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JOEY JONES, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CONTRIBUTOR: Probably not.

ALICIA ACUNA, FOX NEWS CHANNEL HOST: We want him to do it. We want to encourage that. We want them to shine.

DAVID WEBB, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CONTRIBUTOR: I'd love to see it.

ACUNA: Yes, so would America.

That does it for us. We'll see you next weekend. LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN starts right now.

MARK LEVIN, FOX NEWS CHANNEL HOST, "LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN": Hello, America. I'm Mark Levin and this is LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN Sunday.

Two great guests. We have Brett Tolman, former US attorney from Utah, the Tolman Group founder, former federal prosecutor and also Rich Goldberg, former senior official of National Security Council under President Trump, Foundation for Defense of Democracy senior advisor.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, I'm here to make the case that Joe Biden has been awful for America. Since the day he stepped into the US Senate and sided with the racists and segregationists and opposes integrating our public schools. He was a leader in that movement.

He's been awful for America, he took the Senate Judiciary Committee and turned it inside out, using it to character assassinate some of the greatest legal minds in American history to prevent them from going on the Circuit and Supreme Court.

In 1994, he authored a bill, the purpose of which was to round up as many people as possible for violating our crack laws, and you had disparate treatment between blacks and whites, and he was all in and he was all for it. This is a very nasty, dangerous man in so many respects.

Today, he has our borders wide open, so anybody can walk in and they are walking in and you see what it's done to our country. The deaths of tens of thousands of people with the Communist Chinese providing the material for fentanyl to the drug cartels that are making and raking in billions and billions.

He is the greatest slaver in American history, whether during or before the Civil War, he's it. And it's funny how we don't hear very much about that from MSNBC and CNN and the usual reprobates. What he has done to our economic system with rampant inflation and he still wants to deficit spend even more, future generations how they're going to shoulder all this? I don't have the foggiest idea.

Our interest on the debt is now bigger than our Defense budget, which he has frozen in place while our enemies are getting stronger and stronger and stronger. He has turned our judicial system, our justice system into a joke, into a Stalinist-style political operation where he is trying to imprison the former president of the United States, where Donald Trump's free speech rights under the First Amendment, equal protection rights under the Fifth and 14th Amendment, due process rights under the Fifth and 14th Amendments.

Impartial jury under the Sixth Amendment, right to competent counsel under the Sixth Amendment -- you can't be in four separate criminal cases, in four separate jurisdictions simultaneously, and comply with the Bill of Rights of the United States. It is not possible. It is simply not possible.

And Joe Biden is behind all of it, and I've explained it before. So this is the diabolical person who occupies the White House, who doesn't know ingress from egress, who doesn't know his wife from his sister, who doesn't know Haifa from Hamas, who doesn't know the president of Egypt from the president of Mexico.

This is who the Democratic Party is serving up a second time as their fantastic nominee for president, and this is who the ruling class, the media, and all the rest of them in Washington, DC and the power centers in New York and LA are trying to impose on us. This is the man, no matter how he endangers the American people, no matter how he impoverishes the American people, no matter how he endangers our allies, and is an international arsonist turning peace into war in the Middle East, it doesn't matter, because it's all about power.

I want to remind you of this man's record in another regard. We sit back and we watch the Iron Dome in Israel. Well, I got to experience it personally as did members of my family as I was there last Saturday when the Islam-o-Nazi regime in Iran, brought to us by Jimmy Carter and other Democrat shot 300 missiles at Israel.

So much praise for Biden, so much praise for the SDI system, the Strategic Defense System. It was magnificent. Look how fantastic it was.

No thanks to Joe Biden. No thanks to Joe Biden. No thanks to the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party opposed Ronald Reagan when he introduced the Strategic Defense Initiative almost 41 years to the day, March 1983 and General Daniel Graham, the man who was behind promoting it in the first place, they opposed it. They tried to defund it. They tried to prevent it with killer amendments, one after another.

On one occasion, Ronald Reagan had to shut down the government in order to get it funded to some extent. There was a piece written by Martin Anderson, a close adviser for many, many years to Ronald Reagan, on June 9, 1986 in "The Christian Science Monitor," he said: Since President Reagan announced his SDI in 1983, Strategic Defense Initiative, there has been strong and powerful opposition to the idea, most of it from the left side of the political spectrum.

