

# Iran Fires Missile Attack on US Air Base, Israel is NEXT | McGovern & Nixon

CIA analyst Ray McGovern and independent commentator Garland Nixon discuss Israel's Channel 14 reports that Iran is preparing to expand its offensive with a massive attack on Tel Aviv as Iran's missiles have changed the game in the Persian Gulf. The US Navy and military is in full panic amid evidence that the Strait of Hormuz is fully lost. Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis! Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: [chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com](https://chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com) Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> #iran #israel #usnavy

## #Danny

Welcome back. As you can see, I'm joined by former CIA analyst and geopolitical commentator Ray McGovern. Garland Nixon will hopefully join us in a moment. But first, we must go over the latest developments. It appears that Iran right now is launching a surprise attack on the Muwaffaq al-Salti Air Base in Jordan, the third consecutive attack by Iran on where there has been no reported military response from the United States. And here's some of the imagery of that attack now. Now, this surprise attack comes as Iran has been launching multiple waves of anti-ship missiles at the Strait of Hormuz, preventing violating vessels from crossing the strait and firing them at U.S. Navy escorts that are trying to get ships through.

And according to data, there has been absolutely almost zero traffic for tankers crossing through the Iranian route yesterday. Now, Israel is very worried because, as everyone knows, Jordan is a huge layer of defense, really the last layer of defense for Israel from Iranian attacks. And as of right now, Israeli Channel 14 media is sounding the alarm that they believe Iran is preparing to launch an attack against them, a large-scale attack imminently. So to discuss all this and more, we have Ray McGovern here, and now we have Garland Nixon here as well. Garland, good to see you. Ray, how about you begin? What do you make of this? Iran has signaled that it is going to be now offensive in its posture, and it seems like that's what's going on. But what are your thoughts and analysis on this?

## #Ray McGovern

Well, I think that is the big news here. Iran has moved to a preemptive, a shoot-first, fire-first mode, and they're being rather merciless with respect to those air bases and other bases in Jordan, and firing on ships that try to enter or escape the Gulf of Hormuz. So we're in a more active phase of this

war. And from a layman's point of view, maybe that's because the U.S. is out of missiles, huh? Maybe it's because the U.S. didn't plan very well for this kind of war, now in many months' existence.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, and Garland, your reaction to this—what does it tell you about the current state of this war and geopolitically, given that the United States has not even commented on these attacks? Your thoughts on this?

## **#Garland Nixon**

Well, I think—I hope you guys can hear me okay. I think that the U.S. is in a difficult position, and Iran knows it. I think Iran understands that what Trump is trying to do is save face going into the midterms. He's trying to keep this kind of thing simmering and do what the U.S. can do, which at this point is they can throw a couple of missiles at Iran every week or so. They can play the tough guy and just kind of string this out and not admit defeat. And I don't think Iran wants to allow the United States to dictate how this conflict is going to go to benefit the U.S. Hmm.

## **#Danny**

Yeah. And Ray, I mean, this comes as J.D. Vance yesterday said that they're not at war with Iran. He wouldn't call it a war anymore. And of course, he had some other choice things to say in reaction to lots of questions about whether the United States is going to wrap this up by the midterms. It seems like Iran has other plans about allowing the United States to wrap up any kind of war here. Could you talk about maybe the reasoning for why Iran would go on this offensive posture now and what it seeks to accomplish as the Trump administration tries to spin this war in all kinds of different directions?

## **#Ray McGovern**

In my view, Iran is much stronger than it was at the start of this latest fracas. It's got Russia, it's got China, it's got all manner of new patriotic kind of supporters which are not going to let it lose. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization meeting just earlier this week was really indicative of how the power has shifted and how Russia and China and actually India have signed on to this business with saying, look, Ukraine—I'm sorry, Ukraine—Israel and the United States are not going to prevail. But you mentioned J.D. Vance. His performance substituting for the spokesperson was really pretty bizarre. He said all those things that you mentioned, namely, we don't know when this is going to end.

I mean, it's really up to the Iranians. And then, you know, what disturbed me most is that he preached this Antichrist thing. I mean, it's hard for me to believe this is supposed to be a newbie Catholic. I'm an oldie Catholic. I never paid much attention to Antichrist. Maybe he gets that from

Peter Thiel, who has bankrolled his Senate and other things. What he said was this: "You know, I wouldn't be shocked," says J.D. Vance, "if an Antichrist were walking on the earth. These may be the end times." You know, I don't know where he's getting this stuff, but he appears to believe it, unless you dismiss it as just an appeal to the evangelicals who are way out there saying, "Yeah, fix me up for the rapture," you know.

I once had a bumper sticker that put, you know, for other drivers, you know, "When you go to the rapture, may I have your car?" You know? I mean, it's really strange. Now, you know, I didn't know about this Antichrist business as a cradle Catholic and a person with an advanced degree in theology, so I looked it up. I googled it, okay? Antichrist was mentioned just once or twice by Paul in the Gospels. Paul refers to this person as the man of lawlessness, right? The man who puts himself in the place of God's law. My God. I mean, not to be funny about this, but isn't that the guy J.D. Vance works for? Yeah. I'm sure he didn't intend it that way. But here, you know, this is the—he's a figure that the Bible points out will reign terribly in the period prior to the Last Judgment and otherwise the end time.

