

Jiang Xueqin: Iran War Trap Ends U.S. Empire, New World Order is Here

Prof. Jiang Xueqin argues that a deep dive into game theory & history can accurately predict future events. Prof. Jiang gives his shocking predictions for the US-Iran War, economic collapse, the new world order, and the future of Israel in this wide-ranging discussion. Prof. Jiang is the host of the popular educational channel Predictive History: <https://www.youtube.com/@UC11aHtNnc5bEPLI4jf6mnYg> Jiang Xueqin's Substack: <https://predictivehistory.substack.com/> FOLLOW ME ON RUMBLE: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> FOLLOW ME ON TELEGRAM: <https://t.me/dannyhaiphong> 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 Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> Follow me on Telegram: <https://t.me/dannyhaiphong> #iran #israel #trump

#Danny

Hello, everyone. Welcome back to the show. It's your host, Danny Haiphong. As you can see, I'm joined by Professor Jiang Sui-Ching of Predictive History. Professor Jiang, thanks so much for joining me today.

#Jiang Xueqin

Thanks for having me, Danny.

#Danny

Yeah, well, let's get right to it then, Professor Jiang. I wanted to ask you right out of the gate: in prior shows and programs, you've said that the U.S. empire would lose the war with Iran even before it began. Well, now we're over 13 days into this, and I want to ask if you believe we're witnessing your predictions in real time. What do you make of Trump's words today, saying that Iran is actually on the verge of surrender, despite the fact that we see—I can pull up some of those images—Iranian officials, the Iranian president, the Iranian foreign minister, all out on the streets on Quds Day without a security detail? Talk about your predictions for how this war will go and whether we're seeing them bear fruit now.

#Jiang Xueqin

Right, so what's interesting about this war is that the Americans and Iranians have different strategies, and therefore they live in different, um, political realities. For the Americans and the Israelis, they believe they can decapitate the regime—the government—and they've done that by killing Ayatollah Khamenei, then putting pressure on the military by bombarding air defenses and military infrastructure, and exerting tremendous pressure on the civilian population by battering the economy. And then, by embedding themselves and promoting certain dissident groups—whether religious, political, or ethnic groups in Iran—they hope to create a color revolution to eventually overthrow the government.

Basically, what they're trying to do is provoke a civil war in Iran. That's the American strategy. From their perspective, it does seem as though things are going to plan because, again, they've decapitated Khamenei, the Supreme Leader, on the first day, and they've hit civilian infrastructure. They destroyed those oil depots in Tehran—you might have seen the video footage of black clouds and dark skies over the city these past few days. They're also embargoing the Iranian economy, so they believe it's going to plan. There's talk of them arming insurgents. From the Iranian perspective, their strategy is very different. They understand that the very basis of the American empire is actually the global economy.

So if you put enough pressure on the global economy, you would eventually force America to call UNCLE. What we're seeing in the first few days are sustained attacks on American military installations throughout the GCC. The American Fifth Fleet is based in Bahrain. You're also seeing sustained attacks on Israel. In the first few days, the main purpose for Iran was actually to degrade the air defenses of both the Israelis and the Americans—basically to blind them. And from reporting, it seems as though the Iranians have achieved this objective, meaning that most of the interceptor inventory is gone, and these Patriot missile defenses are no longer relevant in this fight. Also, what's even more significant is that much of the radar system is now depleted, meaning that basically, with \$10,000 Shahed drones, Iran can cause tremendous damage to the GCC and Israel.

We're already seeing that in Dubai, where airports, banks, and data centers are being attacked. Now, one major advantage that Iran has, which the Americans don't, is that the Iranians are able to calibrate their attacks. What I mean by that is, the Americans just go in with shock and awe—they try to blow up as many things as possible. Whereas the Iranians actually try to figure out what the pressure points are in the GCC. So what they're trying to do is split the GCC off from the American empire. They're trying to cause instability within these different kingdoms, whether it be Bahrain, the UAE, or Saudi Arabia. They're basically trying to provoke a civil uprising against these Gulf monarchies.

And they're trying to basically splinter the alliance, because by controlling the Strait of Hormuz, they can say to the GCC, "If you play ball, we'll let your ships through." And that's very appealing to the GCC, because the reality is that they depend on the Strait of Hormuz not just for oil exports, but also for food imports. Also, we have to remember that if Iran wanted to destroy the entire GCC, it could

do so. Trump had threatened the cement infrastructure of Iran—basically to destroy the desalination plants and the electric grid. Iran's response was that if you do that, then we will destroy the desalination plants of the GCC and their oil refineries as well, basically causing their economies to collapse.