One curious aspect of this opposition is that the scientists who raised technical objections and the nuclear weapons experts who detect flaws in the military strategy are to the best of my knowledge, virtually all Democrats.

When you can safely predict that a scientist or nuclear weapons expert who was opposed to our missile Defense efforts will more than likely turn out to be a registered Democrat, then you can be pretty sure you are dealing with a political issue, not a scientific one or a military one.

In fact, much of the Democrats recent opposition 1986 to their notion of missile defense can be explained as a reflex action to an overwhelmingly political problem that they have.

Two prime policy issues have dominated the political debate in the United States for the last 40 years -- again, that would be the last 80 now -- Defense policy and economic policy. When either of our political parties gets crosswise with the American voter on one of these issues, it is in severe political trouble.

And if it gets on the wrong side of both issues for long enough, it can destroy itself. The Democrats are already on the wrong side of economic policy. When Reagan announced his comprehensive economic program in the 1980 campaign, they quickly denounced it -- and that includes Biden.

For the last five years, they have been searching desperately for an alternative. They have not yet found one, and the reason they have not found one is that none exists.

The Democrats made a fundamental political error by allowing Mr. Reagan to stake his claim for the only politically viable solution to the economic difficulties that face us, and he went on to talk about Reaganomics, which they used as a term to attack Reagan's policies.

But when President Reagan suddenly proposed a missile defense system for his country, this country in 1983, he placed the Democrats in an impossible political situation. The Strategic Defense Initiative, these defensive missile, was a radical fundamental change in our nuclear defense strategy.

A proposal to move from a policy of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), which relies on the threat of the revenge killing of millions of innocent people as a deterrent -- it always bothered Reagan -- to a missile defense shield, which relies on killing incoming nuclear missiles before they can kill anyone.

Morally, the policy of the missile defense shield is vastly superior to mutually assured destruction, and the swift advances in rocket and laser beam technology since we abandoned our first efforts at missile defense in the mid-70s have tremendously increased the practicality of missile defense.

He goes on: The Democrats' dilemma is now that for the Democrats to succeed politically, a US missile defense system must fail. For if we do begin to deploy an effective missile shield, the Democrats would have only two choices. They could either admit they were wrong and belatedly embrace the idea or they could persist in their opposition, which would become more irrelevant with each passing day.

Either course is politically damaging, particularly when taken together with their economic policy blunder in 1980. To a significant extent, the political fortunes of the Democrats. In the years ahead, will rise and fall on the failure or success of our attempts at missile defense.

What is he talking about?

The power and ***politics*** first for Biden and the Democrats all the time. There was a piece written a few years ago in "The Dallas Morning News" by a member of the Hudson Institute, I believe, Rebecca Heinrichs, 2021: Leading up to the 1986 Summit in Reykjavik, President Ronald Reagan faced strong pressure from many Democrats in Congress to put a strategic defense initiative on the bargaining table with the Soviets.

They wanted him to bargain it away because they didn't have anything close to the technical capabilities to build a Strategic Defense and this is one of the reasons we won the Cold War because Reagan insisted on it and he knew it would bankrupt them.

Among the most vocal critics of the Reagan Doctrine they write, and a strong voice for putting it on the bargaining table was then Senator Joe Biden, who said: "The president's continued adherence to SDI constitutes one of the most reckless and irresponsible acts in the history of modern statecraft." Joe Biden, an imbecile long before his official certified imbecile status today.

Reagan stood fast in the face of that pressure, refused to back off his Missile Defense Initiative. But the Democrats continued relentlessly to try and sabotage it.

Hear from CQ Almanac: 1985: Arms Control advocates failed in repeated efforts in 1985 to impose substantial restraints on Reagan's anti-missile research program, the Strategic Defense Initiative, which critics called "Star Wars." SDI encompass research on several possible kinds of anti- missile defenses, including laser armed space satellites -- they were trying different techniques, and they finally found one that they relied on.

The arms controllers were against it. The peaceniks were against it. The Democratic Party was uniformly against it. Joe Biden was one of the leading opponents. That was 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986 -- Reagan had to keep fighting for funding. They tried to block even the efforts to test different systems.

So in 1986, what did the Reagan administration do? They made a deal with the state of Israel, because they knew Israel would want a system, would use their technological know-how to help advance the system, and would in fact, try the system out on multiple fronts until it worked.