So here's J.D. Vance saying, you know, "I wouldn't be surprised if the Antichrist is walking on the earth." I suppose he means, like, communists or Iranians, or I don't know what it means, but I put myself in the shoes of Russian leaders, and we have increasing expressions of, my God, what has happened to nuclear deterrence? Lukyanov today says, you know, "This is really dangerous when people don't realize what could happen. Nothing good could come of this." Well, you put that together with this crazy, in my view, evangelical spin that the end times are coming and the Antichrist, whoever that may be in J.D. Vance's view, may be walking around just as we speak.

You've got a very volatile situation. I think the Russians can try to tamp this thing down in Ukraine quick, right quick, so that at least the Antichrist doesn't reign supreme there. With respect to Iran, I think that, you know, the U.S. has run out of weapons. I think that's the main concern here. And the other thing that I mentioned before, that Iran has moved to a preemptive—to a, "We're not going to retaliate anymore. We're going to do the first strikes, and you're going to have to deal with it, and you ain't getting the Gulf of Hormuz open until you start to agree to some of the principles in that memo that we signed, well, in Versailles, of all places, by Trump."

## **#Danny**

And Israel is sounding the alarm, they believe, and I mean, maybe for a good reason, given that all these strikes by Iran recently have been on Jordan, which is a huge layer of defense for Israel, that Israel may eventually come imminently under attack by Iran. Iran does have an offensive posture now. What do you make of Israel's panic at this moment, especially given the fact that they are trying to challenge and essentially obliterate all of those terms in the MOU that have to do with de-escalating on the fronts in which it is quite horrifically engaging in?

## **#Garland Nixon**

Well, I think it's a bit of a calculated panic, in that I think that the Iranians have been pretty clear in saying that if the Israelis attack Beirut, then, you know, that will pull Iran into the conflict, and they will feel forced to respond. And I think one could interpret that to mean that the Israelis are planning to attack Beirut sometime soon. And rather than attack Beirut and then the Iranians answer with attacks, and then it's clear that this is what the Iranians had planned and this is what they said all the time, I think this is a preemptive PR move so that when and if they attack Beirut, and the Iranians respond.

They can just say, "See, we told you two weeks ago they were ready to attack us at any moment for nothing," and try to blunt the Iranians, you know, try to deflect the Iranian position that if you act against Lebanon, then we'll act. So I think it was kind of a public relations move from the Israelis, implying to me that they're planning on doing something that would incite the Iranians to respond.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, well, that makes a lot of sense, Ray. Here's Israeli media talking about these fears that Israel is seeing serious signs, quote-unquote, that Iran may resume the fighting. Well, I would say that Iran is seeing serious signs that Israel is asking for it in a lot of ways. This seems to be a big issue. What do you make of Israel's role here? I'm going to pull it up too, but there's also a memo, an advertisement almost, inside the Jerusalem Post saying that the United States is unprepared for a ground invasion against Iran and that the United States should institute a program of debt forgiveness for the military to increase recruiting so that they can be prepared for a ground invasion. It seems like there's a lot of ideas being bandied about here. But what's your thoughts on Israel's reaction and its role in all of this?

## **#Ray McGovern**

Well, it was Israel who started this whole fracas, of course. We have a very active political campaign within Israel right now. The elections are coming up quite soon. Each candidate is trying to appear tougher than the others, and it's really pretty unpredictable what the Israelis will do. Now, if there is another exchange, let's say the Iranians do actually act preemptively against Israel or react to what Israel is doing in Lebanon, the first item in that MOU, mind you, then it's really off the charts. You have an unpredictable president. You have Netanyahu in dire straits. My concern, as always, is that Netanyahu has one and only one ace in the hole, and it ain't Trump. It's his nuclear weapons.

Now, would a person who has initiated and is still conducting genocide, forced starvation, assassinations of other leaders of other countries—would he hesitate to resort to nuclear weapons? I think the chances are that he would. That is really, really torturing me. And would he ask the United States first? Well, my guess, and it's just a guess, is that the Israelis would proceed as they usually do. They'd much rather ask for forgiveness after the fact than permission before the fact. What would Trump do? God knows. Trump is unpredictable. But if the Israelis are in dire straits, I think

the chances are better than even that they would do that. And just a couple, maybe five, ten nuclear weapons should do the Iranians in, according to Israeli calculations.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, and Garland, I pulled up this economic enlistment for indebted military-age Americans, where the Jerusalem Post literally describes how it would be so good if the U.S. military offers debt forgiveness for indebted Americans. There are a lot of those. And that would give them the force projection necessary to fight Iran on the ground. And Netanyahu has said—and this is so contradictory—there's a huge alarm now being sounded of a possible attack on Israel, and Netanyahu is blathering about how he's convinced that Israel has the ability to remove Iran once and for all, to topple the regime. And that's why Iran does not attack, because Israel is so mighty and superior. What's your reaction to this contradiction, and anything else you want to follow up on what Garland said?