Because remember, the GCC relies on desalination plants for about 60% of its fresh water supply, meaning it doesn't have an organic source of fresh water. Iran has far more advantages than the United States in this war. So for these reasons, I actually think that, from a military perspective, Iran has more advantages. From a political perspective, it's night and day, because this war is extremely unpopular in the United States. About three-quarters of Americans did not support a strike against Iran. And now that the war has started, more and more Americans are confused about the strategy and purpose of this war. And Trump himself has failed to articulate a clear strategy.

And it seems as though the rationale behind this war changes every day. Maybe in the beginning it was about protests, then it became about nuclear weapons. And now it's because Israel was supposedly going to attack first, and Iran was going to retaliate against both the United States and Israel. Therefore, the United States had to preempt Israel's preemptive strike. From a political perspective, right now in America it's a very divided nation, whereas in Iran it's the complete opposite. Remember, on the first day, an American Tomahawk missile struck a girls' school in the south, killing about 170 schoolgirls—these were primary school girls.

And most of them are actually the children of Islamic Revolutionary Guard members. So what that's done is galvanize the nation to resist and defend its sovereignty. Because if you're Iranian, you've seen what the Americans have done across the border in Iraq. You've seen what they've done in Libya and Syria. This is a war of destruction. The Americans are hoping to break Iran into ethnic enclaves—what we call balkanization—to divide and rule Iran and basically destroy Persian civilization. And many Iranians will not tolerate this. So for the Iranians, this is a fight to the death. For Americans, this is a war of choice. From a military and political perspective, Iran has the advantage.

And last, of course, is economic, where the American economy is very dependent on the GCC. In fact, you could argue that the GCC is essentially the linchpin of the American empire, because what they do is sell oil in petrodollars and then recycle those petrodollars back into the American stock market. And of course, the Gulf monarchies do that because America provides military protection. But you know, on the first day when this war began, what we know is that these American military bases were abandoned. In fact, the soldiers changed into civilian clothes and went to hide in hotels, and that's why Iran was striking those hotels. So these twelve monarchies are now forced to reconsider their vassalage to the American empire. What we're seeing, I think, is very much the collapse of the American empire.

#Danny

Yeah, I mean, that seems to be exactly what's happening, Professor Jung. But then, you know, what do you believe is behind the Trump administration and the U.S. empire going all in—saying they're going to continue this war until further notice? It seems like this is a trap of their own making. We know there are lots of interests in war. We know the U.S. empire is built on war, and war is supposed to make certain people rich. War is supposed to ensure that an empire expands, and we can go on and on. But that doesn't seem to be happening here—the opposite is. So what do you say, given that the American empire, as you're saying, is collapsing from this war? Why keep digging the hole of this trap deeper and deeper?

#Jiang Xueqin

Right, so I think the best explanation for why this war started, and why it's progressing the way it is, is a lethal, toxic combination of both hubris and desperation. Let me take some time to explain what I mean, okay? The very premise of the American empire is something called the Mackinder Heartland Thesis, which was actually developed by the British. Britain was an island with a relatively small population, and for it to control the world, it had to control the seas. So it built the world's greatest navy and made sure that this navy was the most dominant in the world. In fact, it was designed to be able to defeat the next two great naval powers combined.

So the Navy—a navy—is useless against a land power. The great fear of the British imperialists was that a great power would emerge in the Eurasian heartland—basically Europe and Asia. At that time, there were several candidates that could have unified the Eurasian heartland and created a continental trade system that would negate British naval power. We're talking about the 18th century, by the way. The candidates were the Ottoman Empire, the French, the Germans, and the Russians—these four great powers. And that's what ultimately led to the Napoleonic Wars.

Seven wars were fought between France and the British and their allies. You can actually see the Napoleonic Wars as, ultimately, an economic trade war, in that Napoleon wanted to create a continental trade system, and the British refused to let him do so because that would mean the collapse of the British economy. The British basically had an infinite printing machine called the Bank of England. They financed Europe to fight against Napoleon seven times. They lost six times, but ultimately they won. They had no choice, because the British economy—like the American economy—is essentially a Ponzi scheme. So they had to keep financing the wars until they finally beat Napoleon.

