

Trump's FATAL AI MISTAKE: US Just Seconds from Nuclear War on China & Iran

| KJ Noh

As major US assets take a pounding in Strait of Hormuz & Riyadh, Trump and the elite have buried a close call to nuclear war with China and Iran that will shock you. KJ Noh joins to discuss this and the latest geopolitical developments. 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 Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> #iranwar #trump #china #yemen #usmilitary

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. Danny Haiphong here. As you can see, I'm joined by analyst and geopolitical commentator KJ Noh. And we are beginning with a harrowing and absolutely stunning report that was released by CNN that the U.S. almost started a nuclear war with China after an AI-generated intelligence report using a chatbot falsely claimed that a Chinese vessel in the Middle East area, Persian Gulf, was carrying nuclear weapons components. This is per CNN. The U.S. military was preparing to board the vessel, and as armed personnel were ready, the military aircraft were already in the air. Now, here is the CNN report, and the CNN report claims that it was just seconds to minutes later before they launched the operation that it was realized that this report had been entirely false and a mistake by the chatbot.

But it comes, KJ, amid reports from the CSIS, the Defense Department, State Department think tank, that the U.S. Navy should target aircraft carriers of China and its Navy, citing particular ways of doing this, particularly via submarine technology or through anti-ship missiles from the Philippines to Japan. And of course, this all comes as the oil crisis explodes. Ansar Allah has struck Riyadh for the first time in years last night. And all the reports today, KJ, in the news from CNN and elsewhere are talking about how massive this energy crisis is. But let's begin with what has happened here. This war in Iran seems to have so many consequences. Back in the spring, it seemed that we were very close to potentially nuclear war, a World War III scenario, China over AI. What do you make of this report and what it tells you about the overall geopolitical situation as these wars carry on?

#KJ Noh

Well, I mean, to state the blindingly obvious, it points out that things are incredibly tense, but it also points out the ways in which AI is being used for military purposes. We have to understand that AI, from its inception, was conceived as a multiplier for military force. The first neural network by Frank Rosenblatt, the perceptron, was invented to improve and accelerate targeting. So if you think of war as a kind of labor, it's a kind of catabolic labor or a necrotic labor. What you want to do is you want to accelerate that labor as much as possible, amplify it, and also accelerate the cognitive labor that's involved.

And that's where the idea of neural networks was originally conceived. So AI, from its inception, has always had a martial purpose. And now we're seeing, you know, the fruits of that, you know, ugly tree. Of course, this type of stuff is not unique or unusual. We know that the strike on the Minab school was facilitated by Anthropic or Palantir using Maven. So, I mean, this kind of stuff is part and parcel of the fact that AI is—sometimes it works, but when it fails, it fails spectacularly. And in this situation, you know, it could have triggered a war, or at least a significant escalation with China. That said, you don't need AI to have this kind of strategy.

For example, during the war against Yugoslavia and the bombing of Yugoslavia, the U.S. hit the Chinese embassy, which is, you know, sovereign Chinese territory. They hit them not once, not twice, not three times, not four times, but five times with guided bombs and, you know, killed Chinese journalists, a newlywed couple, et cetera. So this kind of stuff happens, but it shows you how heightened China is and how fraught the current situation is. And the fact that you have automated systems facilitating this cognitive labor of targeting and target selection and initiation of aggression simply means that things get accelerated even further.

And that compounds the risks if you consider that there's also the potential for the counterparty to also be using AI. So all of this lets us know that this original conception of using technology to inflict violence and destroy lives is misbegotten from the outset. But it also happens to be the logic of capital itself. So that is the core contradiction that we're facing here. And we see, again, you know, this kind of alarmist messaging from the AI companies themselves, most notably Dario Amodei, who says that, you know, AI is a threat to humanity. Therefore, you should give us monopolistic control to self-police ourselves. It's absolute nonsense.

But, you know, once again, the capitalists, they want to build AI to increase their profits, and they don't care about what kind of damage that it creates to the rest of the world. As capitalists, this is how capitalists think in general. And on the other hand, you have China that wants to build AI for the public good, that wants to build AI for people, not for profits. And that's kind of the core contradiction. And this AI doomer-gloomer, you know, threat-mongering is also designed to steer your thinking to accede to the demands of the imperial tech pro elite that want to enclose and manage this for A, their profits, and B, to destroy any competitors, including a different conception of AI as put forth by China.

#Danny

Well, in this report, I'll read a bit more of it because it's incredible. It says this intelligence report, which was circulated across the U.S. military back in the spring in the midst of the war with Iran, merely set off alarm bells. A Chinese ship in the Middle East was supposedly transporting components of a nuclear weapons program. The U.S. military then swung into action with plans to intercept the vessel. According to two sources, members of our military were preparing to board the ship. Military planes were in the air.

One of those sources and another source close to the incident said so. I mean, this operation was essentially underway. It sounded like they had to pull it back at the very last minute. That's how close we came to a direct confrontation with China, which most people understand as inevitably nuclear. But nonetheless, KJ, also this comes amid the war in Iran, and so the war in Iran has obviously facilitated—we see it in Yemen now, with Yemen's offensive against Saudi Arabia, and now we see it with this. Obviously, this war in Iran has blown up into something a lot bigger than just the U.S. versus Iran or U.S.-Israeli versus Iran war. Your thoughts on this?