## **#Garland Nixon**

Well, a couple of things. Number one, I mean, I don't—it's kind of like when someone says Trump said this or Trump tweeted this or, you know, Barak Ravid, the guy over at Axios. There's certain people and groups that you have to kind of ignore the content of what they say and focus more on the context. I think the important thing in this, in the context of the conversation or the comments that he made about, you know, effectively the U.S. instituting a poverty draft, is that he recognizes that the war is lost. He recognizes that the plans that he and the U.S. had have all completely failed. And now he's saying, "But you can't give up."

You have to fight to the last. Well, we don't have Ukrainians, so it'll be like a fight to the last American. He's saying, let's use the American people in the same way that NATO is using the Ukrainian people. Let's use them for cannon fodder. Look, your economy's crap. You got a lot of poor people. Let's use that to our advantage. We'll do a poverty draft and just keep throwing them at the Iranians. Sooner or later, we'll wear them down. I mean, it shows total and complete disdain for the American people, not as an ally, but as a convenient military tool for his diabolical, you know, plans for the region.

And of course, once again, it shows that he expects—it's kind of like he's giving orders to the Americans and to the political class here. Look, you guys got young people. They're the people who probably, you know, 30 and under, have the highest percentage of people in opposition to Israel. Well, you can kill two birds with one stone in that, number one, you throw them all at Iran and get rid of them. And number two, it gives you an opportunity to possibly, you know, defeat Iran, at least wear them down. It's a pretty sad, pathetic, evil, and cynical plan. But I think that's theirs.

## **#Ray McGovern**

Danny, let me let me learn here. I was at the Veterans for Peace Convention in Kansas City, and I met some recent graduates of a very, very distinguished military academy, sort of like West Point or the Naval Academy or the Air Force Academy. And I was talking to him, and I said, you know, it doesn't sound like you're really with this war, or it does sound like you were smart enough to know that before you enrolled in the academy. Why'd you do it? I was astounded. Our family's finances were really bad. I had scholarships, but not enough to pay all the tuition. And the Air Force recruiter was pretty, pretty, pretty convincing.

So it was simply so I could get a good education and not have to pay for it. My God, that was an officer, okay? He's serving now, so he's serving his required five years, or whatever it is. And, I mean, so the poverty draft is not just with folks that live in the small towns of Kansas or Arkansas, or in the cities of New York and San Francisco. It has to do with the officers themselves, who are driven into this thing and then finally realize, oh my God, this was a devil's bargain here. I'm going to hopefully finish out my term here and get out. But that's why I got in. I was really astounded at that. Little tidbit for you.

## **#Danny**

Hmm. Yeah, very important. And Garland, we have now, it seems, according to someone I trust, Elijah Magnier—he made the connection—he said, "In preparation to a potential attack on Israel in the very near future, Iran launched minutes ago a surprise ballistic missile attack on the U.S. airbase in Jordan, exhausting interception systems." So he's making that connection. But I wonder if both of you will comment also on the fact that it appears that both Iran and Russia have been going on an offensive posture in both of these wars, and how that changes the dynamic of the overall geopolitical situation. This is not something that the U.S. hegemon is very used to. So, Garland, your comments on this and anything else?

## **#Garland Nixon**

Well, I kind of, I think it's like a boxing match. I mean, just from the perspective of conflict and how a conflict works. You know, if you ever watch a boxing match, you'll see the boxers. You know, Muhammad Ali, he'd box around with the guy, et cetera. But when he saw that the guy was weak, when he saw that the guy was shook, he'd start throwing a flurry of punches and knock him out. So in a conflict, if a person sees that their adversary is stunned, if their adversary is weak, then they're going to do a knockout punch. I do think with the Russians, there is a timing thing now. I think they see that they're about ready to clean up the Donbas. I mean, you know, to complete their operations in the Donbas region for the most part and take that.

I think they also see that the Europeans are getting more and more dangerous and unhinged, and trying, you know, more and more false flags. And I think they feel like they need to put this—two things. They need to end it. But one of the things I think, I believe, is this: the Russians are looking at it thinking, if we're fighting the Ukrainian military and the Ukrainian military is losing, there's a

potential for the Europeans, the NATO, to say, well, we're going to send some troops in to fight alongside them. But if we break this thing so that not only is the Ukrainian military coming unglued, you have a mass refugee crisis, you have the entire country falling apart, that it is broken as a country, as a society, et cetera, that there's nothing for the Ukrainians—I mean, for the NATO—to come in and fight alongside.

They'd have to come in on their own, and the Ukrainians will be screaming for food and water, not somebody to fight alongside them. It's bad. It's ugly. But let's face it, the Russians have an existential threat, and they're going to act on an existential threat. So I think they're going to break Ukraine completely as a country, as a society, and also so that whatever happens at the end of this, it'll be very difficult to rebuild something. It'll be very difficult to say to Ukrainians, "All right, guys, we're going to sharpen you back up so you can go back to fight with Russia." And the Ukrainians are going to be like, "You got to be kidding me. We ain't going back into that buzzsaw." So that's my thoughts.