After Napoleon was defeated, Britain became the global hegemon, and then it focused its attention on trying to divide and conquer Germany and Russia. In the 19th century, Britain engaged in something called the Great Game with Russia, where they fought over Central Asia. Because again, Britain could not afford for Russia to unify the heartland—if Russia did that, it could build a railroad system so that all trade could happen within the continent and then extend to Africa as well as the Middle East. And then, of course, in the 20th century, Britain and Germany fought two great wars, and America came in to save Britain in the end and prevent Germany from unifying the heartland. So that's the main idea behind the American empire, and it's still true today.

After the Soviet Union fell, America had this unipolar moment where it could extend its empire throughout the world. That empire really came to an end in 2022 when Putin invaded Ukraine. With Russia essentially winning the war in Ukraine, there's now a great fear that Russia, Iran, and China could come together as partners in BRICS, unify the heartland economically, and then extend into Europe, the Middle East, and Africa—basically BRICS Plus. They could just dump the U.S. dollar, and right now the United States is sitting on \$40 trillion in debt. It's a Ponzi scheme, so if other nations stop buying U.S. dollars, America would be left holding the bag. Then the bomb would explode in their face—the American economy would collapse, and you'd see a revolution in the streets of America.

So in other words, America didn't even have a choice but to prevent Iran, Russia, and China from forming a heartland alliance. Now, the problem with an empire is that once you become desperate, you make silly decisions. And the reason why is hubris—the belief that you're invincible. America developed that hubris mainly because, for the past 20 years, it could do whatever it wanted in the Middle East. In 2003, it took America exactly two weeks to steamroll over Iraq, with very few casualties and massive political support at home. So America just believed it was invincible.

And this sense of inevitability and invincibility cemented itself throughout the Middle East, uh, because America, even though it faced some disruption, was still triumphant in Libya, in Syria—throughout the Middle East, basically. And so, from their perspective, what's the difference between, you know, Iraq and Iran, right? Same name, just one letter different. And so that's the idea of hubris. And this hubris basically blinded Donald Trump with arrogance in Venezuela. Because remember, back in January—January 3rd—the forces swept into Caracas and basically kidnapped Maduro. And there were no American casualties. It was a miracle of the American military.

It was almost as though God was on his side. And that made Trump extremely arrogant, probably convincing him that he could do anything he wanted because he had the most powerful military in the world. So he basically ordered the invasion—the attack on Iran—believing that a decapitation strike on the first day would cause the regime to collapse because it was so hated by the people. Remember, there were also protests in Iran at the time. So it was a severe miscalculation, caused by a lethal combination of both hubris and desperation—hubris in that the empire thought it was invincible, and desperation in that it felt it had no choice but to start this war to maintain its hegemony throughout the world.

#Danny

Then, Professor Zhang, we've heard some rumblings in the Wall Street Journal about a possible land invasion—U.S. troops being sent to try to seize the coastline, especially amid the Strait of Hormuz crisis. At the same time, though, you have the U.S. Navy saying they can't escort tankers. You have reports, not yet confirmed, of the USS Lincoln needing to retreat because it was hit, and the USS Gerald Ford having mysterious fires. Then, of course, the tankers that were downed over Iraq just in

the last 24 hours. But do you see U.S. troops coming into Iran to invade? And if so, game-theory that for us, will you?

#Jiang Xueqin

What people forget is that in 2003, when America launched “shock and awe,” there was tremendous military pushback against that strategy. Donald Rumsfeld, who was Secretary of Defense at the time, and his deputy, Paul Wolfowitz, believed America could go in with air power and very few ground troops, quickly decapitating the regime by destroying its command and control centers. They thought the U.S. could do this cheaply and fast. But the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff—the generals who actually knew what they were doing—were against the plan. They thought it was insane. It went against centuries of military doctrine.

From their perspective, you have to fight a war conservatively if you want to win. You just can't gamble with war. I believe at that time they went in with about 100,000 troops, while the Joint Chiefs of Staff had actually asked for half a million because they believed that's what was needed to win. It became a political dogfight, and ultimately Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz won. Their gamble paid off with massive dividends, and ever since then, America has adopted its “shock and awe” policy. The problem with shock and awe, though, is that people forget—in 2003, Iraq didn't have any air defense. It had no real way to defend against an American invasion.

