

# Iran Drops Russia-China BOMBHELL as Trump's War BACKFIRES | Narwani

Iran is preparing for imminent war with the United States as Trump declares an attack is coming any moment, and Tehran's bombshell response includes massive support from Russia and China which has already begun. Journalist for The Cradle Sharmine Narwani joined to discuss. SUPPORT THE CHANNEL ON PATREON: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: [chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com](https://www.substack.com/p/chroniclesofhaiphong) Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> Follow me on Telegram: <https://t.me/dannyhaiphong> #iran #iranwar #russia #china #ww3

## #Danny

I noticed something very interesting. We have this massive buildup—actually, that's probably an understatement now because it keeps changing. We had those drills that Iran held, but now there are joint drills being held by China, Russia, and Iran in and around the Strait of Hormuz. These are annual drills called World for Peace 2026. They've been happening every year since 2018. What's interesting about this, Charmaine, is that if we go by what Axios has said about when a war might launch, they've suggested the timeline could be shorter—just weeks away. Which means, Charmaine, that if a war begins, if the United States launches a war, Russia and China will be sailing together—their naval carriers, destroyers, and whatnot that are participating in these drills—while all this is happening.

## #Narwani

Trump says a lot of things. You know, the action's where it's at—and actions can change from week to week. I mean, expect the unexpected. Our ability to rationally parse through the information and come up with likely scenarios has gone out the window, right? We don't know the level of cooperation between Russia, China, and Iran—only in a few things like these drills, etc., that they announce. And we're not going to know, and there's good reason for that. You don't let your enemy—well, I never understand how the Americans just nonstop talk in the lead-up to war.

They provide so much information to their enemy, and maybe it hasn't mattered in the past because they haven't been fighting peer adversaries. But I would argue that Iran is a peer adversary at this point, at least in terms of its missile arsenal. It doesn't have to be a peer in every area, right? But in terms of missiles, Iran has become a peer to most of NATO. So these three countries are sending a signal. And as I mentioned earlier, the naval drills in the Strait of Hormuz were announced by Nikolai Patrushev, Putin's advisor and former head of Russia's Security Council—who, by the way, people think of as hardline.

Putin's considered a moderate in Russia. Patrushev is—oh my God, you have to read about this guy if y'all don't know. I posted an interview on my blog years ago. This guy was getting to the heart of things like I hadn't seen anyone do. Really remarkable fellow. He's now an advisor to Putin, and he said these drills are part of expanded BRICS coordination. Okay, BRICS. BRICS is more of an economic organization, right? These particular drills are called the Maritime Security Belt of 2026. This is new language, all right?

So in a recent interview Patrushev gave to—I think it was a Russian newspaper—he said that raids on Russian vessels and cargoes in the world's oceans, this is language you're going to be seeing more and more, will become more frequent because the West seeks to disrupt Russia's foreign trade. The Russians are saying that the sea is becoming a springboard for aggression, and the West is now reviving and engaging in gunboat diplomacy. Patrushev and others suspect that the next step is—if these acts of piracy, as the Russians call them, meaning stopping or boarding sanctioned vessels, what the Americans describe as dangerous ships carrying contraband or oil that's not allowed—these are unilateral U.S. rulings that other countries, like India, feel pressured to uphold.

So if the West's piracy isn't stopped, the West is going to be emboldened to try to block Russian access to the Atlantic, okay, and just take out Russian trade as much as possible. So Patrushev is saying that the Russians need a formidable new navy to stop this piracy and develop a high-tech fleet. As we know, the Russians—like the Chinese and the Iranians—when they make a decision like that, they move very quickly. And now Moscow is talking about building a multipolar world order in the world's oceans, a key objective it expects BRICS to also implement, okay?

And when I hear the Russians saying that, I feel like it's a hint to India—especially in light of India's boarding of vessels just this week. The BRICS needs to create a full-fledged strategic maritime dimension. There's a reason this one's called the Maritime Security Belt. It's not just to warn off the Americans, but to warn a lot of players that these three countries have full freedom of navigation in any waterway anywhere. And because the Americans have done it, they just have to recreate the wheel. I heard this from someone very close to an IRGC think tank in Iran years ago.