## **#Danny**

Yeah. And, you know, Garland said, "Break the back of Ukraine." Seems like Iran is also breaking the back of the entirety of the U.S. military's Gulf and Middle East presence. Ray, how do you connect these two things? Because it does feel like there is a concerted strategy by both of these countries to diminish the ability of the United States and, of course, NATO involved in the Ukraine conflict from being able to pursue and achieve their objectives, but more so also for them to not be able to prevent Iranian and Russian objectives, which is the offensive part of this. Your thoughts on this?

## **#Ray McGovern**

I think it speaks to the lack of, gosh, common sense, lack of professionalism on the part of those who run our armed forces. Let's look at how they prepared for Ukraine, how they prepared for the fight against Iran. They didn't think to look into what the British called their inventories, their warehouses. They didn't look and see if they had enough weapons or if they could build enough weapons to sustain a fight that was inevitable to anyone who looked at the situation dispassionately and without a lot of hubris. So that was at work against Iran, and it's still at work. And that is, as I mentioned two times already, the cardinal fact: we are running out of weapons that we can use.

And it's the same thing with respect to Ukraine. Now, let me say just a word about Ukraine. Back in 2022, Russia was not prepared to have a war, a full-scale invasion of Ukraine, and not stop there, which is what the propaganda says. They were about 90,000 troops arrayed somewhere near Kyiv. Putin didn't want to even take over Donbas. He worked out an agreement. He named one of his best friends, and so did Zelensky, a fellow named David Arakhamia, and they worked out a deal in Belarus and then in Istanbul, whereby Ukraine would stop trying to get into NATO. There would be a ceasefire, would deal with Crimea later, but Ukraine would remain integral.

And you know what happened to that. The British and the French put the kibosh on that. So what's the deal here? The deal is that then the Russians put in their troops to the degree they could against a NATO-trained army, equipped by NATO over the previous seven years, while NATO and the U.S. pretended to be interested in the Minsk Accords, which was a betrayal. So what I'm saying here is that during all this period of time, the Russians were building up. They raised, what, 500,000, 300,000 folks there? And then they started attriting and attriting, and then, oh, they had enough weapons, and they had sophisticated weapons. And so it's the contrast in both cases.

It's just stark. Did our military leaders not tell the president, "Oh, we don't have enough weapons, and the Russians have too many weapons, and the Iranians have too many weapons, and a lot of those weapons we can't defend against, but we'll support Israel anyway"? Give me a break. It's professional warfare. Gosh, what's the word? Betrayal. I don't know who's running our armed forces, but they haven't learned, when I was in the army, they haven't learned the basics about looking at the enemy and what they have and what they will have and how they're, you know, the terrain. Look at those mountains.

The weather, you know, pretty hot there. And then the lines of communication and supply. Basic things called estimate of the situation. We had to do that before we sent a patrol out there of ten people, okay? Now, did they not do that? No, they didn't. Or does the president know that? Probably not yet, but he's learning the hard way. And I'm afraid what he might be tempted to let Israel do with respect to Iran, and what he himself might be tempted to do to make sure that Ukraine is not a terrible defeat for him, for everyone to see, particularly in the next two months.

## **#Danny**

We have some breaking news now. Great points, Ray, that the Trump administration is denying that a surprise attack on a U.S. air base in Jordan actually occurred. And of course, this is coming—there's about an hour and a half until the market closes. There is now a report that came out exactly 40 minutes ago, as this surprise attack has been reported all over social media, that now Trump is drafting a post-war Middle East plan with two events, the midterms, of course, and then the Israeli election looming over it. Now, this plan, Garland, says that the United States will be a guarantor of regional security for the containment of Iran. Your reaction to this, especially as the U.S. is trying to deny what I think everybody on social media and their reports of explosions—Iran has confirmed it—that, you know, it is going on the offensive? To you, Garland.

## **#Garland Nixon**

Well, it's just another grand proclamation. You know, one day it's D-Day. Monday, everything's going down. It's D-Day. And then it's like, okay, it's D-Day. What are you going to do? Yeah, you know, we'll do something a little bit later, right?

## **#Ray McGovern**

One thing we found about the Trump administration.

## **#Garland Nixon**

Whenever I see this breaking news that the Trump administration is going to do something in the Middle East or Ukraine or whatever, I yawn and I just say, "Forty-eight hours, forty-eight hours." You'll just—yeah. Remember a couple of days ago when they said they had a plan for this or that? They don't have a plan. And the reason is because these are all tactics, and tactics are supposed to sum up to a strategy. And as Sun Tzu said, tactics without strategy is the noise before defeat. All they have is tactics. So now they're reacting to something. Holy moly, the markets are going south. We're getting punched in the nose. What are we going to do?