And that was partly because, by that time, Iraq had suffered over ten years of American sanctions. The economy was depleted, the people were demoralized, and the soldiers weren't really being paid. So they didn't have much air defense. And when Saddam Hussein was advised to build up air defenses, his response was basically, “Listen, if the Americans came after me, they'd be eliminating the main adversary to Iran in the Middle East. Why would they do that? That would be insane. And honestly, if they did come, I couldn't really defend myself anyway, okay?” That was his thinking. It was extremely logical and rational.

But unfortunately, Americans were not logical or rational, because they're an empire. People forget that 2003 was an anomaly—it wasn't a real war. But this war in Iran is a real war. And in a real war, you need to use ground troops. Why? Because air defense is meant to defend against the air. So the way you counter air defense is actually with ground troops, okay? In a real war, the ground troops are the bread and butter—the infantry are the bread and butter—of your military. The Americans have been living in a fantasy world for the past 20 years, and now they need to adapt to the real world if they want to win this war.

Now, I understand that a ground invasion would be political suicide in the United States because the war's not very popular. And quite honestly, Donald Trump would have to institute a national draft to get the 500,000 combat soldiers he'd need for a ground invasion. And by the way, half a million is just the bare minimum. You'd probably want two million troops if you were going to fight this war properly, okay? So half a million is what they're proposing, and that would require a national draft to

reach that number. You can imagine the political opposition in the United States if that were to happen.

Plus, what most military analysts would tell you is that America is not equipped to fight Iran because Iran is a mountain fortress. America doesn't have the logistics chains, the manufacturing capacity, or the inventory to launch a multi-year ground invasion of Iran from multiple vectors, okay? So we're talking—you would need to control the Strait of Hormuz, and then you'd need to come in from the east, the west, and the north. It's a very complicated thing, and it would take about two years to actually plan properly. But in those two years, Iran would get enough assistance from the Russians, the Chinese, and others to properly prepare for this ground invasion. Therefore, you'd need to do it as soon as possible, before Iran can fully recover from this war.

So a ground invasion wouldn't work, but they have to do it if they actually want to win this war. Now, I understand there are people who say, "Why not just declare victory, go home, and end this war?" It's not as simple as that, okay? When a war starts, it develops its own momentum. So let me play this out for you using game theory. What would happen if Donald Trump were to say, "You know what? We got al-Qaeda. We've destroyed their nuclear weapons program. We've destroyed their ballistics program. We've made the world safe for Israel. Let's just go home, guys. Goodbye, see you later." Here's what would happen.

The first thing that would happen is Iran would say to the GCC nations, "Hey, man, the Americans came and destroyed our country. Most of our civilian and military infrastructure is gone. We need reparations. You either pay us reparations or we'll come and invade you guys, okay?" And the G7 nations would be like, "But we didn't do anything." And the Iranians would say, "Well, you know what? You've been hosting American bases for the longest time. You let them use your airspace to attack us. You're also the ones financing this war because of your investments in the American economy." So if the G7 nations refused to pay reparations, then Iran would stir up civil uprisings in those countries.

Remember, these are unpopular, corrupt monarchies in the GCC. Iran has basically fallen, and everyone else could fall as well. The UAE can be easily taken out. So what these GCC nations would then say to Iran is, "Let's make a deal." And the deal is very simple: "We have four trillion dollars in our sovereign wealth funds. We're going to help you finance the rebuilding of your nation. And also, when our ships go through the Strait of Hormuz, we'll pay you a tax, because now you are the defender of the Strait of Hormuz." So that's the GCC. Basically, the GCC, which was a linchpin of the American empire, now transfers over to Iran, and they become the client states of Iran.

That's the first major consequence. The second major consequence is, if you're Japan or South Korea, for the longest time you've been buying U.S. Treasuries at an inflated price. You're basically paying a tax—a tribute—to the American empire in order to ensure that the American empire defends you. Well, you just saw what happened in the Middle East, so you're like, "Why am I doing this? Why am I hosting these American bases when, if a war starts, these guys—these 50,000 or

100,000 American soldiers—will just fly home?” So, first of all, get out of here, guys. We don’t want you anymore. Second of all, we’re not gonna buy U.S. Treasuries, because clearly the United States is not a reliable ally, okay?

