avoid a nuclear war, which miraculously the U.S. has managed to do during the last four years. Then it goes on and says: "The broad policy for Europe should be enabling Europe to stand on its own feet and operate as a group of aligned sovereign nations," in other words, radically increasing their military spending and using it to buy weapons from the United States. Also "cultivating

resistance to Europe's current trajectory within European nations, opening European markets to U.S. goods and services, and ensuring fair treatment of U.S. workers and businesses, building up healthy nations of Central, Eastern, and Southern Europe, which tend to be particularly subservient to the United States, ending the perception and preventing the reality of NATO as a perpetually expanding alliance." But it doesn't say anything in here about ending Ukraine's bid for membership in NATO. I saw nothing in there about that. So it's basically saying at some point we're going to stop expanding NATO, but doesn't address the key question of whether Ukraine will be excluded. And finally, "Encouraging Europe to take action to combat mercantilist overcapacity, technological theft," blah, blah, blah. This sounds like a call for more pressure for Europe to take action, trade action against China, which is precisely what, as Rami pointed out, the Trump regime has caused Mexico to do. So you tell me, do you think there's anything in there that signals a withdrawal of the United States from NATO or the U.S. disengagement from NATO? I just don't see it. Rami, what do you make of this language?

RY: I mean, clearly the document is talking about a perception, right? Many people will argue that Ukraine is already indirectly part of NATO, part of these agreements that they're hoping to come in where there will be these security guarantees from neighbouring countries, especially as the coalition of the willing, was that it?! But also most importantly is that I feel like America will be playing a bigger role and expanding its presence across Latin America. We're already seeing it with the presence of Kenyan soldiers roaming around Haiti. They're using Trinidad and Tobago as a base to kind of target Venezuela. So I don't see anything in this document that is showing that America is looking to be more peaceful. If anything, we're seeing that the action on the ground is that America is being a lot more hostile than it has ever been.

DL: Agreed. 100%. So now let's see what the document has to say specifically about Russia. "We want Europe to remain European to regain its civilizational self-confidence." Sure. Yeah. That's why he's constantly ridiculing European nations and interfering in their domestic policies. "This lack of self-confidence is most evident in Europe's relationship with Russia. European allies enjoy a significant hard power advantage by Russia by almost every measure, save nuclear weapons." That that's just total nonsense. If the Europeans actually, even if they combined all their military forces and went to war with Russia, I think it's safe to say that they'd get annihilated. Their military forces are relatively small. Their military technologies are inferior to those of Russia. And Russia's forces are now battle-tested, battle-hardened, and they have been waging a brutal war for four years using the most advanced military technologies; both sides have. And so the idea that the British army or the French military, or the pathetic German military, even if they combined all the resources, would have a significant hard power advantage over Russia, is really frankly delusional. And then it says: "As a result of Russia's war in Ukraine, European relations with Russia are now deeply attenuated." Well, that too is false. It was, in fact, the U.S.-European provocation of a coup in Ukraine in 2014, which caused those relations ultimately to become deeply attenuated. "And many Europeans regard Russia as an existential threat." That's true that they regard it as an existential threat, but there's no reason to believe that Russia intends to attack NATO