#KJ Noh

Well, I mean, the war on Iran is incredibly significant because it shows the U.S. up for its weaknesses, namely that it does not have the industrial capacity to fight a protracted industrial war against another industrial power, essentially. You know, the doctrine of battle against Iran is something called air-sea battle, which was originally conceived for China, tested out on Libya, and more recently tested out on Iran. One of the architects, Robert Work, who, you know, was with the Department of Defense, he said that it was a guided missile salvo competition, a guided missile salvo competition.

And essentially, the U.S. lost this guided missile salvo competition because, A, it didn't have the interceptors; B, its standoff weaponry was much, much more expensive and didn't have them in significant quantities. And more significantly, all of its basing structure was wiped out, including its strategic radars. Once you're blinded, you really can't fight anymore. And then it had to revert to, you know, airframes and aircraft carriers, which were then also pushed out further and further. And now the U.S. has to do a lot of its basing in the Indian Ocean from Diego Garcia. And so all of this points out that there are significant weaknesses in U.S. military capacity that have been highlighted, that have resulted in essentially what is a strategic defeat for the United States in Iran.

You know, The Washington Post, I think yesterday, came out with an article: by every metric, the U. S. is losing by every metric. If you know the heart of the deep state and its propaganda rags are saying by every metric we have lost or are losing, then you know it's game over. And similarly, you know, the sudden rout of Saudi mercenaries by Ansar Allah along the Red Sea and in the Bab el-Mandeb shows once again that, you know, proxies with huge military budgets and high-tech weaponry are not able to prevail against a motivated force with real conviction, resolve, and courage, as well as military strategy.

So all of these things showed the tremendous weakness of U.S. military capacities and also the tremendous liabilities of being a U.S. subcontractor or vassal. But we have to note what Eldridge Colby has been saying recently. Eldridge Colby is Undersecretary of Policy for War or Defense. And since 2015, he has advocated the use of nuclear weapons, essentially saying we should be able to use nuclear weapons like candy, you know, that there should be a seamless continuum. It should be part of the toolbox.

If we feel like we're not getting what we want, if we are facing strategic defeat, if we have—if we need to bring a losing war to an acceptable close, we should be able to use nuclear weapons. And he's been agitating, militating for that for 11 years at Center for New American Security. And CNAS is the neo-neocons, that New American Security, like Project for a New American Century, Center for a New American Security—security meaning hegemony. These are the neocons, the neo-neocons. They never went away. They simply repackaged themselves, rebranded, retitled their institutions. And Elbridge Colby right now is number three at the Pentagon, and he is setting the agenda for nuclear war.

And more recently, he said that essentially there is a misalignment between means and ends. What does he mean by that? Ends means U.S. military hegemony, U.S. global domination. That's the end. The means he's talking about are conventional weapons. The U.S. cannot get what it wants with boots, bombing, blockade. It simply does not have the conventional capacities, the industrial infrastructure, defense industrial base capabilities, the military conventional capacity to achieve its ends. And so he says that we have to rethink the ways of how we realign ways and means with ends. What he's saying there is coded language for saying we need to use nukes because nukes are the only thing that will allow us to achieve our ends, because conventional means are exhausted and we don't have those capacities.

So this is very, very deadly and dangerous language. It's very coded. If you go back to 2015 speeches, it's very clear. We just use nukes like candy. Essentially, that's what he's saying. But now all of that language has been scrapped from CNAS's website, and it's being hidden. They're playing hide-and-seek with it right now. But the language, the meaning is still clear. The U.S. is planning to use nukes, and it plans to use them. I would say there's lots of preparation, lots of intention to prepare the use of nukes against Iran and most certainly China. So this is the real risk that we're facing.

#Danny

Yeah, and that's why I think this report is so damning, in the sense that given everything you just outlined with regards to what direction the United States is going in, a confrontation of this sort is one that almost produces that nightmare scenario of, okay, how would the United States respond to an actual kinetic action in self-defense for China? I mean, what I'm hearing is that this ship was

actually just transporting wheat and had been doing so for years and years and years. But nevertheless, it could have been a disaster that triggered a full-scale confrontation. KJ, we also have CSIS reporting that they are looking to take out Chinese aircraft carriers—that they should do.

Get this: they should do to China what makes the U.S. vulnerable. This is the Center for Strategic International Studies essentially saying the U.S. is vulnerable in terms of its aircraft carriers, as we've seen in the Iran war. So they should take a cue from this and begin preparations to strike China's navy. What do you make of this? It's almost like a sickening perversion of war that the United States military brass, or strategic so-called thinkers, are trying to take lessons from a steaming dog pile of shit and apply it to the next adversary, the next target. Your thoughts on this?

#KJ Noh

Yeah.