So South Korea and Japan would remilitarize and basically become much more self-sufficient economies, and they’d stop buying U.S. Treasuries. Then you’d have Europe saying, “Why are we fighting this war in Ukraine again? Oh, wait a minute—we’re fighting this war because the Americans asked us to.” In fact, the Americans asked us to spend 5% of our GDP to finance this war in Ukraine. They’re also asking us to draft our soldiers, which is political suicide in our countries. It could even cause a civil uprising. But we have no choice, because there are lots and lots of American bases in Europe. But after seeing what happened in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia, you’d be like, “You know what?”

We don’t actually need these American bases. So why don’t you guys go home, okay? The American empire gets kicked out of everywhere—they’re forced to close most of their global bases. And you’re like, “Okay, fine, we’ll just go home.” Isn’t that what Trump said in the first place? America First. Make America Great Again. Forget the rest of the world; let’s focus on the Western Hemisphere. But it’s not that simple, because remember, America is a Ponzi scheme that depends on the rest of the world buying U.S. dollars. As long as the rest of the world buys U.S. dollars, the Ponzi scheme can continue. Once Japan, China, South Korea, Europe, and the GCC stop buying U.S. dollars—what happens?

You have economic collapse. And once you have economic collapse, you have civil discontent. We’re talking about something much, much worse than the Great Depression. Take the Great Depression and magnify it by a hundred times—you come close to the calamity that lies ahead for America. So it’s very possible that if you were to retreat from the GCC, you’d trigger a chain of events leading to a blue revolution in America. And if you’re part of the elite in America, your options are to wait for the revolution to happen sooner or later, or send in ground troops and hope—pray to God—that you can somehow maintain your empire. Yes.

#Danny

Yeah, well, I wanted to get to how you believe, given these possibilities, it will actually play out for us—especially in terms of the impact on the world with this war. You know, we’ve been talking on this show for many years about the emergence of a new world order that isn’t dominated by U.S. hegemony. How do you see this war and its aftermath affecting the wider world, given that it’s not only a regional war but has become a global one—a world war in many respects? And you’ve talked about this being not just a prelude, but actually part of a World War III scenario that we’re already in.

#Jiang Xueqin

Right. So people don't really appreciate how unique and unsustainable the American unipolar moment was. Think about this: an average American—just a middle-class American—can have, any day of the week, avocados from Mexico for breakfast, white wine from Chile, book a flight online, and very cheaply fly to the Maldives for a week-long vacation, paying for everything in U.S. dollars. He can go to Europe for the summer, use the internet, and communicate with people all around the world. And this is unsustainable, because a lot of it depends on people's belief that the American empire is invincible, and therefore they have no choice but to be vassals to this empire. That's what sustains this unipolar moment.

But now that this aura of inevitability—of inevitable collapse—has been punctured by the war in Iran, people no longer believe in the American empire. So what you'll see are three major trends over the next five to ten years. And honestly, the nations most willing to embrace these three trends will emerge from the old empire the most vibrant, okay? The first major trend is de-industrialization and de-urbanization. What I mean by that is it's kind of silly that we have so many megacities around the world. Think about how many cities with ten million or more people there are. It's silly, even stupid, because we depend on food to live.

And these people in the cities—they're not growing food. Where they're getting food is by importing it, either from overseas or from other parts of the country. So you basically have a specialization of agriculture around the world, where one nation just does one thing—one cash crop, you know, growing bananas or avocados, whatever. But that's really silly to do. You can only do this as long as you have cheap oil, because cheap oil gives you the fertilizers to grow food, but it also allows you to transport that food around the world. But again, it's all based on cheap oil. What happens when the cheap oil goes away? Well, you have food supply issues, okay?

So these ten million people in the cities, doing whatever—whether it's cryptocurrency scams, gambling on Polymarket, or creating derivatives, creating AI—it's all just useless and silly. People need to grow food so we can eat. Okay, so if you're really into AI, guess what? You're gonna be really, really screwed without access to cheap energy. So stop this AI stupidity and go back to growing food, okay? That means getting people out of the cities and back to the farmland to grow food, to create more sustainable supply chains. And again, you have to do this or your people are gonna starve. I'm telling this to the entire world, okay? Give up your delusions about AI. It does nothing. It'll get you nowhere. Make sure your people have access to food and water, okay? That's the first major trend.

#Danny

Uh, Professor John, it seems like we've lost you here. You said, "Make sure to prepare to grow food, focus on food," but you're frozen. If you can hear me, maybe try refreshing your browser, since you've frozen. Oh—there you are.