Oh my gosh, my numbers are going down. Do something. All right, all right. Here's what we're going to do. We're going to announce a Middle East plan. They don't have a Middle East plan. Well, they've had Middle East plan after Middle East plan. One of them was called the MOU. But they are able to make proclamations and do public relations stuff. What they're not able to do is the actual work. It requires discipline. It requires delegation. You know, it requires sending people who are professional diplomats and professionals that have professionalism in the areas of expertise that you need to sit down and to think and to write things out.

It requires a level of competence. You talk about people that hired Pete Hegseth. They don't even understand the concept of competence. You've got people in the military jumping off a sinking ship. So whenever I read that the Trump administration has a new plan, I think to myself, let's just say, for the sake of argument, that the outcome they want is this—a good outcome that we'd all want. They are not competent to do the things that would be necessary to achieve that outcome. So this is just another headline, hoping that it'll take the heat off for a few hours, maybe the markets or whatever. It's sad and pathetic.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, I mean, I've never seen anything quite like it. But, Ray, please.

## **#Ray McGovern**

No, I would second what Garland said. I think I'll play the part of an evangelical here and quote the Bible. Without a strategy—no, was it without a plan? No, it wasn't. Without a vision, the people perish. We don't have a vision. We have a vision that may have existed right after World War II, where we could throw our weight around. We don't have any vision now except to throw our weight around, and our weight is not what it used to be. And that's concretized, that's in flesh, by what happened with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization this week and exactly a year before.

When, if you remember, in Beijing, everyone who was anybody in the world convened there to celebrate the victory over Japan, ending World War II, and Trump wasn't there. None of the satraps we have in Western Europe were there. I mean, it's a tectonic shift. It's eastward, okay? And most of all, not only China and Russia, but even India now has signed on, as my good friend Johnson pointed out, to this communiqué, which says, "We're going to support Iran. We don't like this kind of thing happening."

## **#Danny**

And, yeah, I've never seen anything quite like this market manipulation in the presidency, mind you. It's been—I think it really is another step forward in the uncivilization that is the United States regime in Washington. But, Garland, your thoughts on this? You know, recently, China—Xi Jinping met with the president of Egypt during this SCO summit. And China proposed a security architecture for the Middle East, which emphasized indigenous security architecture and sovereignty in the development of security. And Mohammad Ghalibaf, who's the envoy to China as well as the primary negotiator, and I think he's the head of parliament as well, said, "China's emphasis on fostering common security reflects a principle Iran has long championed."

Regional countries must be taking their future into their own hands, and true stability can only come through a new security architecture that is homegrown. Iran stands ready. What do you make of this development here? We have, I think, on the one side, a new world order being built, led by China and now led by Iran and, of course, Russia. And on the other side, you have the United States, or Trump, leaking out, of course, right before the markets close, a plan that is about the U.S. being a guarantor, despite the fact that 15 U.S. bases stand in complete ruins. What is your comment on this contrast here?

## **#Garland Nixon**

Well, a couple of things. Number one, it is—we see it. And when it comes to economics, the United States saying—we remember them a while back saying, "We're going to crush China's economy." Remember with the whole Trump tariff thing? And, you know, it was like, "We don't have the power to do that. We're going to crush anybody's economy who doesn't do what we want, or we've got this massive military that nobody's ever seen before, and we'll do whatever we want." It is an inability to accept the limits of U.S. power, and even worse, that U.S. power is deteriorating economically, diplomatically, in every way, shape, or form. And I'd even say this: the more the U.S. fights to slow its deterioration, the faster it's deteriorating.

You know, there's a paradox here. The more they fight to stop it, the faster it goes away. A lot of these proclamations and a lot of these plans that you hear from the Trump administration are based on still being the, as they saw it—there are those who argued that it was never really this—but the so-called unipolar moment. It's still, "We're going to be the guarantor of peace." Number one, you

don't even have the military power or economic power to be the guarantor of peace. If they asked you to do it, you couldn't do it. You don't have—if they said, "Okay, you got to put troops in this and that." Well, I can't really. My bases are all smashed, my troops are hungry and jumping overboard, and my ship's pretty much a rust bucket.

So if they wanted it and they said, "Please do it," the United States doesn't have the capacity to do it anyway. But they can't admit that they've lost the war. They can't admit that we've lost the so-called unipolar moment. It's just a pathetic situation where the leader—what's interesting is, I think the people in America intuitively understand where we are because they're feeling the economic pain, for one thing. But the leaders are still out in space, thinking that we are the 1995 country that can attack whoever we want and everybody has to listen to us. Yeah, right. Your comments on this contrast? Well, I think it's really interesting because you talked about an indigenous security architecture.

## **#Ray McGovern**

Well, one seems to be forming. We have the Mecca Agreement, which I was inclined to laugh at in the beginning. I saw it just as Saudi Arabia trying to search around for friends and say, "Well, we're not alone." But that included Pakistan, a nuclear country. That included Turkey. And now they're talking to Iran. And now China is going to Egypt. So there has to be a new security architecture because the old is broken. The basis that the United States had in the Persian Gulf, they were to protect. The deal was big, big money, big, big oil, and we'll protect you. Well, that deal didn't work out real well for the Gulfies, did it? No, we now haven't been protected. So they're searching around for some kind of new thing, and a new thing is arising. Now, last thing here, Xi Jinping is due here in the United States in three weeks. What's he going to say to Trump?