#KJ Noh

Well, first thing to understand, CSIS was related to Henry Kissinger, and they actually gave birth to CNAS. So these are the hardcore hawks, the realists, the aggressive realists, the offensive realists. And they are deeply, deeply wedded to U.S. hegemony. Their notion of security is hegemony. When they talk about security, Center for a New American Security, they're talking about U.S. hegemony. And that comes out of their doctrine of offensive realism, which believes that countries can never trust each other because they never know the intentions of the other. They can only assume that the other is self-interested. And because of this epistemic blindness, the only way to gain a measure of security is to dominate. It's a kind of, you know, violent ideology that has been packaged into kind of this anodyne theory. But essentially, the only safety, the only security, is through domination.

No such thing as communication, negotiation, mediation, cooperation. Those things don't exist in this world of domination, of offensive realism, which they're now referring to, because it's so offensive. They now refer to it as flexible realism. It just means we're going to dominate you because we cannot connect. We cannot connect. We cannot meet as equals. Therefore, the only thing for us to do is to control you and dominate you. That's the ideology of CSIS and CNAS and all of the U.S. think tanks. So they have been saying this type of language for a very, very long time. Michèle Flournoy, one of the founders, says we'll knock out all of China's ships in 72 hours. The thing is, China does not pose a threat to the United States. There are no Chinese ships, you know, going, you know, doing maneuvers off the coast of Florida.

There are no Chinese ships around California. There's nothing there. The only thing that poses a risk is U.S. forward basing and U.S. forward force projection. In other words, the only risk is the fact that the U.S. is positioned in an aggressive force posture, ready to attack China. And so, if the U.S. does attack China, China, of course, has its own capacity to defend itself. What China thinks of as defensive capacity, the U.S. refers to as anti-access area denial, as if they are not allowed to deny us

access to their own territory and their literal waters. It's this notion of entitlement, almost—it has sexual overtones—but this notion of entitlement that the U.S. arrogates to itself in this overarching ideology of hegemony.

But in that context, they believe that they should knock out all—not simply knock out China's aircraft carriers. I mean, that is anodyne stuff. What the real plan is, is to knock out Beijing and all of China's bases and essentially to decapitate it. Again, this is the doctrine of war, air-sea battle. And it comes from Israeli war doctrine. It comes from air-land battle, which is also known as shock and awe. The U.S. plan of war is decapitation, what they call distant blockade, to choke it off at the Malacca Straits, choke it out, as well as to have rapid, preemptive, aggressive strikes on China's military command and control and political leadership.

Essentially, they want to decapitate and sucker punch China, every part of China's control and political leadership. So that is really what's at hand. And this language of, "Oh yeah, we should knock out their aircraft carriers," I mean, this is just kind of warm-up. This is the language that they use because they just want you to get used to the other stuff, the stuff which is much, much worse, which is being prepared. So, you know, in Foreign Affairs, they talk about thinning out Chinese troops with nukes. They talk about knocking out Chinese ships, et cetera, et cetera. All of this signals the incredibly hostile, aggressive, and incredibly detailed plans of organized violence that they have in plan against China.

#Danny

Yeah, and KJ, maybe you could comment on this connection between the U.S.'s current situation in West Asia vis-à-vis Iran and now Yemen with this. Obviously, while we aren't always seeing it—and I think we've talked about this so many times, KJ, on this program—we don't always see it here. It's not making the headlines. It's not getting in there except for this Pentagon-finally-broken story about the AI mishap that almost led us down to nuclear war. But nevertheless, we don't always see it. We don't always hear it. They don't always focus on it because there's this energy crisis. There's multiple fronts of catastrophe for U.S. interests now in West Asia. But it's happening. They're still planning things, all of this, and to the point where what the U.S. is doing in West Asia seems intimately connected to what's happening in terms of U.S.-China confrontation elsewhere. So, KJ, maybe you can speak a little bit to that connection, because it's very glaring now in these reports.

#KJ Noh

I think it was the 2017 or 2018 National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy, where they came up with this two-plus-three formulation, that there were two revisionist powers—a fancy word for saying official enemies, state enemies. Those were Russia and China. And then there were three minor-power enemies, which were North Korea, Iran, and non-state actors. This is the two-plus-three formulation. And since then, the U.S. strategy has been to wage war against all five of these, but in particular focusing on Russia, China, and Iran. Now, all of this goes back even further. Of

course, there are other historical threads that we have to braid into this understanding. But essentially, the U.S. has this conception of global hegemony.

It sees contenders to its global hegemony. And the key contender, the main course, if you will, the main enemy to be taken out was China. And for decades, the U.S. waged overt war against China from Taiwan, from Myanmar, during the Korean War. Even the Vietnam War was, in some sense, a proxy war against China. It continued warring against China until 1979, until it decided that it was more useful to see if it could pull China into its orbit and also to use it against the Soviet Union. And so from 1979 until 2008, there was a period that looks on the surface like coexistence or *détente*, but was actually an attempt to pull China in by absorbing it, by seeing if it could be collapsed internally, if it could be corrupted into a capitalist state.

2008, it became clear that China was not going to collapse of its own accord because it was the only country that had survived the global Western financial collapse. And therefore, this is when the daggers came out. The United States decided that China needed a rapid push down the stairs. And that's when the U.S. drafted something called Air-Sea Battle, which I've just alluded to. It's a plan of decapitation, military attacks on China, combined with possible blockade, combined with economic warfare, what was known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. And then it came out with a political declaration called the Pivot to Asia. So all of this is pretty well established history.