#Jiang Xueqin

All right.

#Danny

You're back. Yeah.

#Jiang Xueqin

So, I mean, I have a basic point, which is that deindustrialization and urbanization require cheap energy. Once you lose access to cheap energy, you have to worry about maintaining sustainable food supply networks. That means moving people back to the countryside to grow food in order to feed the population. That has to be done. That's my first point. My second trend—the second trend that's very important—is the idea of remilitarization, meaning that in the future, people are going to fight over resources. So you need to remilitarize your population. And what this ultimately means is the return of nationalism, and in some cases, actually the return of fascism, because how you galvanize your population—how you convince them to sacrifice their lives for the greater good—is through nationalism.

There are some other nations that will become theocracies, embracing religious faith. But this idea of multicultural, global diversity—DEI, all that nonsense—it has to go away. Just throw it out. No more diversity, no more multiculturalism. Just focus on who we are as a people and the need for us to be cohesive in order to defend our nation. So, remilitarization—the return of nationalism. And the third major trend is the breaking up of the global economy and the creation of mercantile trade networks. That could mean cooperation among certain nations, and that's what we should see in Europe, where Europe becomes its own trading bloc and no longer engages with the rest of the world.

But it can also mean that a certain nation becomes dominant in a region and imposes its will there. I see Israel pursuing something called the Greater Israel Project and being able to control trade throughout the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and Africa. In East Asia, there would be competition between South Korea, North Korea, Vietnam, Japan, and China for resources. They'd need to create their own independent supply chains—especially Japan. Japan, in this kind of scenario, is the most disadvantaged because it doesn't have enough resources to fuel its advanced manufacturing economy. So we could see a very aggressive, remilitarized Japan over the next few months.

In fact, Prime Minister Takeuchi has voiced tremendous support for this Israel–U.S. war against Iran, and she's promised to send missiles and munitions—sorry, over to the Middle East—to support this war, okay? So these are the three major trends we should see over the next few months: nations adopting more deindustrialized policies, nations embracing nationalism, and nations trying to create their own independent supply chains. And the irony, of course, is that the nations benefiting the most from globalization will be the ones that actually have the toughest time adapting to the new world. And that includes, of course, the United States, China, and Germany. Yeah, okay.

#Danny

I wanted to ask you, Professor Zhang—you made a comment about Greater Israel and the attempt to achieve it. Where do you see that now, given that Iran doesn't seem to be on the verge of collapse? Its government looks very much intact, and even the collective West is admitting this. I think Europe is on the phone with Iran right now, trying to get a deal to move their cargo and commercial vessels through the Strait of Hormuz. But also, Israel is in heavy fighting with Hezbollah, and part of the Greater Israel Project would also include Iraq. We're seeing the resistance downing refueling tankers, so there's certainly opposition to this. And we haven't even gotten into Yemen yet—what could happen if the Bab al-Mandeb is closed? So, what do you make of where the Greater Israel Project stands right now, and how it might take shape in the days and weeks to come?

#Jiang Xueqin

Okay, so Israel is a very—sorry—Israel is a very difficult nation to understand because of its theology, because of its understanding of its place in the world. They call themselves God's chosen people. So, from an Israeli perspective, if you're a religious extremist, this war is going according to God's plan. How do you achieve the Greater Israel Project? Well, you achieve it by removing America from the Middle East, and by basically destroying the GCC. Ultimately, to achieve the Greater Israel Project, you'd eventually have to go after Turkey and Egypt as well. Because if you look at a map, Greater Israel actually extends from the Nile to the Euphrates. Iran is not part of Greater Israel.

So, in other words, these religious extremists want this war in the Middle East to move forward—to accelerate the Greater Israel Project, which they believe is what God promised them through their ancestor Abraham. From an Israeli perspective, the real objective in this war isn't to defeat Iran. Okay, you want to weaken Iran, but it's not really feasible for you, as a small nation, to defeat Iran. So what are your real military objectives? Well, first of all, it's to destroy the American empire and force Americans out of the Middle East. It's to destroy Saudi Arabia, because part of Saudi Arabia is actually included in the Greater Israel Project, and to drag Türkiye into this war, because the south of Anatolia—Türkiye—is also considered part of the Greater Israel Project.