We don't even have to— you know, the Americans go into all waters now, claiming counterterrorism, claiming piracy reasons, and so on. So now we just go into all waters too. The Iranians send naval vessels into the Indian Ocean and far beyond, because, really, who can say no? We're also countering terrorism, we're also countering piracy. These three countries are sending a signal in these exercises that we're going to create a new paradigm for the world's oceans. And we expect our partners in BRICS and other institutions to comply. Otherwise, we're all going to have our trade routes cut off.

**#Danny**

So in this article in the Tehran Times, they cite Patrushev, and he says straight up that we will tap into the potential of BRICS, which should now be given a full-fledged strategic maritime dimension. And that is—yeah, I mean, that's new language. Generally, BRICS has stayed on the level of economic cooperation and developing, you know, payment and trading platforms—yeah, payment systems, cooperation around financing. This is different. This is the first time I've heard it, because these are not new exercises, but it's the first time I've heard anyone from those three countries use the words BRICS alongside “maritime strategic direction.”

## **#Narwani**

Which is good, because it tells us that they're paying attention. You know, like I said, we don't get a lot of sound bites from these governments, these three countries. So it's hard for us to figure out—do they understand what's going on? Are they even aware, you know? But something else maybe worth mentioning here in passing is that I think these countries are also expecting, like, mass terror operations by the West. You know, the way China sort of, like, latched onto the Mossad operations in Iran, and how foreign actors turned these riots—sorry, peaceful protests—in Iran into, you know, murderous riots, right? Where hundreds of security officials were killed, most of them unarmed. Things were burned down—from banks to buses, you know, things that civilians use, right?

The reason China sort of latched onto that and wanted to understand the intricacies—and is likely working with Iran to do that—is because it expects that kind of thing on its own territory. I don't know what you think of the Uyghur situation, but China was experiencing terrorism in its cities until, in the 2000s, it started these reeducation camps. And, you know, when I went to China last fall—it was my first time there ever—I didn't go to Beijing. I've heard that you will see security forces in Beijing, in key areas, but you won't see them in other Chinese cities. They've done a great job wiping out terrorism, but I think that's going to come back with a vengeance. You know, the Ukrainians have already sort of paved the road for that.

You know, Russia expects these kinds of activities. Nord Stream—the blowing up of the Nord Stream pipeline. I mean, please, a Ukrainian boat did it? It's insane. This was a Western government operation at the highest levels, very likely involving multiple governments. The Russians have constantly pointed to the British. It's not something we often see blamed in English-language media, but the British come up regularly in Moscow's discourse. And, you know, there was the Druzhba pipeline. I don't know if your viewers have heard about this, but Hungary—okay, so the reason it's come up in the news again is that Hungary just said this week that Ukraine is obstructing the Druzhba pipeline from delivering Russian oil. “Druzhba” means “friendship” in Russian.

It says, you know, the Hungarians said the attacks on or around the pipeline didn't damage it. Ukraine can allow Russian oil to flow, but it won't. Then Slovakia jumped in and said, yes, Ukraine is basically engaging in political blackmail. The pipeline is one of the world's longest—something like over 4,000 kilometers. It goes from Russia through Ukraine, Belarus, Hungary, I think also Poland

and Slovakia, all the way to Germany. But then remember, in 2023, when the Pentagon documents leaked, there was a note about a conversation between Zelensky and his deputy in which he suggested blowing up the Druzhba pipeline to hit Hungary's industry—to punish Hungary for not cooperating with the rest of the EU on sanctions against Russia, and so on. And then the pipeline was struck several times in 2025. That's what they're going to do.

That's what the West is going to do. That's what Trump's new sort of rejigging of the world order is going to lead us to, essentially. But here's my question: will Russia, China, Iran, and others do that back? Because they're not going to learn unless you do it back to them. How do you think Hezbollah managed for 18 years? Okay, a much smaller country—a non-state actor in a state where its position is contested—versus Israel, the most qualitatively advanced military in the region. How do you think Hezbollah managed to keep the Israelis at bay for 18 years? Deterrence. They would strike selectively to send messages to the Israeli military.