But essentially what it tells us is the U.S. shifted from hedging and kind of soft subversion back onto the footing of aggression, overt preparations for war, starting 2008, 2011, starting with the Pivot to Asia. This has continued up to the current moment. The other countries that were considered to be allies of China or other challenges to this U.S. project of unipolar hegemony, unipolar dominance, what was laid out in the Project for a New American Century, were, of course, Iran, you know, other areas in West Asia, and of course, most notably, Russia. This agenda has not changed. You know, it's twisted and turned, and there have been tactical shifts.

But the grand strategy of domination has not changed, as far as I can tell. I'm open to anybody who can show me that that has changed. But if you look at the escalation to war against China, if you look at the escalation, the ongoing war against Iran, you see the ongoing war against Russia through the Ukrainian proxy, it shows that nothing has changed. So all of this is connected. And if you ask the ruling elite, they will say that—they will acknowledge this. I mean, people like Kurt Campbell say it's a unified field. It is one large global battle. It's one large chessboard. And according to Kurt Campbell, he is prepared to unleash it.

In his words, he's prepared to unleash a magnificent symphony of death. Those are his words. He wants to unleash a magnificent symphony of death. What does he mean by that? Well, I think that certainly nukes are part of this picture. So this escalation, this constant preparation for war, this constant threat-mongering, information warfare, all of that signals that the U.S. ruling imperial elite

have China, Russia, Iran in their crosshairs, and they see them as, you know, one collective, you know, enemy to be destroyed. It's just that they've, you know, mistimed their sequencing, and now they're paying for it in Iran.

#Danny

Yeah, those are great points, especially that last point, mistiming the sequencing. I can't speak. Very apt, KJ. And it comes to, as you mentioned earlier, the U.S. not having the industrial capacity militarily. It doesn't have the munitions. It doesn't have the resources, literally, to fight a major conflict, not only against Iran. It can't reenter the war against Yemen, no matter if there are people inside of Washington, which I'm sure there are, who would love to drop some more bombs on Yemen. Doesn't seem like that's going to happen directly from the United States anytime soon. And then there's also this energy crisis.

Now, I mean, we're talking about a lot of manufactured scarcity in many respects because the U.S. has produced the conditions for now a massive oil crisis. Everyone's talking about it. The gas price, the diesel is literally—I mean, on the West Coast, Southwest—it's absolutely abhorrent. You have truckers paying thousands of dollars for diesel. You have some saying, "We don't have any left, can't get it here because of the costs." And economists, analysts, mainstream ones, are saying, "This is just the beginning." So, KJ, how does this factor into this push toward ever-growing escalation toward a nuclear conflict, which is where the U.S. empire, at least, is heading the more it digs deeper?

#KJ Noh

Well, the rational thing would be to de-escalate, to find a modus vivendi. You know, diesel costs and gasoline costs have almost doubled, in some cases more than doubled. Most people are paying, what, two, three, four, five dollars extra for gas per gallon. But essentially, if the U.S. came to a modus vivendi and if Iran were granted the acknowledgement that it could levy a small tariff on transit, which it is within its rights to do, I'm sure they could find a mechanism for doing that properly. You know, we would end up paying one, perhaps two extra cents per gallon.

So the question boils down to, you know, very simple, you know, in its most simplest bean-counting analysis, would you rather pay two cents additional per gallon, or would you rather pay three, four, or five dollars extra per gallon? I think everybody knows where that lies. So why aren't, you know, the ruling imperialists making this rational calculation? As I said, it has to do with hegemony, this desire for hegemony, and the notion that the U.S. wants to control the world, but in particular, controls the world through choke points. There are between seven and ten, depending on how you count them, up to twenty-five different choke points around the world.

The key choke points, the most important choke points, are in West Asia, in particular the Bab el-Mandeb and the Strait of Hormuz. They're like the left and right carotid arteries of global capitalist

circulation, if you will. And the U.S. still believes and wants and thinks that it has to control this. Why? Because the larger story behind this is that U.S. global power is predicated on its control of the global financial system, which is tied to it being the global reserve currency, which is tied to the fact that the oil-producing countries sell and buy oil in dollars and then recycle those profits into U.S. Treasuries and U.S. assets, et cetera.

And so this petrodollar recycling is the thing that gives the U.S. this unlimited credit card of the global reserve currency. And that is tied to U.S. capacity to control the flow of oil around the world, but in particular in the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, and as well as the U.S. capacity to assert its control over these waterways, that it is the guarantor of the security and the flow of oil all around the world, but in particular in the Middle East. This is tied to U.S. power, U.S. prestige, U.S. financial dominance, to the dollar itself. The U.S. doesn't want to give that up because, as we see, even as the choke points—even as the U.S. is losing these choke points—it is also losing control of the other financial mechanisms.

That is, BRICS is moving towards de-dollarization by creating settlement mechanisms and clearinghouses that bypass U.S. institutions and bypass the dollar by simply allowing, you know, exchange in local currencies and CBDCs. So all of this is completely shifting the landscape of U.S. power, of the global hegemony of the U.S. in multiple domains: financial, military, geostrategic, geographic, etc. All of that is a shock. And so the U.S. is holding on against hope that it can still assert some kind of dominance against these insurgent, you know, anti-imperialist, anti-colonial movements. And, you know, once again, not to be morbid, but, you know, one of the things that they may be relying on is the capacity to unleash nuclear weapons against their enemies.