And since 1986, almost four years, the United States and Israel have built what is today the effective missile defense system in different levels. The missile defense system that was used last week that Blinken and Biden praise would not even exist, but for Reagan and the state of Israel, and they have advanced missile defense systems and the Israelis right now are working on a truly super advanced system involving lasers. It's not a secret, you can read about it.

Laser systems that would shoot missiles, jets out of the sky with pinpoint accuracy, and they are advancing in this research. All of this was possible because of 1983 and 1986.

Can you imagine if Joe Biden had won the day? Could you imagine? This man is wrong in every respect, and now he is literally funding the Iranian regime to the tune of over $100 billion -- funding them, telling Israel to take their foot off the gas pedal. They hit the brakes, don't defeat Hamas, don't defeat Hezbollah. Don't you dare respond to Iran in a way that that might actually expand the conflict.

Joe Biden has blood on his hands, he and Blinken. These crackpot ideologues that are Iranian special pleaders who believe that they can rejigger and re-engineer the Middle East by weakening Israel and empowering Iran.

They have no plan for stopping Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. None. And they are funding it as a matter of fact.

Biden has blood on his hands in the Middle East. He has blood on his hands on the southern border.

If he has his way, the Iranians will get a nuke and then what the hell are we going to do?

I'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

Brett Tolman, former United States attorney.

Brett Tolman, I'm going to ask you what I asked a seasoned litigator last night on this program. As a seasoned prosecutor, and now defense counsel, are you aware of any case that you can think of in your decades of practice where an individual was facing four criminal indictments in four separate jurisdictions on scores of separate statues simultaneously? Can you think of one person?

BRETT TOLMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RIGHT ON CRIME: No, absolutely not.

I mean, even some of our worst criminals I'm talking about, you know, and I had one of those cases, the kidnapper of Elizabeth Smart. He had multiple crimes in multiple jurisdictions. You take it one at a time. We got to conviction. We put him away for the rest of his life. That was the end of it.

It was preservation of resources. It was efficiency, but nothing like what we're seeing now. This is a concerted effort that is not based on the rule of law. It is based in ***politics*** and it is using power that is unbridled, with no transparency using that power to actually target a person that they're more afraid of than we are concerned about any criminal activity.

LEVIN: These are all Democrat prosecutors. Two of them are elected local DAs and of course, we have the rogue federal prosecutor who was unconstitutionally appointed by the US attorney general of the United States who was appointed by Joe Biden.

So let's go through some of this. We have this prosecutor in Manhattan who is funded in part by Soros, who campaigned on getting Donald Trump. Don't we have basic rules of conduct, a professional conduct, basic rules of ethics that the American people should know? Their prosecutor has limitations when it comes to targeting people, campaigning against people for the purpose of upholding the public interest and the public trust, do they not?

TOLMAN: Well, they do, Mark, but one thing I've been beating the drum for many years now is that we have given power to prosecutors without an accompanying ability to hold them accountable when they abuse that power.

The Ethics violations are neutered by the position that he is in and the ability that he has to control the narrative. We have expanded immunity so that now we can't hold them personally responsible when they do use their office as a as a weapon against someone they might they not like or they have a vendetta against.

And so until we start to change this, and Clarence Thomas on the Supreme Court has agreed with this, and has said that immunity needs to be narrowed and it needs to be reined in so that we can start to hold these individuals accountable, that are willing to abuse their power.

LEVIN: It is interesting the state gives itself immunity, the state gives its own prosecutors immunity, expansive immunity. And yet the Constitution has built the Bill of Rights to protect the individual and certain key parts of the Bill of Rights are intended to protect the individual under circumstances like this.

So, let's take a look at this free speech in the First Amendment, a gag order, this gag order, this is sort of my bailiwick now. This First Amendment here, this is a clear violation.

I mean, you have witnesses that can say whatever they want, they go on CNN. Michael Cohen is an example. And under this gag order, President Trump is not even free to respond to this person. What do you make of that gag order.

TOLMAN: Well, let me tell you, I'm glad you hit on this because in my experience, and we are now pushing almost 30 years in the criminal justice system, the only instances in which a gag order has been issued, has been when it is intended to protect the defendant in the case, and that is when you use the gag order.

And then it applies to the government, it applies to witnesses, and it is a universal application. I have never seen anything like this where the defendant is actually given the gag order, cannot say anything about the case, but others are free to say things.