Well, I don't know what you're going to say to Trump. I have a good idea, but will Trump listen? I think Xi Jinping will take away from his meetings with Trump whether this guy can listen at all or whether he's going to be dismissed and just, we have to do our own thing completely. That will be big because he will report to his friend Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin and the Iranians and everybody else. Here's what I think is really going on. Hegseth is running things. The vice president is one of these really strange evangelical guys looking to the end times and says the Antichrist is here. Oh, my God. So what he tells the rest of them from the Shanghai Cooperation Organization is going to determine some of the architecture that forms very slowly, but surely, in my view, in the Persian Gulf area. It's not going to look anything like what existed before February 28th this year.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, those are great points. And I know, Garland, you have some time constraints, so I wanted to ask you your reaction to China. Xi Jinping is coming at the end of this month, and I'm curious on your thoughts about that, the position that the Trump administration finds itself in now that it has, I think, is witnessing especially a major energy crisis. Reports are today that diesel gas is at record

highs, which, as we head into the holidays with all of these goods that have to get around, we're already hearing reports that massive inflation, especially around food, is going to escalate even further. What are your thoughts on this crisis that's brewing, a major crisis that's already happening in many ways? And now Trump has to meet with Xi Jinping, and this is supposed to be the number one rival, the adversary, who the United States is trying to prevent from supplanting him.

## **#Garland Nixon**

Well, you know, to some extent, I think that this argument about whether the United States can, quote, contain China, control China, you know, make them behave—they love to use this word—it was settled very early in the Trump administration when he said, "Okay, we're going to, you know, tariff them 100 percent, 150, 250." All of this stuff, and China basically stood there. They stood their ground, and they said, "Okay, we're willing to kind of do like Iran. We're going to fight this fight and see who can last the longest." And the U.S. had to fold. So I think the reality is that this has been settled.

I think the United States is in a particularly difficult position because of what you were just mentioning about the diesel crisis and about the looming economic crisis, which means that all China would have to do, you know, one or a few small moves, and they could basically virtually bring down the Trump administration. So I think in this move, Donald Trump is going to have to step very lightly. I think he's going to have to be very friendly with Xi Jinping. I think he's going to have to back off all of the anti-China rhetoric because right now the United States needs China. We see that Japan's in deep and serious trouble. So I think you'll see Donald Trump do the, "We're the best of friends. We get along."

And I think you'll see him back off of going after China rhetorically simply because of exactly what we're saying: the very, very difficult economic position he finds himself in, and the fact that at this point, I think what the Trump administration is trying to do is to hold off the inevitable economic—I don't know if the right word is crash—but some kind of calamity, hold off the economic calamity until after the midterms. I don't think they'll be able to do it, but I think that's their plan. And who knows, they may even try to make deals or enlist the aid, be it wittingly or unwittingly, of the Chinese to try to help hold off this calamity. Because if it happens before the midterms, well, I think we understand what that means, but I don't see how they can. So those are my thoughts on the visit with Xi Jinping.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, it makes a lot of sense, Garland, the notion of the United States. There's reports everywhere, too, that the U.S., in the background, is trying to find ways to contain its own Iran conflict so that it doesn't cause absolute catastrophe in the midterm elections. But even as that's happening—and Ray, you talk about the MICIMATT a lot—and part of the MICIMATT are these think tanks. And one

of these think tanks is called the Center for a New American Security, which is funded by the Defense Department and all of the major military contractors, especially U.S. monopolies in that sector of the economy.

And now they are urging the Center for a New American Security that the U.S. strike China and its AI facilities, its AGI facilities—artificial general intelligence—to stop them from surpassing the United States in this field of tech. In many ways, China has surpassed the U.S. in most fields of high tech. But nevertheless, this is an idea that's being publicly talked about. It seems like a hammer to a nail, Ray. Every time a country—Iran, with its ability to develop itself and stand up for itself and become a leader in that region—well, you got a bomb, you got to destroy it. Russia, the same thing, goes from indignity to dignity, and suddenly now there's a Ukraine proxy war at its borders. Your thoughts about MICIMATT here and the compulsion to resort to, and even plan for, even the most catastrophic forms of military warfare.

## **#Ray McGovern**

Well, I should probably spell out MICIMATT as a military-industrial-congressional-intelligence-media-academia-think tank complex. MICIMATT sort of rhymes a little with Mickey Mouse, so you can remember it, but it's much more serious than Mickey Mouse. Now, that came from the China Morning Post, so it should be taken seriously. But is it delusional? Well, I don't know. Is our president delusional? Is our Secretary of War, so to speak, delusional? I suggest that the answer is yes. So it could not be ruled out. Is it going to happen? I think our military—even the military such as we have now—will be reluctant to do what that headline suggests. In other words, we're not capable of doing that kind of thing. And with respect to the threat from China, I mean, the way I look at Chinese foreign policy, and I've followed that as well as Russian for a while, when they say, "Can't we just get along?"