#Danny

Yeah, well, I think we've seen throughout the war in Iran and now with everything kind of spiraling out of control for the United States that there isn't, as you said, any capacity to de-escalate, which means that obviously, in the minds of those who are doing what we could call thinking and planning in the Pentagon, I obviously believe they have the capacity to continue to squeeze and bully. And even if they have to buy time to do that, we can't underestimate—I think trillions of dollars are spent on the nuclear arsenal in total, whether it comes to their production or their maintenance. And those things aren't just sitting there just to be. I think the era of mutually assured destruction ended with the Cold War, but the US kept the weapons. And that is, I think, a huge indicator of where the US's mindset is. And you mentioned the connections, KJ, every single day.

I mean, even just today, U.S. intelligence is warning the F-35 Saudi deal, which isn't really even a deal at all yet, could expose sensitive technology to China. They're always thinking about China. Every move the U.S. makes, or is about to make, or maybe will make has to do with China. And then, of course, you have some of these neocons like Alyssa Slotkin in the Democratic Party urging Trump to press Xi, when Xi Jinping comes to Washington, on satellite technology that Iran supposedly used to target the U.S. bases in Jordan, leading to several U.S. personnel being killed.

So, KJ, China's always on the brain, but it's always a connection. Every time the U.S. is doing something, China's on the brain. And then you add in the factor of, well, the Pentagon is obviously thinking about a lot of things, and we can't rule it all out. Your thoughts on all this, KJ? Yeah.

#KJ Noh

Well, China is an existential threat because it is the threat of a good example. It's a threat of a country that develops on its own terms. It's a threat of a system that is built for people and not for profits. It's a system that is not built on exploitation, endless war, slavery, genocide. That is an example that the U.S. absolutely wants to destroy. So that gets to the core of its vicious and unending stream of propaganda against China. Recently, you know, the legislature passed legislation saying, you know, China was guilty of, you know, every manner of wrongdoing on the planet, including using human waste to grow garlic.

And this was, you know, some kind of nefarious plan of the Chinese to poison or kill Americans. So the level of paranoid ideation is off the charts. But as I said, this paranoid ideation, you know, is really a confession. The U.S. has a very, very aggressive agenda towards China. It wants to attack and, if possible, destroy China. And so the accusation is a confession. Regarding nuclear weapons, you know, for probably up until the 1980s, the U.S. had what was called countervalue doctrine, what we refer to as mutually assured destruction. That is, if you hit our cities, we hit your cities. This is madness. Let's not do that.

We will mutually destroy each other. We can't do that. You know, therefore, these things are off the table for use. Starting in the mid to late '80s, the U.S. shifted to what was called counterforce strike. It relates to what is called the second offset, which is the development of precision weapons that they believe can knock out missiles before they're launched, or even knock them out of the sky as they're launched. And so the idea became then we can survive a nuclear attack, but it's actually to our advantage to strike first. And so this counterforce doctrine was put into place. And essentially, in its simplest terms, it means a nuclear sucker punch.

If we can attack China with nuclear weapons first, we can knock out enough of their capacity that anything they launch to us afterwards as a second strike, we can simply knock out with interceptors. This was the conceit. And this is referred to as not MAD, but NUTS: nuclear utilization target selection. Yes, it is absolutely nuts. It is completely insane. But this is what, quote unquote, smart boffins at RAND and at the highest levels of the U.S. think tank deep state thought have been contemplating for decades. And now we have the other, you know, wrinkle in this, which is the use of tactical nukes. And what the U.S. refers to as tactical nukes are weapons that are perhaps 300, 360-kiloton range.

The Hiroshima bomb was 15 kilotons. So we're looking at things that are an order of magnitude higher than the Hiroshima bomb. So clearly, there is a nuclear agenda. There is nuclear doctrine, which is being bandied about. You know, RAND is recruiting interns to study nuclear gaming. It's not

even top-secret stuff anymore. They're just, you know, interns, anybody in the door, you know, anybody with a piece of, you know, paper, you know, we will have you plan out and play with nuclear war gaming. And they're offering courses on that. So it's just the way that it has been normalized in elite circles and elite operational concepts is extraordinarily frightening.

And so, at the end of the day, you know, de-escalation, a way for finding a *modus vivendi*, would be, you know, the rational way to go. But the problem is, is hegemony is one hell of a drug. And the U.S. is a drug addict that does not want to let go of hegemony, does not want to let go of its power and privilege, rather end the world than see the end of its power and privilege. And it is high on its own supply. And it believes, I believe, that it believes that it can win a nuclear war. Everything that they are putting out there seems to indicate that they believe a nuclear war is winnable. And they've been saying that since the 1980s. And they're simply fleshing out more and more details to it.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah, I mean, I can't imagine some of that assumption, that horrifying assumption that you just outlined there, KJ, doesn't have something to do with the fact that, I don't know for how many years now, the United States—a big part of how the U.S. bases its actions is, some call it underestimating, but I think truly just believing that a country like China or a country like Russia and Iran, they would never go to the levels that the U.S. is willing to go to achieve their ends. I truly believe that that's a big part of the calculation. If we do this, if we use tactical nukes, for example, they will not escalate that. They might not even pull out their arsenal against us, and then we have the upper hand. Absolutely crazy, but that's how it seems, at least just looking at this and taking everything that you just said here, KJ. But Russia, China, Iran, they're all trying to de-escalate.