So that's what you want to do. And if this war drags on, and American citizens become ground troops, then you're actually accelerating God's plan. Also, what people don't recognize is that this destruction in Israel—these religious extremists think it's the will of God. So where are the Iranians striking? Tel Aviv. Where are they not really striking? Jerusalem. There's a huge difference between Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. People don't really appreciate that.

#Danny

Oh, sorry—sorry, that was a mistake.

#Jiang Xueqin

People don't really appreciate the political dynamic in Tel Aviv. People don't really appreciate the political dynamic in Israel. Tel Aviv and Jerusalem are two opposing centers of gravity in Israel. Tel Aviv is the Western-looking, open, cosmopolitan, secular, democratic face of Israel. Jerusalem is the inward-looking, religious, theocratic, conservative face of Israel. And guess what? They hate each other. If Tel Aviv were to be destroyed—meaning the open, cosmopolitan, democratic sector of Israel would be destroyed in this war—good, because that is God's will. God doesn't want these open, Western Jews in Israel.

He wants them to repent. He wants them to engage in redemption. And in Jewish theology, redemption is only possible through pain and suffering. You need to commit sin in order to force God to punish you, and then you engage in a long process of self-reflection and self-revitalization to fully embrace God. So, in other words, these religious extremists are hoping to use this war to inflict so much damage and pain on secular Israel that Jews see the error of their ways and embrace God fully. And if they don't, well, then go away—go back to Europe, go back to America—who cares, okay? But they want Israel to become a theocracy because of this war.

So I know it's hard to understand, because most of us are not religious. And when we hear this, we think it's all insane. But unfortunately, right now, the religious fanatics have control over the national security apparatus—the military of Israel. They want to use this war to bring the Jewish people closer to God, and they believe that by doing so, it will accelerate the coming of the Messiah and usher in the Messianic age. So from their perspective, it's all going according to plan, and they have some surprises in store for the world. For example, the Al-Aqsa Mosque, which they think may be destroyed in this war.

#Danny

Well, also, Professor Zhang, the U.S. military has been infected by this kind of religious extremism. You've probably seen the reports—over 200 complaints to the Military Religious Freedom Foundation from U.S. troops saying they were told this war was part of God's divine plan. There were multiple references to the Book of Revelation, to Armageddon, and to the imminent return of Jesus Christ because of this war. So, you know, I think a lot of people are interested, Professor Zhang, in hearing your take on how this happened—this rise in religious extremism we're seeing. And when we talk about Israel and, of course, the collective West, it's getting worse and worse, contrary to how people often view Iran, actually. I'm wondering how you see that affecting not just this war but also the world, as the end of U.S. unipolar dominance becomes much more apparent through this conflict.

#Jiang Xueqin

You know, in the coming days and weeks—right—so, um, I've always argued that this war is eschatological, meaning you can't really explain it from a purely geopolitical lens. Yes, I know I spent the early part of this discussion talking about why empires need to engage in war, but there are

alternatives to what they're doing. The first alternative is to just become friends with Iran—remove the sanctions, return to the Obama-era nuclear deal, and engage in trade with Iran. Look, the Iranians are pragmatic people; they would welcome American investment, they would welcome the opportunity to sell their oil to America. That's your first option. But if you don't want to do that, then you can also choose a strategy of economic strangulation—basically, embargo Iran.

Iran sells most of its oil to China, and that's a shuttle fleet. Well, you can embargo Iran, because if you look at the map, there are American military bases everywhere. Right, so you have options. The worst thing you can do is actually go and attack Iran, because then you find yourself in this situation where you're losing the war and you're forced to send in ground troops if you want to win. And we've already discussed why that would be suicidal—militarily, economically, and politically. So then the question is, why did they pick the worst option? It's eschatological. There are people in the United States—these secret societies, different secret societies—who believe this. They believe that a war in the Middle East, once it starts, will create a chain of events that eventually leads to the end of the world, the end times.

And for different secret societies, this could mean different things, okay? So for the Freemasons, it would mean the creation of Pax Judaica—a one-world government and the rise of an AI surveillance state with Jerusalem as the center of the world, okay? Then you have these Masonic Jews called the Chabad-Lubavitch movement, and there are others as well, but they're the most famous. They believe that this war will initiate something called the War of Gog and Magog, which is really the final battle of humanity, where the world basically attacks Israel. This will force the coming of the Messiah—the intervention of God, basically—and the beginning of the Messianic Age, where God will live with his people, the Jews.