I mean, if there -- it is frustrating to those of us who watch this because this is not a common prosecution. It is not the use of facts and the adherence to law. This is not a judge that is willing to set ***politics*** aside.

As soon as that ruling came out, Mark, I shook my head and I thought to myself, this is the epitome of using your position and your power to take down someone you don't like.

LEVIN: We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

JON SCOTT, FOX NEWS CHANNEL ANCHOR: Welcome to "Fox News Live." I'm Jon Scott in New York.

Opening statements set to begin tomorrow in former President Trump's historic criminal hush money trial. Testimony from the first witness might also be given. Mr. Trump is accused of falsifying business records to hide and alleged affair with an adult film star.

On Tuesday, the judge in the case will hear arguments from prosecutors on whether the former president repeatedly violated a gag order. Prosecutors allege he did so with his social media posts.

US servicemembers in the Middle East are on alert after at least five rockets were launched from Iraq into Northern Syria near a US military base. No injuries or damage reported. It's still unclear whether the base was the target. It's the first report of an attack near on US forces in the region since early February.

I'm Jon Scott. Now back to LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN.

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

We're here with former US attorney, Brett Tolman.

Brett Tolman, let's go through other aspects of the Bill of Rights. Let's talk about the Due Process Clause in the Fifth Amendment and 14th Amendment. It applies to New York, it applies to Manhattan, due process.

Now let's see. They dumped 30,000 pages of documents on the defendant three weeks before the trial. They, being the federal government. The judge is insisting on meeting a quick timetable to pursue this case for no reason, whatsoever. The judge decides that they're going to have trial days on Fridays rather than taking off Fridays, like many courts do, in order, in my view to exclude some of the most conservative people in Manhattan, in the city of New York, that would be Orthodox Jews who tend to support Donald Trump.

The judge decides that he shouldn't recuse himself despite the fact he made a de minimis donation, as the Ethics advice was. It doesn't matter if it's de minimis, it matters what's in your head, whether you're giving $5.00 or $5,000.00. His daughter is an activist who is raising money on the trial for Adam Schiff and Chuck Schumer's PAC.

Now let me ask you this, with all of this swirling around, wouldn't it have been the best idea for a judge to say, you know what? I'm going to step aside, another judge can handle this, and yet, he doesn't and he comes under no criticism.

What do you make of that when it comes to due process?

TOLMAN: You know, Mark, there's a lot to unpack there. I'll tell you this. I am well aware of many judges, and in fact, I would say the majority of judges that were in the same position would have recused themselves.

They would have recused themselves because there's an interest in fairness and the application of due process is very important. Remember, we have 200-plus years of history that has presumed an individual innocent. Now, it doesn't always feel that way, certainly for the accused.

But one way that it does usually manifest itself is that the judges will bend over backwards to accommodate a defendant, whether it's to allow in more evidence than the prosecution might like, or whether it's to give leeway in terms of their theory of the defense. There is always a willingness by the judges to bend over backwards for the defendant.

And you talked about the speedy trial. You know who actually owns that, right? It's the defendant, and it's the only one that can say, hey, I need more time. The government can't.

The government can't say that it needs more time, but the defendant can, so here we have Donald Trump indicating it needs more time to review documents, more time to prepare its defense and the judge -- there is not a case out there in the history of this country, under these circumstances where the average white collar crime is over three years long from indictment to trial.

There is not a judge out there that wouldn't grant the defendant additional time to make sure that that case has the appearance of fairness, and that is the same for when you talk about the recusal issue, and this judge should have recused himself. And it was obvious and it's obvious to many of my friends that are Democrat or Republican that that should have happened given all of that is swirling around this judge.

LEVIN: So, there is a couple more of these, you kind of touched on it, but I want to focus on like a laser. The sixth amendment, an impartial jury and a right to a competent counsel.

Tell me, how do you have competent counsel when you have counsel that is working on four cases at once. Really, five, when you take the civil case; when you need the attention of your client to participate in his own defense, where he is bouncing around from courtroom to courtroom, appellate courts, Supreme Court, trial courts, for different states, impartial jury - - isn't the reason these cases were brought in these heavily Democrat areas is to prevent an impartial jury? They can do voir dire, they can go through that all they want. It's very difficult to get an impartial jury in a city that is 90 percent pro Joe Biden. It's not an impartial Biden jury. It's an impartial jury.