We had this important veto that essentially gets rid of any kind of UN monitoring of the snapback sanctions on Iran, which does really do big damage to its legitimacy. You have China. I know Wang Yi was meeting with Abbas Araghchi just these last few days. Constant, constant, constant activity. The BRICS summit, of course, toward de-escalation and also building a more prosperous and peaceful world. But I'm curious on what, KJ, your assessment and reactions—yeah, maybe a focus on the China side, the Iranian side, the Russian side. Even what Yemen is doing on Tehran, I mean, some of the actions seem offensive in nature, but a lot of it is not just defensive, but also attempts to build something completely different. So your thoughts on that?

#KJ Noh

The movements of national liberation, the anti-imperial movements of national liberation. And, you know, as we know, you know, when a country is occupied and colonized—for example, Yemen by Saudi Arabia and Saudi Arabian mercenaries and the UAE—they have the right to fight back. You know, armed resistance is permissible under international law. But the larger picture around Iran

and China, once again, I said that this has to do with the U.S. plans for global hegemony. And for decades, the U.S. got a little fat and flabby. You know, it's like the boxer who was sparring with children. Essentially, that's what the United States was doing for decades.

It was bombing goat herders from the sky using exquisite weaponry, exquisite technology, you know, combined arms maneuver, you know, with this global panopticon to hit a goat herder with a pickup truck or, you know, a group of people celebrating their wedding. And this they called, you know, it was called COIN. It's both a kind of hearts and minds strategy: we have a plan to kill everybody. We are polite. We are professional. And we have a plan to kill everyone, as General Mattis, as the U.S. general leading CENTCOM, said. So this is like, you know, sparring with children, and then you get back into the ring and you actually face somebody who knows how to fight.

And Iran showed that if you hit it, it will hit back, and it will hit back just as hard. It has just as many, if not more, standoff weapons. It understands military strategy better. It has innate geographic advantages, cost advantages, strategic advantages, advantages in resolve, etc. But essentially, it showed that it could stand its ground and hit back hard, and essentially put the U.S. into a chokehold. So having done that, has the U.S. realized once again that it needs to make accommodation, come to an agreement, fulfill the provisions of the MOU, or is it going to continue to escalate? Well, what it looked like was it was trying to corral proxies into the war. And so this was the demand on South Korea to send troops.

Now, just to give you a sense of South Korea's involvement in U.S. wars, South Korea sent 325,000 troops to Vietnam. As a percentage of the adult male population who fought in the war, more Korean males fought in combat in the Vietnam War than Americans did during the Vietnam War. And so that gives you a sense of how deeply vassalized and how deeply South Korea has been exploited as a proxy force for the United States. The U.S. made this demand of South Korea publicly, not even quietly, privately, but publicly, demanding that South Korea send troops to Iran. South Korea already has troops in the UAE, in the United Arab Emirates, special forces, UDT troops, and they were demanding South Korea send more troops.

And everybody expected—the vast expectation was that South Korea would have no choice but to accede to this demand. Why do I say that? Because every South Korean president since 1953 has essentially sent troops to do U.S. bidding. Park Chung-hee sent 325,000 troops to Vietnam. That was over 3% of the male population fought in Vietnam. Chun Doo-hwan, the next president, Noh Tae-woo, they were actually fighters. They actually fought in Vietnam. And Noh Tae-woo sent troops to the Gulf War, and then Kim Young-sam after that sent troops to Somalia. Kim Dae-jung sent troops to Afghanistan. Roh Moo-hyun sent troops to Iraq. It was the third-largest deployment. Park Geun-hye continued troops in Afghanistan.

And Lee Jae-myung, for the first time in Korean history, has publicly and explicitly said no to a U.S. demand for troops. Will he be able to sustain this position? We'll wait and see. On the ground for months now, there have been massive, massive protests in Korea opposing—fierce protests

opposing—potential South Korean deployment to Iran because they knew that they would be cannon fodder. They'd be used as boots on the ground, as they were in Vietnam. And Koreans have been saying fiercely and with deep conviction that they want no part of this criminal war, that they do not want to be accomplices to war crimes in this criminal war of the United States against Iran. So there was pressure from the street.

There was also pressure from Iran. South Korea has had a very, very long history with Iran, a mutually beneficial history. South Korea built out a lot of Iran's infrastructure, including its ports that the U.S. has been attacking and bombing recently. But it also has large amounts of infrastructure in the Gulf states, petroleum infrastructure, refining infrastructure, port infrastructure, etc. This is the work that Hyundai and other, you know, multinational construction companies did in the '80s, '90s, and onwards. And so Iran has sent a very strong message to South Korea, saying, "You join the U.S. war against us, and your infrastructure becomes a target." That's billions, tens of billions of dollars' worth of contracts and infrastructure.