I mean, like, how about a win-win? I mean, why should that be automatically excluded? It's crazy, okay? So, I think Xi Jinping will make a, you know, a final stab at talking some sense into Trump, but that is the delusional plan of that headline. And Trump is a delusional guy. And I would not rule this out. Here's Xi saying, "No, President Trump, you care a lot about Taiwan, okay? At one point, a couple of years ago, you were saying, 'Oh, you're going to build up your fleet, and you're going to actually defend Taiwan no matter what.' Okay. In recent months, it's shown that actually those missiles and anti-missiles, they're all part of the Persian Gulf now. And even Japan and South Korea are sort of wavering and sort of like the Persian Gulfies. What does it mean to have a guarantee from the United States?"

So just be aware that if the flag was up in Ukraine or with respect to Iran, you know, we have lots of Navy there in the South China Sea and in the Taiwan Strait. Please don't rule out the fact that we'll use that Navy. We could easily blockade—it's one of your favorite things—we could easily blockade Taiwan. We did that as a rehearsal about a couple of years ago. So think about this stuff. If you're going to do these crazy things, we have now, with our alliance with Russia, and now, for God's sake,

with India and Iran itself, we have the means to make it very, very difficult for you with respect to the election or respect to your next two years.

And just one final word about the election. I see signs that President Trump doesn't give a rat's patootie about the midterm elections. I think he has other plans. I say this not just—I think it's dead serious. We've had 250 pretty nice years of a republic here. I see it possibly going downhill all down in November. I see Trump using ICE, the National Guard troops that he can summon. I see him asking Hegseth for regular Army troops to make sure that the election does not come out the way he doesn't want, or that this doesn't happen at all, or whatever. So he's unpredictable, but I can predict that this is in his ken.

Why would he do this stuff with Iran before the election if he cared about—didn't somebody, somebody must have told him about the Strait of Hormuz and what that would do to our economy, instead of the other? You know, why does he do these things without sort of thinking them through? I think, you know, why does he pick—here's another one—why does he pick a fight with the Pope? You know, I mean, 55% of us Catholics, I'm sorry to say, voted for Trump last time. And here he is picking on—he and J.D. Vance saying, "Oh, the Pope doesn't really know his theology very well."

And yeah, so if you put this stuff together in a very speculative way, I reason that the midterms may be crucial to the future of our republic, and that in these next two months, we who feel strongly about elections and feel strongly about prohibiting people like Trump from acting the way I feel he might, we have to put our shoulders to the wheel and act like winter soldiers for once to save the republic that those early winter soldiers in George Washington's army did way back when, 250 or so years ago. I say that very seriously. I ask my fellow Americans to think about that, what we can do to prevent the worst. And we only have less than two months, about two months to do that.

## **#Danny**

Well, I agree with you, Ray, that I don't believe the Trump administration, Donald Trump himself, cares about the midterm elections, because those are only two months away, as you said. And there's absolutely nothing about what's happened in this Iran war, the U.S. aggression on Iran, that is going to change so dramatically that there could be a shift dramatically. The economic situation is already, it seems like, a bygone conclusion. There's not going to be a relief in gas prices and in the economic situation, diesel, et cetera, in large part because Iran has said that it's—how can they come to peace when there is no justice? Iran just suffered an absolutely horrific war crime yesterday in Zurich, where the United States killed, I believe it was nearly half a dozen people, and several children injured, like 70 or more people at a wedding party.

I mean, this is the kind of behavior that demonstrates the U.S. isn't serious. The Trump administration isn't serious about stopping the bleeding, so to speak, from its own internal crises building because of the war, not least because it's still engaging in these horrific war crimes. And how could we rule out the United States continuing to do this, given that there's been nothing in the

Trump administration's behavior that's shown anything otherwise? Now they're trying to say, "We're investigating it. We didn't. We might not have done it. It might have been ricochet." But it's quite odd. I mean, the record is clear. And, Ray, you've been following this for so long. So Garland had to leave, but we still got about five or so minutes here, Ray. So please take it away.

## **#Ray McGovern**

Well, Danny, I still think of the children of Minab on the first day of the war, where not only the Supreme Leader of Iran, but about 170 people were killed at that children's school, 150 of them some underage girls, like five to nine, I think it was. Now, okay, let's assume that was some kind of mistake. I suppose it probably was. But you apologize for mistakes, for God's sake. You don't say, "Oh, we're investigating, we're investigating," you know? I mean, it's no longer necessary. We know exactly what happened. Those were Tomahawks and a double-tap Tomahawk, okay? Did they know it was a school? Well, we could say maybe, give them the benefit of the doubt, they didn't, but they should have, for God's sake.