If you do this, we can do that. Do you want to go there? Do you? Do you? So I think I'm very worried about infrastructure. And don't forget China's BRI, and Russia, Iran, and India's INSTC—the International North-South Transport Corridor—and the many other pipelines and corridors that have emerged from this big push to develop more routes: land routes, land pipelines, land railroads, as well as port systems. These are going to be hit. Economic warfare... I mean, we've seen so much of it. We've seen it in Venezuela. We've seen it in Yemen. We've seen it in Cuba now, right? Absolutely besiege a country. Starve them out. This has become run-of-the-mill.

And to think that they won't take out all our infrastructure to starve our people—you've got another thing coming. Maybe the only way to stop them is to hit them back. This is the rule of the jungle, and guess who's pushing it? The Americans. The Americans, who have benefited more from the post-World War II global order than any other country on earth, are now shattering it. And, you know, Danny, I sent you—when we first started chatting—the Munich Security Conference's report, which is kind of crazy. I mean, if you read it, it's... I have to remember, I think the title of it, just for viewers to know, is *\*Under Destruction\**. And in it, they basically pick—so this is Europe.

Okay. Europe's security apparatus basically said, and I quote, "The world has entered a period of wrecking-ball politics—sweeping destruction rather than careful reforms and policy corrections is the order of the day. The most prominent of those who promise to free their country from the existing order's constraints and rebuild a stronger, more prosperous nation is the current U.S. administration. As a result, more than 80 years after construction began, the U.S.-led post-1945 international order is now under destruction." They consistently named Trump as the leader of the destruction—the era of destruction. They called Trump and his cronies, meaning also political parties in Europe that like Trump, the "demolition men."

You know, I mean, it's a great read, by the way—the Munich Security Report that just came out in February. And European nations now have to find another way not to be disposed of, you know, to stay relevant. Because they're saying the Americans, the Trump administration, are trying to kick out

liberalism once and for all. But liberalism is kind of how Trump's coterie has fared—the billionaire class, how they've done well, right? Liberalism has ushered in an era of billionaire-run governments throughout the Western Hemisphere. And so I'm not sure. I mean, the Europeans really, really don't understand how bad their situation is.

And they're worried—and they say this in the report—that what Trump is doing now is ushering in a period where the U.S., Russia, and China are establishing spheres of influence, which really leaves no place for Europe. And they're saying that in order to destroy the destroyers, we have to be as bold as the actors doing the destroying. I don't see Europe going that way; I see Europe being sidelined. But then, of course, they talk about Trump and these people—the demolition men—bringing in a culture war and resurrecting a supposed pre-feminist, white Christian past, which takes us right to Marco Rubio's speech at the Munich Security Conference.

And this all plays into whether there's going to be a war or not. I mean, it's really worth discussing, because what I'm seeing basically is that what the Americans are saying and doing, and what the Europeans are saying and doing, is giving us some brand-new geopolitical information, okay? We cannot ignore this. This is how they're seeing things, and they're going to move forward on the basis of these observations and statements of theirs. We should be paying close attention to this. So, you know, on one hand, the Europeans are derisive about how the Americans are operating.

On the other hand, they're not condemning U.S. attacks on nuclear facilities in Iran, right? Neither are their institutions—not the IAEA. They're not allowed to do so at the U.N. Security Council. The Europeans seemed fine with the U.S. kidnapping of a sitting president in Venezuela. They seem fine with the economic blockade of Cuba. You can't have your cake and eat it too. I think Europe's in a very bad place, and it won't recover soon enough to help the Americans with their agenda. So the Americans, in my view—and we've had some hints of this—are talking about regime-changing European countries, and that will be interesting.

You know, that's the end of the Atlantic alliance. I mean, if they can—listen, Danny—what if they get in? What if the Trump regime changes the U.K., France, and Germany, arguably their most important European partners, and brings in right-wing, anti-immigrant, you know, “let's destroy the world” type people? Where's the money going to come from to do this? The fact is, the only thing the Chinese, the Russians, the Iranians, and their allies in the multipolar world need to do is disrupt trade in Western currencies, particularly the U.S. dollar. Then there's nothing—no money—for them to go forward on this path of global destruction and demolition.