So I think South Korea didn't want to risk that. And then the third factor is, I think, the fact that Yemen's victory, as far as we can tell at this point, in the Red Sea, and Iran's drubbing of the United States in the Persian Gulf and in the Strait of Hormuz, I think that opens up some space, and it shows that the U.S. is really a paper tiger when it comes to the military. The very demand that it was making of South Korea is a signal of its weakness. And instead of simply being cowed by this demand and responding reflexively and automatically, as it has done for the last, you know, seven presidents, Lee Jae-myung, you know, put some fire in his spine and gut and said no, said no publicly.

So that is a good sign. But I also think—I'm concerned that that is not the end of the story. There could be a technical deployment that could be escalated into, you know, quote-unquote civilian deployment, or a technical deployment that could just be the thin edge of the wedge and a continual mission creep. And the second thing is that Lee Jae-myung could pay very, very dearly. He could essentially—he could be couped in South Korea. And we also see that there are preparations that have been set up for that. Most notably, they've sent in what we refer to in the trade as a coup ambassador. That's Michelle Steele. She's firmly opposed to Lee Jae-myung.

She has accused him of being a Chinese agent and being corrupt, you know, elected illegitimately. And there are vast networks of extreme far-right U.S.-allied conservatives in South Korea that are also, you know, primed to create disturbance. So this is not the end of the story. It would be nice if the decision remains and the U.S. takes it gracefully. The former president, Roh Moo-hyun, in the 2000s, after he retired, he said, "There will come a day when it will be okay, when it will be normal for South Korea to say no to the United States. But that day is not now." And, you know, two decades later, can we say that day has arrived? I'm not sure. But at least the statement is a strong message, and we'll see if it holds.

#Danny

Well, KJ, in the last 10 minutes that we have or so, I wanted to broach the topic of chaos with you because I think a lot of what we see in terms of U.S. imperial behavior ultimately leads to a form, in one form or another, of chaos. And, you know, in the cases of everything that's going on, for example, the constant—now it's become a debate in the minds of the ruling elite in the United States, especially within the Trump administration. It's military brass, you know, Strait of Hormuz. It's open. It's closed. There's, you know, billions and billions of errors coming up. There's actually very little coming up.

Whereas, you know, now with Yemen, Venezuela, there's some who are very much looking at this and saying, wow, this is a sweeping defeat for Saudi Arabia and, in large part, for the United States because that Bab al-Mandab Strait has been lost to Yemeni armed forces. Then there are others who say, well, it seems like the U.S. is willing to sacrifice Saudi Arabia and is far more keen, it seems, on raking in massive profits for oil monopolies via this ongoing oil squeeze. And then there are others who say—I don't know if you catch the pattern here—there are others who say, oh, well, this oil crisis is an absolute disaster.

It's going to lead to a recession. It's only going to hurt U.S. power, but also, there's a lot of money to be made off of manipulating the market. So there's a lot of chaos in the world situation. Hell, we almost had an AI-facilitated war that could have easily gone nuclear. There are also those who claim that, well, all of this is benefiting the U.S. empire. Where do you stand on this? How do you see it in terms of really understanding how to put these events and developments together to get a better picture of where the world is right now on this September 19th, 2026?

#KJ Noh

Well, capitalism is always chaos. It's violence, it's chaos, it's anarchy. The system is anarchic and self-interested, and therefore it is always going to result in chaos. Now, sometimes that chaos is slightly better organized, and it gives a semblance of functioning, but it's always parasitic on vast amounts of exploitation and violence. And now that the system's contradictions are coming to the fore, you're seeing the chaos and the violence in a more visceral way. Before, you could look in another direction, pretend it wasn't happening. Now it's ongoing. And of course, the ruling elite, they will never let a crisis go to waste.

So even as everything is going to hell in a handbasket, they want to profit as much from it. In fact, their ideology is if they continue to profit from it, if they continue to seek their self-interest, somehow magically, good results will come out of this. This is the core ideology of capitalism, that somehow you get magical good results from engaging in the worst, vicious, selfish, and self-interested behaviors. That's kind of a core doxa for them. They never want to let go of that ideology anymore. And of course, over the short term, a little bit of chaos around the world, well, they'll take advantage of it.

A little bit of chaos in the markets, they will sweep up the profits. This is the empire of chaos. If everything goes to pot, we still control the financial systems, and we control the global channels of transportation, global choke points. Well, now they're not controlling those anymore either. And the global financial system is, you know, multiplying, and it's de-dollarizing. It's shifting into local CBDCs that are, you know, mediated through, you know, national clearinghouses and clearing systems. So the system is changing. You know, the things, as far as the empire is concerned, things are falling apart and changing.

Yes, anarchy has been loosed upon the world. And what are they going to do about it? I think they're going to have an even bigger tantrum. And, you know, is the tantrum going to be nuclear, or is it just going to be using proxies and information warfare and doubling down even further on the problem? You know, on getting high on their own supply. That's definitely a possibility. Also, the other possibility that we have to look at is increasing repression, both internally and externally. You know, it's not a random coincidence. As the U.S. has been deindustrializing, what has it been building? Has it been, as it deindustrializes, de-skills?