members. "Managing European relations with Russia will require significant U.S. diplomatic engagement, both to re-establish conditions of strategic stability across the Eurasian land mass and to mitigate the risk of conflict between Russia and European states. It is a core interest of the United States to negotiate an expeditious cessation of hostilities in Ukraine." Well, Trump has been saying that since he ran to be the president last year. And what has he done to actually realise that goal, that stated goal of the United States government? He has continued supplying weapons in large quantities to Ukraine. He's just forced the Europeans to pay for them, but the flow of weapons continues to flow. They continue the U.S. military to provide key battlefield intelligence to the Ukrainian military. He imposed sanctions, secondary sanctions on India and China for buying Russian oil, tried to bring that to an end. So he's also allowing Ukraine to blow up tankers that are believed to be part of Russia's so-called shadow fleet. There have been attacks on military bases and energy facilities deep inside Russia by the Ukrainian military, many of them constituting, according to the Western definition of terrorism, terrorist acts. All of this has happened on Trump's watch. So, whatever Trump may be saying about wanting to bring this war to an end, his actions say the exact contrary. And he has never put on the table an offer, a firm offer that there was any prospect of Russia accepting, including this 28-point peace plan. And the last thing I'll say about this claim that Trump is trying to bring a war with Russia to an end, is that the core problem has been from the very outset Ukraine's bid for NATO membership. And as I explained in a recent episode, under Article ten of the NATO treaty, any new member can only be admitted upon the unanimous approval of all existing NATO members. So that means that the United States acting alone could block definitively Ukraine's entry into NATO. The United States, even if you were Ukraine, was adamant about wanting to be part of NATO. The United States could enter into a binding treaty with the Russian Federation that it will veto any attempt by Ukraine to enter the NATO military alliance and put the issue to bed once and for all. But the United States government hasn't done that. As far as we can tell, it hasn't even offered to do such a thing; in any of these negotiations. It keeps pretending that it's up to Zelensky whether Ukraine becomes a part of NATO. No, that's not true. And it's palpably false. Just look at Article ten. It is up to each and every member of NATO, existing member, whether Ukraine becomes a member of NATO. And any member can veto that initiative. Why hasn't Trump done that? Why hasn't he committed to doing that if he was so serious about ending the Ukraine war? So go ahead, go ahead, Rami.

RY: Well, with Trump basically pushing that peace plan, basically it seems like he put Europe on the alert to foot a bigger bill towards Ukraine. And now we're seeing reports today of the UK saying that they're ready to send much more aeroplanes, guns, tanks and armaments to Ukraine to compensate United States pressure for a ceasefire. So it could be that Trump just wants the Europeans to step up a bit more and pay a bigger part of the bill. And also in other news, Dimitri, I don't know if you read this report that came out that a UK high ranking soldier was killed in Ukraine during the war in Ukraine. I'm not sure if you were able to follow up with that.

DL: No, it wasn't. A member of the British military?

RY: Yes, so a UK armed forces member dies in an accident in Ukraine. They call it an accident. But the first question is why do you happen to be in Ukraine in the first place? And second of all, how do we actually know that it was just an accident and not died in battle?

DL: Yeah. Did you see what his rank is, Rami?

RY: I could try to pull up his rank over here.

DL: Okay. While you're looking, there were reports, unverified reports, that there were NATO troops in the Myrnohrad cauldron, which is right beside Pokrovsk. You know, those troops have been surrounded, Ukrainian troops. I'm not sure how many, but I've seen unverified reports that there were NATO troops there. So maybe that's where this so-called accident occurred.

RY: Also during the siege of Mariupol, right, there were claims that there were negotiations to get specific soldiers of the siege of Mariupol, and there were some hints that these were probably European soldiers or high ranking officials that were coordinating Ukrainian soldiers. But there's this article from Reuters that says Russia says: UK should disclose what British soldier killed in Ukraine was doing. The person is currently unnamed. So if you have nothing to hide, I feel like being transparent is probably fine, no?

DL: Yeah. And this is just another indication of how much restraint Russia has shown vis-a-vis NATO. It's been given ample reason as a legal matter to attack NATO countries, because NATO is, for all intents and purposes, a party to this war. But it has refrained from attacking any of the military facilities of NATO countries, including those that are funnelling huge amounts of weapons to the Ukrainian military. Which all just undermines this claim that Russia ultimately intends to attack NATO states themselves. There has never been a time in history when Russia had a greater legal justification for doing that than during the past four years. And it's refrained from doing it. So why would you think that they would do it in the future if the Russian forces ultimately defeat Ukraine, which is clearly the trajectory that we're on.