## **#Danny**

There was a piece in The Cradle that you mentioned about how China is moving to help Iran contain Mossad inside the country. You mentioned that you've been to Xinjiang a couple of times, and even in Urumqi they have a whole expo for new security forces to look at what happened during that period between 1990 and 2016, when hundreds, if not thousands, of Chinese people were killed by

so-called Uyghur separatists who were actually being trained in the border regions outside the country. So there's a lot of sensitivity to this, and a lot of emphasis on it—both in border policy and in general security in that part of the country—to keep that from coming back, to keep it away.

And so that's the point I wanted to ask you about. What exactly was covered in this piece? Because I've also been hearing about cooperation between Iran and China in this area. And it's one that, given the way Israel and the U.S. like to wage war now—or maybe how they've always liked to wage war since the U.S. became hegemon in 1945—is about creating this incredible internal disruption, chaos, division, and dissension, so that whatever they do kinetically can be that much more effective, or even just effective at all.

## **#Narwani**

Well, I mean, we've seen through these wars—the Israeli one, the U.S. ones, and the foreign-backed ones inside Iran, etc.—a great deal of technological and intelligence penetration, penetration that's been made possible by technology, right? Let's just call it intelligence warfare, but heavily dependent on technology today. And the Chinese have noticed that this kind of intelligence warfare now precedes kinetic military engagement. What we've seen from the Israelis and the Americans is an internal “shock and awe,” right? Maybe targeting organizations or leaders. And then they think they can sort of run free after that, right? That isn't always the case. That wasn't the case in Lebanon.

The Lebanese special forces—Hezbollah's special forces—were on the front lines, stopping any Israeli troop encroachment into Lebanon after the Pager attacks and so on. You know, after the killing of the Hezbollah Secretary General, Iran didn't stop. I think there were maybe twelve hours before they launched their attack—new people assigned to these roles, things already moving. The Chinese want to learn from this. At least that's what our author, who is a China specialist and a China-Israel relations specialist based in Egypt, has written. So I think that's a really important point—seeing this system, this development of warfare, that it always now seems to be preceded, right? I said the blueprint for the Europeans, the Americans, and the Israelis—that alliance is now one and the same.

So they're noticing those patterns. They're also, you know, watching or examining things like structural weaknesses. There are technological gaps for a country like Iran, right? So China can help fill those technological gaps—maybe the Russians, maybe other allies even. But they're digging deeper: what are the structural weaknesses? How were any Iranian facilities penetrated through technological and intelligence means? When you get that information—because the blueprint or the playbook is the same—you can be far more prepared. China can be far more prepared internally. Russia can be far more prepared internally. You know, at almost every level, the Americans are pushing these three Eurasian powers to cooperate more and more. You know, why aren't they cooperating now?

I mean, we just had—was it yesterday?—the Russian minister, I can't remember which one, went and signed a whole bunch of deals with Iran. Guess what? Infrastructure. The Russians developing

Iran's gas fields. Next level, right? It's just pushing us closer and closer together. I don't know. I advise everyone watching this to read the article. There's not a lot of information in China about this kind of thing—we're just not going to know. But the author, who, like I said, is a China expert, looked at Chinese literature about what was happening in Iran to piece together a story of how interested the Chinese have been in getting knee-deep in what happened there, and how foreign actors were able to do this to help Iran—and also China—prepare for future breaches of security.

## **#Danny**

The big story to me, with all of this—from the naval drills to this kind of cooperation with Iran—is, as you mentioned before, infrastructure. You know, China, of course, doesn't want to see its allies taking a beating, being overthrown, or destroyed by war. But there's another side to this too: the reason these countries are allies with China is because they're willing to engage in some of the deepest cooperation. Iran has been called the key ally to West Asia and Europe.

And if Iran falls, then a lot of China's Belt and Road Initiative is actually in danger—and it has been for quite some time. I mean, we know that a lot of these proxy forces, like the Baluchi armed groups, tend to go after Belt and Road projects. In Pakistan, for example, they blow them up, they carry out terror attacks on them. And that also affects Chinese people, because Chinese workers have to go to these countries to do the advising, the training, the equipping, and the labor.