So, for example, California built, from 1980 to the current moment, 23 new prisons, and they built one major university, UC Merced. So during this period, you can see where their priorities are. The prison population increased sevenfold, and they are moving in a very specific direction. So it's clear that the violence, the chaos, the de-skilling, the de-centering of reason, logic, human compassion is all part of this ongoing agenda. And, you know, our point or our goal is not to accede to it. You know, when they tell us there is no alternative but an AI-overlord-controlled, nuclear-powered madhouse, that's something that we have to, you know, deny. You know, we cannot say yes to the nuclear-armed madhouse.

#Danny

You mentioned repression, KJ, and if there's anyone who can sometimes inadvertently, or maybe advertently, say the truth without actually adhering to any principles that we may agree to around that truth, it's Donald Trump himself. Here's what he had to say about repression.

#KJ Noh

China is one of the most repressive countries for journalists in the world. What signal does it send?

#Donald Trump

Well, I don't know about that. I think we're repressive also. We get fake news. We don't repress, but they write fake news.

#Danny

And this goes as, you know, Trump is banning all sorts of mainstream media now from access to the White House because, in some part, they've been reporting on some of the U.S. troop deaths that have been covered up. And that's recently come out, that there's, what, about five more or so troop deaths that have not been accounted for in the Iran war. But, yeah, your final thoughts, KJ, about, you know, where we're headed as we, you know, the presidency is coming to Washington. There's obviously a lot more. You know, Trump is mulling what they're going to do with the Iran war, because they obviously don't really know what they need to—what they should do, or which way to go. But eventually there will be some kind of decision made. Your thoughts on all of this.

#KJ Noh

Well, yeah, I mean, President Trump is facing several, you know, critical junctures. You know, there's the midterms, which are coming up. And if he loses the House and legislature, he will be impeached until kingdom come. And so he knows that he's facing that. And of course, you know, obviously the shortage in munitions industrial capacity as a result of U.S. deindustrialization and de-skilling is a real issue, which they have been trying to outsource the defense industrial base to countries like South Korea. South Korea essentially has been recruited as the quartermaster, not only to the war in Ukraine, but actually potential war against China on behalf of the United States.

So inside this shifting tectonic moment in history, Donald Trump plays a very, very interesting role. People have said that Trump is making China great again. He's certainly doing great things for the multipolar world. When I say doing great things for the multipolar world, not because of these aggressive, violent wars that he's engaging in, which would have happened anyway because they were drawn—you know, these were off-the-rack plans that had been brewing for decades—but because he is the Brechtian president. He's like a character in a Bertolt Brecht play, where he tells you what is really happening.

He apprises you of the real situation. He tells you his real intuitions. And that is a slight glimmer of truth that you get. And Donald Trump, because of his nature, he is prone to these kinds of Brechtian revelations, which the ruling imperial elite hate. And this is why they want to impeach and overthrow him, not because of anything that he's done, but because of his giving away the game. And so inside that, yes, first, you know, China is certainly not a repressive society, certainly not any more repressive than most liberal, quote-unquote democracies. I think, you know, you just have to follow the money.

You know, for example, in China—the city of Oakland, they spend 50% of the city's general budget on police. Any country that spends the vast majority—or any place that spends the vast majority—of its budget on police and policing and lets everything else go to, you know, go to rack and ruin is essentially a police state. I think that all you have to do is look at where the budget is going. As I said, the 23 prisons built in California, the fact that people don't have enough to eat, people don't have basic needs met, and the only way to deal with those contradictions is by more and more policing, more and more oppressive force, more and more repression, more and more incarceration.

These are the hallmarks of a repressive state. And so I think Trump gives away the game. Anybody who's gone to China knows that it's exactly the opposite. And they hate that about Trump.

They hate that he's telling the truth or letting the truth slip out from time to time. This is why they want to take him down, because he's not a faithful servant of the ruling imperial elite and their ideology. And all of this signals, once again, you know, the fractures, the contradictions, the weakening of this apparatus of mystification, which is ultimately what upholds the empire. The empire has a superpower, and that is not simply its military power, its financial power, but its capacity to mind-fuck everybody with propaganda, indoctrination, and illusion. Trump is breaking that illusion, and say what you will, that is a service he's doing for, you know, for the world. And people should take these understandings and run with them and believe them, and exercise critical thinking and resist this indoctrination that is manufacturing consent for war and occupying, colonizing our minds.

#Danny

Well said, Keiji. I think we can definitely leave it there until the next time you come on. Really appreciate your time. Thanks, Farzana Deem, for your super chat. Thanks to everyone who moderated today. Thanks to all the members who watched. Thanks to, of course, everybody who watched. Be sure to hit the like button before you go. That helps boost the show and YouTube's algorithm so more people can hear KJ's Wisdom. In the video description below are also all the places to support this channel: Patreon, Substack, and many more options. You can become a YouTube member. It's also a great way to do that. Be sure also to catch me tomorrow. I'm going to be on a little earlier tomorrow, 10 a.m. Eastern, because I have some commitments in the day. So, 10 a.m. Eastern time with Professor Mohamed Rondi. Check us out then, September 20th. I will see you all tomorrow. Bye-bye.