So then finally I'd like to move to China, the big enchilada from the perspective of the Trump regime. And this is what the document says: "The US has to lead from a position of strength. President Trump single handedly reversed more than three decades of mistaken American assumptions about China, namely that by opening our markets to China, encouraging American business to invest in China and outsourcing our manufacturing in China, we would facilitate China's entry into the so-called rules based international order." We're still waiting for somebody to define what that means, by the way. And Trump says, or the document says, "This did not happen. China got rich and powerful and used its wealth and power to its considerable advantage." Yeah, why wouldn't it use its wealth and power to its considerable advantage? American elites over four successive administrations of both political parties were either willing enablers of China's strategy or in denial. And then it says: "The Indo-Pacific region is already and will continue to be among the next century's key economic and geopolitical battlegrounds. To thrive at home, we must successfully compete there, and

we are." So again, does this sound to you like a government that is interested in withdrawing from the post World War II project of U.S. global hegemony? I don't see the slightest indication of this language. It is very clear that the Trump regime intends to continue to project military power deep into the Chinese sphere of influence. And if the Chinese were to behave this way vis a vis the United States we would probably find ourselves in a nuclear war in no time. The U.S. government would never tolerate massive Chinese naval armadours off of its coast. But China is expected to do that. And then it goes on the document and says: "Deterring military threats. A favourable conventional military balance remains an essential component of strategic competition. There is rightly much focus on Taiwan, partly because of Taiwan's dominance of semiconductor production, but mostly because Taiwan provides direct access to the second island chain and splits Northeast and Southeast Asia into two distinct theatres." Where is the recognition in this document that Taiwan forms part of China? That the U.S. has long taken the position itself, that there is a single state and that Taiwan is part of that Chinese state. It goes on and says, "Given that one-third of global shipping passes annually through the South China Sea, this has major implications for the U.S. economy, hence, deterring a conflict over Taiwan, ideally by preserving military overmatch." So they have to be militarily superior to China, including in that region, in China's own sphere of influence. "Hence, deterring a conflict over Taiwan, ideally by preserving military overmatch is a priority. We will also maintain our long-standing declaratory policy on Taiwan, meaning the United States does not support any unilateral change to the status quo. "And the United States is in fact providing weapons to Taiwan and military training to its military forces. It goes on and says: "We will build a military capable of denying aggression anywhere in the first island chain. But the American military cannot and should not have to do this alone." And at the bottom, this "will interlink maritime security issues along the first island chain while reinforcing U.S. and allies' capacity, deny", blah, blah, blah. So you may be wondering what is the first island chain? Here it is. It's that red line. So the United States, what it's saying in this document is it will continue to maintain robust military presence in the islands along that chain. As you can see, they ring the entire Pacific coast of China, not only China, but also further to the north there, the Russian coast as well. So this military presence is not only, the massive US military presence along this chain is not only a threat to China's security, it is also a threat to the security of the Russian Federation, with whom the Trump administration claims to want peace. So again, Rami, do you see any indication here that the US government is giving up on its project of U.S. global hegemony?

RY: I mean, it's clearly saying that America needs total control of the South China Sea as if it's a sea that belongs to them. We're talking here about protecting America's interests. Where is America's interest in the South China Sea, other than the interests of these oligarchs that are running the country? And then the first island chain, right? You've spoke about that part, but then on the western side of China, where they're trying to build a separatist movement, every now and then, every other month, we hear about the issues in Tibet, issues in Xinjiang, and issues in Hong Kong, the whole point is to balkanize China the way they succeeded in doing the USSR in Yugoslavia. So it's about isolating China from any access to foreign markets through land in the West through its Belt and Road, and access to shipping its goods through the South China Sea to the Pacific Ocean or internationally. And this is why I believe

it makes total sense for China to realise that at some point Western markets, Europe, North America will not be markets they'll have access to. And they're building this Belt and Road initiative, they're doing massive investments in Africa and Latin America, because at some point these will be the only markets China will get access to if America keeps cracking down on China's ability to export. But at the moment, from everything that we've been reading about this security plan of Trump. It's all about controlling markets, controlling shipping routes, and making sure that no one challenges in a fair manner America's economic might. China is guilty of having a great system that is able to produce goods at a cheap price and dominating trade without enslaving any other countries.

DL: Yeah, this is a great point, Rami. You know, no state on earth has a greater interest in freedom of navigation than China because it is an exporting powerhouse, and so much of its exports are delivered to markets by maritime transportation. So this idea that China would impede or halt the flow of maritime transportation in waters off its shores is preposterous. That would do devastating damage to the Chinese economy. The state that has an incentive to halt or impede the free flow of navigation in this part of the world is the United States, because China's export prowess is leading it to become the world's top economic and industrial power. So it's the U.S. that has an incentive to impede the flow of navigation here, not China. And as I said at the outset, this is exactly what the U.S. is doing, either directly or through its proxies in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Black Sea by seizing vessels, its proxy blowing up vessels, it itself blowing up vessels in the Caribbean. It is the primary threat to freedom of navigation, not China.