Yet again, this judge has the power to move the case to say Westchester, which is more mixed, even though it leans Democrat these days or somewhere else just to say, you know what? I don't want any criticism.

I'm going to move this case to a county outside of New York. I'm going to step down. We're going to find a judge whose daughter isn't raising funds off the case. We're going to find a judge who's never made a political contribution, which is what they're supposed to do, make no contribution. Let's handle it that way.

So the Sixth Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, the First Amendment are all under attack here, in my view, what do you think?

TOLMAN: Well, two things there, Mark.

Think about this. There is a presumption in the Department of Justice's policy and manual -- a presumption to allow the states to pursue any criminal matter before they pursue the federal matter.

Now, in 99 percent of all cases out there, in a similar circumstance, the Department of Justice would say, we're going to wait until the states, Georgia on its case, the Alvin Bragg case in New York, until they have gone through indictment to trial and been finalize, then the Department of Justice would step in and that is according to policy.

Why were they willing then to violate their internal policies? They are willing to do it because this is not an effort about finding out the facts and applying the law. This is an effort to keep down a candidate that they do not want to come back into power.

So I will be watching and I'm seeing this and I'm saying to myself, they are violating all of our historical precedent in the criminal justice system that this country has seen today.

LEVIN: Well, I'll tell you as a former chief-of-staff to Attorney General Edwin Meese, I'll tell you what he would have done. He would have intervened in Manhattan and said, wait a minute. It is a federal matter. I don't know what this local DA is doing in a federal matter, and he's interfering with a federal election.

You dismiss this case on behalf of the United States Department of Justice and the United States government. He would intervene same reason in Atlanta and said, I don't know what she is doing with RICO and all the rest of it, but this is a federal matter, it is not a state matter. She has no right to get involved with a civil RICO case in a federal election, because that's what it's about.

Instead, as you point out, we have a Department of Justice that is serving the interests of Biden that wants to clear the field so that Biden does not have a Republican nominee in Donald Trump to run against.

Brett Tolman, I want to thank you very much for your past service as US attorney and I want to thank you now as well.

TOLMAN: Thank you.

LEVIN: God bless you, my friend.

We'll be right back

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

We are with Rich Goldberg, former senior official in the National Security Council under President Trump and he is now a senior adviser, Foundation for Defense of Democracies.

Rich Goldberg, it is my contention that not only are Biden and Blinken mostly unconcerned about Iran acquiring a nuclear missile, and they are on the precipice, but that they're funding it with $100 billion directly and indirectly provided by the United States administration, the Biden regime.

This is traitorous as far as I'm concerned. Iran is going to have nuclear weapons. They'll be able to blackmail any country they want, so they'll be able to cut off oil passing through the Red Sea and other parts of the Middle East. It'll completely change the dynamics because they're aligned with the axis with North Korea, Russia, and China.

And my children and grandchildren and everybody else's in this country are going to suffer as a result of this. And why isn't this a top issue? Why is Joe Biden, why is Antony Blinken funding the Iranians, turning the other cheek when Iran is close to having nuclear weapons and telling Israel don't go on offense, whatever you do, you will expand the war in the Middle East. Where am I wrong and what's going on?

RICHARD GOLDBERG, SENIOR ADVISER, FOUNDATION OF DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACIES: Well, Iran is a top threat to the United States not just to Israel, I think people forget about that.

This is a state sponsor of terrorism, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism that is already responsible for killing hundreds of Americans. And we know they chant "Death to America, Death to Israel," not the other way around, and the missiles you just saw a week ago raining down on Israel, 120 ballistic missiles, plus the cruise missiles and the drones.

Remember, they are building longer range missiles, intercontinental ballistic missiles to partner with their nuclear weapons program to threaten the United States. That is their ultimate goal here.

And so the question is, how did we get here? What is going on right now? Since Joe Biden took office, Iran has raced forward in its nuclear program.

All of the acceleration of Iran's nuclear program did not come under Donald Trump and the maximum pressure campaign, it has come under Joe Biden and the maximum deference campaign to Iran. $10 billion being opened up, a waiver just renewed last month; $6 billion in the ransom payment for five hostages before that. The oil -- the oil flowing to China unlimited oil that the Iranians want to send to China, billions upon billions of dollars of a windfall there and the list goes on.