It was a school for, what, nine or ten years before. So all I'm saying is this brutality has got the arc of resistance in full bloom. Now, I've said before that I tend to be a realpolitik guy. I learned that from John Mearsheimer. I practiced that art for 27 years as a current intelligence reporter, but I never realized that I belonged to that school of international relations. But when you're a realpolitik guy and you look at this stuff, and you realize that the U.S. is running out of ammunition to use against Iran, and you realize that the arc of resistance, for some reason—and I think I know the reason—Iran has made it real. It's Iran. It's the Shia in Iraq. It's the people in Syria who are under occupation.

It's Hezbollah in Lebanon. It's the Houthis in Yemen. It's real. They care about each other, and they care most and foremost about the genocide. And I say that word, [inaudible], the genocide that continues to go on in Gaza. So what I'm saying here is that Iran probably could have made its own deal with Trump, you know. But that's not what this is about. This is about resistance, resistance to occupation, which goes back to 1967, for God's sake. And there was a UN resolution, 1967, November, UN Security Council Resolution 242. Look it up. It requires Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories. Okay? Have they done so? No. Actually, they're going into Lebanon. They're getting more occupied there.

So, all I'm saying is that the very first article of the memorandum of understanding said one country three times in two sentences, and that was Lebanon. Well, what does that have to do with the arc of—well, that has everything to do with the arc of resistance. It has everything to do with how serious, at least, the Iranians are, in contrast to those fat and happy Sunni Arabs that surround the Persian Gulf and now have no protection for all the wealth and all the oil they sold from the United States. So I know where you got to go, but the arc of resistance is a new phenomenon. It's almost altruistic in my view, but I think it's going to prevail. That will mean the end of Israel as it's constituted now.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, I 100% agree with you, Ray, that it will definitely prevail. And I think sometimes, unfortunately, because we can all be, especially in the combined West, particularly the United States, we can be prisoners of the moment. We can be pushed into instant gratification and seeking that. But truthfully, I think what we've seen the arc of resistance and the axis of resistance accomplish since that genocide began after October 7, 2023, it is quite remarkable, especially given the circumstances that all these countries and all these resistance forces have confronted, not least what Iran is doing. And some people, and you can give a final comment to this, Ray, have, you know, criticized the MOU, said it's not a good enough document.

But the number one clause there is so important: this stopping the wars of aggression on all fronts that are committed by the U.S. and Israel. Now, Iran has even expanded that to include Palestine, Yemen, et cetera, in addition to Lebanon. And this means that—yeah, in Gaza. Yes, it is Palestine, yes. And so this means, Ray, that no matter what the U.S. does, Iran, because it says it's committed to this MOU, cannot stop the war because there's no commitments from the United States and, of course, from Israel. Forget about it in that regard. But the United States is an important player here. No commitments. So that means Iran is going to continue to do what you said, altruistically intervening to do its part in making that a reality. But your final thoughts, Ray, on the overall situation?

## **#Ray McGovern**

I'll just say that the last several months have shown that Iran has the upper hand. The other side has run out of ammunition, run out of Patriot missiles to defend themselves. And so it's an inexorable sort of thing where Iran will win unless—and this is what I fear most—in extremis, as I said before, Israel will be tempted to resort to its nuclear weapons. I think chances are that they will probably use nuclear weapons in extremis. And I think that the saving grace here is that there's enlightened leadership with the Supreme Leader and others in Iran. And they're proceeding in a kind of Soviet-Russian attrition way, sometimes preempting things now.

But I just hope and I pray that the Iranians will be sensitive enough to avoid giving the U.S. and Israel a clear pretext to use their nuclear weapons. I hope they don't sink a U.S. naval ship anytime soon, or that they don't do the kinds of things to Israel that would, in Israel's canon, justify, so to speak, use of nuclear weapons. So, it's a tough time, and the arc of resistance is admirable, in my view. It has to do with justice, okay? But the dangers are there because the empire will not go down without a fight. And we'll have to see what happens in the next couple of months. So stay tuned, as they say.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, we will. We will. And I know people hold on to this. They really want to see a U.S. naval vessel be sunk. And I think a lot of that is because of the indignation about the war crimes and, of course, what's been going on. But truthfully, the fact that Iran has literally chased the U.S. Navy out of the Strait of Hormuz and literally chased the U.S. Navy out of the Persian Gulf in some respects, as we saw with the USS Lincoln, I think Iran can be quite satisfied with those outcomes.

## **#Ray McGovern**

Just let me say that what should be mentioned here is a false flag attack on Israel. They have all kinds of capabilities to do that. Blame it on the Iranians and get the U.S. in with both feet. I fear that. It's happened before. So that's the caveat here, would be, well, this would change the game, or could, if Trump still believes in Mossad if it said, "Oh, we didn't do it." So, in other words, it's really pretty delicate still. I just hope that common sense prevails at a lower level than Trump.

## **#Garland Nixon**

Yeah.

## **#Danny**

Well, Ray, it was a great show. Everyone, hit the like button before you go. That helps boost the show in YouTube's algorithm after we are done here. Thanks to everyone who gave a super chat. Thanks to everyone who watched today. And of course, thanks to the moderators who did hard work in the chat today as well. All right, everybody. Thanks for watching. Hit that like button before you go, and I'll see you next time. Bye-bye.