RY: And I think it's also important to talk about these fake islands that China is supposedly building in the South China Sea. I believe it comes from total necessity. It's their only way of breaking this hostile island chain link without using military power so that they can export their cheap goods to the entire world so that we can be able to finally afford things. So I truly expect to see much more courage from countries and – I mean, I was really disappointed when I heard about Mexico putting 50% tariffs on Chinese imports. We were seeing France ban apps like Temu. Of course, Temu is not the most ethical app out there, but it's I mean, clearly the intention is not to have more ethical options, the intent is to suffocate China and not allow them to trade.

DL: Yeah, I think you're referring here to let me just pull it up on the screen. Are you referring to the Spratly Islands?

RY: Yes. So there's islands that China is building close to Vietnam and the Philippines. And the thing is that as soon as you claim an island, you have an exclusive economic zone around that island, and the whole goal is for that exclusive economic zone to pierce into the island chain link. So I mean Dimitri, I was in China right back in April, June, maybe May April and I would love to maybe have a live stream at some point to talk about my findings and my travels in China and all these video recordings that I have. But after coming out of China, I realised that any issue that we hear in the West about Hong Kong, Tibet, Xinjiang never comes from a place of good faith, of improving the lives of the people supposedly under oppression in China, but it's all about fragmenting and dividing China due to its economic

success.

DL: Yeah.

RY: And it's the ability to offer a system that we should all be inspired by.

DL: And we should definitely do that live stream, Rami, as soon as time permits. So, lastly, the last part of this document we want to talk about briefly is the resurrection, the explicit resurrection of the Monroe Doctrine. So this is what the document says: "After years of neglect, the U.S. will reassert and enforce the Monroe Doctrine to restore American preeminence in the Western hemisphere and to protect our homeland and our access to key geographies throughout the region. We will deny non-hemispheric competitors the ability to position forces or other threatening capabilities or to own or control strategically vital assets in our hemisphere." Let's just stop there. This is exactly what the U.S. is doing to China. We just showed you the first island chain. So in China's hemisphere, the U.S. is positioning forces or other threatening capabilities, and it owns or controls strategically vital assets in there, including large U.S. Military bases. For example, Okinawa in Japan. So the U.S. is doing exactly in China's backyard what it says it will not allow any country to do in its backyard. And here they are defining America's backyard very broadly. It's the entire Western hemisphere. It's not just the Gulf of Mexico. It's not just shores off the eastern coast of the United States, and so on. It is the entire Western hemisphere. So if the United States is saying in that entire huge segment of the planet, we won't allow any competing power to install threatening capabilities or control strategically vital assets, but they assume American policymakers that the U.S. has the right to do that in the backyard of China and Russia, that is clearly, clearly a continuation, unambiguous continuation of the policy of U.S. Global hegemony.

RY: And I also want to say that China never actually used the word our backyard. They never used our hemisphere. China believes in this concept of harmony, being good with your neighbours. Japan is being extremely hostile towards China. And Japan has genocided Chinese people during World War II. China is still looking to have amical ties with its neighbours. On the other end, China has no influence in the Western hemisphere, other than through its ability to offer more competitive and affordable goods and being a dominant in trade, which was it's not based on lobbying or coup that coups that they were able to achieve in Latin America, just purely by being better at trade, they were able to gain economic influence. But the reality is that right now, Venezuela, we spoke about this oil tanker that was going towards Cuba, Cuba just went through this hurricane season, right? Where there's been lots of heavy damage to infrastructure. I was in Cuba two years ago, and the generators run off of fuel. So this oil tanker that had 60 million dollars worth of gas and fuel being shipped from Venezuela to Cuba was meant to keep the lights on in this country, to keep the hospitals functioning. So this is not about drugs, this is not about terrorism, narco trafficking, this is about ensuring that people in Latin America can live a life of dignity and a sovereign life, while America is trying to have total control. America imposes an embargo on Gaza, there's currently a total embargo on Venezuela, either from sea, since no boat will be reasonable enough to dock in Venezuela after seeing what happened with that oil tanker. There's a no fly