No working with the European allies to snap back the UN sanctions. By the way, the United Kingdom says this week, they won't even put the Revolutionary Guard Corps on their terror list. And Biden says okay with me.

So what are we really doing here? The Iranians are at the one yard line of their nuclear weapons capability. They've just demonstrated the delivery capability in 120 ballistic missiles fired at Israel, and our response is to keep the money flowing?

LEVIN: Now, you're the expert on this. Wasn't there an occasion to reinstate sanctions or somehow prevent Iran from continuing building its intercontinental ballistic system? But the United States refuse to enforce that? Refuse to target that? And aren't we doing things like that along the way, whether it's their steel industry and so forth and so on. That is -- it is not appeasement. It's intentional.

And Blinken, he brings in Malley, who is a special pleader. The guy is a Marxist. He is a special pleader for Iran. I mean, they are doing everything possible to ensure that Iran gets a nuclear weapon. No?

GOLDBERG: They only know one way of dealing with threats, and that is accommodation and appeasement. They do not know how to actually deter our enemies and we've seen that for more than three years and not just in the Middle East, obviously, and that is why we have multiple wars raging in the world today with more conflicts potentially breaking out in other areas.

We need to return to a peace through strength mentality. It starts with the economic and political but also extends to our military deterrence as well. Shut down all the money spigots.

You talk about the missile embargo, the drone embargo that existed at the UN Security Council, it expired in October, just 10 days after the October 7th massacre. It would have taken a letter to the Security Council to say, hey, we want this embargo to continue, but it was owed to the Iranians under the old nuclear deal. The Biden administration still holds out hope of negotiating another nuclear deal, so they let it expire 10 days after October 7th, and now we see the results of an unprecedented missile attack on Israel just last week.

So you always see their actions leading to terrible consequences. Appeasement invites terrible escalation; weakness invites conflict. It's a strength that you have to project if you want to have stability and peace.

LEVIN: And they have sabotaged, have they not, the building relationship between Saudi Arabia and Israel, which was about to take place under the Trump administration in the Abraham Accords, where peace was breaking out everywhere. The Arab countries, the so-called moderate Arab countries, they don't have the capacity to defeat or even take on Iran, they need support with a new ally and that was Israel, backed up by the United States.

And this was the sort of defense and diplomatic mission that they were on, and more countries were preparing to join. And now, Joe Biden and Blinken step in, they sabotage it. They say, look, Saudi Arabia, you can agree and should agree to have diplomatic relations with Israel, but only if Israel is willing to accept a two-state solution. So they're actually sabotaging that, too, no?

GOLDBERG: Well, look at the bigger picture here. I think you're right on that one. Absolutely. But it's political warfare against allies and partners and appeasement of enemies. So you start with political warfare against Saudi Arabia, you sabotage the ability to expand the Abraham Accords, you push the Saudis into a truce with Iran, you push them into the arms of the Chinese, which is a terrible outcome for the United States. And then you wonder when war breaks out in Ukraine, when You can't call up the king in Saudi Arabia and say, hey, can you help us out in the energy market?

Now, we see them leaning into political warfare against Israel. Their objective is regime change in Israel, not regime change in Iran, while they continue to pump money into the Iranians. What do you think is going to happen if you conduct regular political warfare against your allies and appease your enemies? You're going to see 120 ballistic missiles launched against Israel the way we just did.

LEVIN: Well, my objective is regime change in the United States of America and I hope we're able to do that.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

I just want the nation to understand what's on the line here. This isn't some regional dispute. This is an international dispute that will affect the United States of America with these sonic, hypersonic at some point missiles. I mean there's nothing to stop Iran one day from getting hypersonic technology from one of its friendly terrorist states or Marxist are fascistic states, and once Iran gets a nuclear weapon, Saudi Arabia is not going to sit on their hands. Nobody is going to sit on their hands and now, we're going to have a complete disaster in the Middle East.

So we will have gone from -- and this is what is up for election, too.

We will have gone from a Trump policy that brought peace. Iran was failing, it was collapsing. The PLO was in a box. Hamas was in a box. Hezbollah didn't want anything to do with Israel and the United States to the complete opposite and the likelihood that if Biden remains in office, they're going to have nukes, if not before. Isn't this on the ballot, too?

And let me ask you this: Why aren't the Republicans pushing back harder on Capitol Hill?