## **#Narwani**

Yeah, but you know, there's evidence that even the Israelis have realized some of their actions have created reactions that were not just unforeseen, but very, very dangerous for Israel. Who was it? I think it was Bennett who was talking about this recently—Naftali Bennett, the former prime minister of Israel. He was saying that, in fact, we might see an Arab NATO converge, right? The Israelis and Americans have always pushed the idea of an Arab NATO that would work with Israel to basically combat Iran's influence in the region.

But Bennett was saying there could, in fact, emerge an Arab NATO with nuclear Pakistan at its center—and this would be very bad for us. Oh, and, um, sorry—under the auspices, like, led by Turkey's new aversion to Israel. Because Turkey is opportunistic; it swings both ways with Israel. But currently, Turkey's new aversion to Israel would make a Turkish–Arab–Pakistani configuration that wouldn't have Iran in its sights, but would have Israel in its sights. And this is very real. This kind of became possible because of the UAE and Israel—their close relationship, showing their hands one after another. You know, the UAE basically took over swaths of the south of Yemen, went into Hadramut. It was the first major kinetic military operation of that scale that happened since the sort of, you know, unannounced ceasefire in Yemen some years back.

They went in and took over the south of Yemen. The Saudis really woke up at that. And then, shortly thereafter, the Israelis declared their recognition of Somaliland—a breakaway state

recognized by no other countries in the world. And guess what? Somaliland lies right across from the southern shores of Yemen, okay? That's where the—why can't I—yeah, the Bab al-Mandab is. This is a choke point that could stop the Saudis from moving their ships and trade through the Suez Canal. A map would be good for something like this, but, you know, maybe you can stick one up later. I can send you one now, if you like. Yeah, sure. And this kind of Saudi—sorry, Israeli—Emirati—cooperation in encircling Saudi Arabia just broke any reservations the Saudis had left about acting decently in the face of Yemeni and Israeli aggressions.

And basically, the Saudis went, you know, max on the UAE, right? They went max on the UAE. They basically kicked the UAE out of—well, I sent this on WhatsApp to you; you can choose whichever of the maps. They went max on the UAE. They've tried to reverse all their gains, not just in Yemen, but in Sudan, throughout the Horn of Africa, in Somalia. We'll actually have a piece on this on Friday, I think—a very, very deep dive into Ethiopia. There's so much happening, Danny, it's hard to keep up. But Ethiopia is now playing with the Emiratis and the Israelis, to the chagrin of the Egyptians and other actors.

I mean, there is hell breaking out there. But the Saudis are going in a way we haven't seen them go in for such a long time. They're a very conservative country in terms of foreign policy. We saw a little deviation from that when Mohammed bin Salman became the crown prince and de facto ruler of Saudi Arabia—right?—when he was this wild 31-year-old doing everything his heart desired. But he pulled back from that. And for a couple of years now, the Saudis have been steaming beneath the surface about the Emiratis.

OK, and now every single Arab country that couldn't make a peep about Israel—because the Americans would be mad at them—is going full force against the Emirates, partly because of Israel's desire to work with the Emirates to basically, you know, surround Saudi Arabia, to be able to trap them, if you will, maybe even break up Saudi Arabia, maybe even kill Mohammed bin Salman. It's like, what wouldn't they do, right? But here's the thing—what this did was it broke, or rather, it brought all three existing alliances in the region—the resistance axis, the Qatari-Turkey sort of Muslim Brotherhood alliance, and then the moderate Arab alliance, you know, the Arab monarchies of the Persian Gulf plus Egypt plus Jordan—it brought them all on the same side against the UAE. So instead of an Arab NATO, see, you can look at this map—you can see that the Saudis are so big, Saudi Arabia, that they're on both the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, right?

But if the Emiratis, together with the Israelis, were able to get that whole string of ports—from the Persian Gulf all the way through the south of Yemen and Oman, then up through the Red Sea into Israel, right, into Israel—bypassing the Suez Canal, the Saudis would, you know, lose a lot of power projection. And so a lot is changing. The Israelis are now afraid this backlash will bring the Arabs more in line with the Iranians and, of course, has made the Arabs—countries like Saudi Arabia—basically lobby against a U.S. war with Iran. Qatar, lobby against a U.S. war with Iran. Turkey, lobby against a U.S. war with Iran. Because now the interests have shifted in this region.