zone. I just flew from Cancun to Panama. All of the Copa airlines, all the airlines basically are no longer flying towards Venezuela. Therefore, there's basically a no fly zone over Venezuela, suffocating the entire economy, basically putting at standstill at the moment, and basically we're doing this to suffocate the Venezuelan people and the Cuban people at a time, because no people who want to resist have a right to exist in a sovereign manner in the Americas.

DL: Exactly. And can you imagine? I mean, there isn't a single Russian or Chinese military base anywhere in the Western hemisphere. There are hundreds of US military bases in the Indo Pacific region, certainly dozens, but I think the number is probably in the hundreds now. And given what they're doing to Venezuela, what you've just so eloquently described, Rami, and to Cuba, they would be entirely justified in saying we want to invite our friends from China and Russia to set up military bases here, to help protect our sovereignty and the dignity and just the bare survival of our peoples. But they haven't done that, and if they did do that, you can just imagine the reaction of the Trump regime, right? We'd find ourselves in a full blown hot war in no time.

RY: Now Maduro came up with a speech, a statement talking about Latin American unity. He spoke about the brotherly ties between the Colombian and the Venezuelan people. Trump said that maybe Colombia is next, because Gustavo Petro, he spoke about building this defence force for Gaza. He spoke eloquently for Gaza. He's not as openly as other people in Latin America in terms of being confrontational with Venezuela. So it's a time right now to take example of the success of people in the Sahel of Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso. Venezuela will be able to push back on America if there's other courageous countries in Latin America that want to join forces and unite. Colombia and Venezuela was historically one country, right? These are Bolivarian states. And it's only united that they'll be able to resist American imperialism.

DL: And I think that this aggression is likely to drive these governments to be more united in their opposition to U.S. hegemony. So the last thing it says about the Monroe Doctrine or the Donald Trump corollary of the Monroe Doctrine is, the "U.S. must reconsider our military presence in the Western hemisphere. This means four obvious things. One, a readjustment of our global military presence to address urgent threats in our hemisphere, especially the missions identified in this strategy, and away from Theodore Roosevelt's relative import to American national security has declined in recent decades or years." So this is, I think, the closest language you can find in the document, the entire document suggesting some kind of withdrawal of U.S. military forces from, you know, places further afield like Europe and their reallocation to the Western hemisphere to this part of the world. But you know, I think people are reading too much into the word readjustment. You know, that could mean just an increase, a modest increase in the U.S. military footprint in the Caribbean region, in South America, Central America. It doesn't mean the U.S. withdrawal from NATO or disengagement from NATO, and all the language you see in this document suggests otherwise. And it certainly doesn't mean any kind of U.S. retrenchment from the Indo Pacific region. It is crystal clear from this document that the U.S. intends to maintain an aggressive, massive military presence

in that region and particularly along the first island chain. So at the end of the day, all of this, what does this amount to? It not only amounts to continuity of agenda, which most people, as far as I can tell in the corporate and alternative media, are not interpreting this document to signal. But it also, I think, signals that the American people under the Trump administration are likely to be less secure. Again, this is why we started this whole programme by calling this the national insecurity strategy. You know, blowing up ships in the Caribbean, stealing oil tankers, destabilising entire nations, causing mass migration, which is where all of this is heading, exacerbating mass migration to the United States. This is not going to make the American people more secure. Putting huge military, costly military assets, three threatening military assets off the coast of China isn't going to make the American people more secure. You know, blowing up commercial tankers in the Black Sea isn't going to make the American people secure. All of this is going to exacerbate instability and heighten the risk of a nuclear war or a broader conventional war with all of its devastating impacts, and it's going to syphon away from the U.S. government massive amounts of public funds that are necessary that could be used to improve the lives of ordinary Americans. Again, this is not a national security strategy. This is a national insecurity strategy.

END

We recently launched our crowdfunding campaign so that we can continue our independent and non-profit journalism in 2026. Support us today:

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](#)