GOLDBERG: The last question is something that I think is really important, Mark. We've had bills sitting in the Senate for a while now passed by the House of Representatives late last year to try to shut down the appeasement campaign towards Iran.

I've hoped that Senate Republicans would do a better job of trying to push those bills through, but guess what? The Speaker of the House has actually gotten pretty creative. He has tied many of those sanctions bills to the supplemental that is moving right now.

If that goes to the president's desk, the president will be forced to threaten Chinese ports with sanctions and potentially even put sanctions on the Supreme Leader himself, something that the Supreme Leader would not like to see happen. He actually asked the president to withdraw President Trump's executive order of sanctions on the Supreme Leader when they were still negotiating the Iran nuclear deal, just in the last couple of years. So yes, we need to be pushing harder to force the President's hand.

Listen, the president has been evading or violating US law now for three years in different ways, and on the Iran sanctions front, he has been ignoring the law. Obviously, if China is importing oil, that's already sanctionable. You should be going after Chinese firms. Why the Congress has to pass additional legislation to force the president to obey the law is mind boggling, but that's where we are today.

But if we don't get serious on this threat, combining economic pressure, political isolation, and a military deterrent, you are going to see this region go from on fire to five alarm fire because Iran is presently waging a seven-front war against Israel.

Its eyes are pointed towards the United States, more than the state of Israel. And if you liked what you saw on Saturday night, with the 120 ballistic missiles raining down on Israel, get ready for when those missiles one day are nuclear tipped and their intercontinental ballistic missiles facing the United States of America.

This is the moment to take on this threat, before it metastasizes, before it becomes North Korea on steroids. And remember, Iran is in bed with the Russians. More importantly, they're in bed with the Chinese and the North Koreans and the Venezuelans. This is a direct threat to the United States.

Their agents, their proxies operate in South America and Central America, they partner with the Mexican drug cartels. And by the way, because Joe Biden has left our southern border wide open, they can come in and out of our country to sabotage us, to plan attacks against us while building their weapons of mass destruction.

LEVIN: And I want to add to all of that the following: People saw the missile defense systems in Israel. Yes, they work, but they can't be perfect, and the way you destroy a missile attack is by destroying those who shoot the missiles. Reagan understood that and he was the founding father really, of SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative.

But I want to make another point about it. While we talk about how fantastic it is, we don't have a missile defense system protecting every corner of the United States, Israel does. We do not have a missile defense system covering the continental United States to protect us from nuclear weapons from Iran or anybody else. Why isn't that being discussed, Rich?

GOLDBERG: That is such an important point it is lost on many today. Democrats have opposed missile defense for decades going back obviously to the Reagan years, but extending even into recent years as well.

All of that controversy should be put to rest. Any Democrat who saw what happened on Saturday night should understand that the United States needs to invest in our own continental ballistic missile defense as well, not just on the West Coast where we need to increase the number of interceptors we have. We right now have them in California and Alaska. We have no East Coast defense.

Republicans have been pushing for this for years. The Iranians are showing their willingness to use ballistic missiles. They are building longer range missiles. How much longer are we going to leave our East Coast vulnerable? We need to fund this now.

LEVIN: I just want Americans to understand that hundreds of millions of us have no protection whatsoever. And we rely on Joe Biden and Antony Blinken. That's frightening.

Okay, Rich -- Rich Goldberg, I want to thank you for what you did before in the Trump administration and thank you for all you're doing today.

God bless you, my friend.

GOLDBERG: You too, Mark. Thank you.

LEVIN: And Happy Pesach to you and all my Jewish friends out there.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

We cover a lot on this program as we did last night, and we go deep, very substantive, so a lot of information is flowing out there, but it's important, and I want to sum up tonight's program this way: Our southern border is wide open by design -- by design -- and all the hell that comes with it.

Our skies are open to nuclear attack by design. The very man who opposed the Strategic Defense Initiative from day one and tried to cripple it and sabotage it all during the Reagan years and beyond is now president of the United States.

And while he points to it in Israel, claim a victory, take a victory lap, America is wide open to nuclear attack. And let me just be very clear: I shouldn't be the only voice speaking about this. You're going to wake up one day and Iran is going to announce that it has a nuclear weapon and missiles to deliver it and then what?

And then what?

I'll see you next time on LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN.
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