And then the Christian Zionists believe that this war will initiate the War of Gog and Magog, and then Jesus will return to save Israel from its enemies. Then all Christians who believe in Jesus will be raptured up into heaven before Jesus ushers in the millennium—the Messianic Age—and then you have the final Day of Judgment. Okay, so I understand this sounds kind of bonkers, but I mean, most people in this world happen to be religious. Christian Zionism makes up about a quarter of the population of America. You know, you have this movement called Christians United for Israel—about 7 million members—and their only goal is to ensure that American politicians help bring about the end of days. And these are the people who are actually funding these West Bank settlements, which are clearly against international law, right?

So you have all these Israeli settlers in the West Bank who don't actually work, and they have large families. It's all being funded by Christians United for Israel and other Christian Zionists. This plan has been in motion for decades—I'd argue even for centuries, okay? They want to usher in the end of days. And there are certain things that will happen that will surprise people, and it makes absolutely no sense. But it's all according to their theology, their eschatology, okay?

So what will happen eventually is the Al-Aqsa Mosque will be destroyed. Um, and in fact, there have been discussions on social media about how this will happen. Basically, the idea is that for the past few years they've been conducting archaeological digs under the Al-Aqsa Mosque, which is the third holiest site in Islam, by the way. So the foundations of the Al-Aqsa Mosque are very unstable. Basically, if an Iranian missile goes astray—and we won't actually know if it's an Iranian missile, but of course it'll be blamed on the Iranians—then there'll be a controlled demolition of the Al-Aqsa Mosque, okay?

So again, look, it's all speculation, it's all rumors. But if it were to happen, then you'll know it's all for eschatological purposes. And of course—this is hard for people to understand—but the rise of anti-Semitism in the Western world is also part of this eschatology, because in both the Jewish and Christian eschatological understanding of things, the Jews must return to Jerusalem to seek redemption, to seek the love of God, to unify with God. And that basically means bringing the Jewish diaspora back to Jerusalem. Now, as you know, most Jews—many Jews—in the Western world live very nice lives. They're very successful.

#Danny

Oh, you froze, Professor John. You said they're very successful—can you come back?

#Jiang Xueqin

Yeah, so they're successful, and they won't come back voluntarily. Well, then you make them. And again, I know this sounds crazy, but please remember, this war with Iran is crazy. It makes absolutely no sense why the Americans are fighting it the way they are. And honestly, it doesn't seem as though Trump and his people really care. Their response to the growing unpopularity of this war in America might be to institute a national draft. There's talk of deploying the National Guard to quell unrest throughout the country. You know, Trump's cabinet has basically moved onto American military bases. And the people who would be most responsible for a national draft and for sending out the National Guard—people like Pete Hegseth, Stephen Miller, and Kristi Noem—they've all moved to American military bases. And why would they do that? So it seems as though something is being prepared for America.

#Danny

Well, Professor Zhang, what you're describing here—I'm wondering how it clashes with capital then. Because we know that finance capital, and we know that the military-industrial complex, they have very—well, I wouldn't call them rational, given everything we've talked about so far with how this war has transpired—but there are, I think, understandable disagreements and irreconcilable

contradictions they have with the Iranian government. Whether it's wanting to maintain hegemony or ensuring, as you said earlier, that Russia, China, and Iran cannot unite at a political, economic, and military level.

And we go on and on about the Strait of Hormuz, for example—to have control of that, to be able to ensure, you know, so-called freedom of navigation, a.k.a. dominance of all trade routes—to cut off China and anyone else who needs to be dominated, to ensure that their trade routes are directed by the U.S. and therefore benefit U.S. financial interests. So how does this development you're describing clash or align, or maybe both? Help us understand, because in many ways what you're describing could very well clash with it. So how does it all come together?

#Jiang Xueqin

Okay, so unfortunately, the eschatology of these religious extremists and the interests of national capital are aligned, okay? Let me explain why. This eschatology comes from these occultists who spent their entire lives reading the Bible and trying to interpret divine providence and divine intention in it, okay? They feel as though the Bible is actually the word of God, and that God has laid out a plan within it. So if we're able to interpret this code properly, then we have an understanding of God's plan, and therefore we can enact it in our world to accelerate the return of God. And famous occultists in the past include Isaac Newton.

People don't appreciate that he spent most of his life actually studying the Bible. And, you know, him creating the laws of physics was actually just a function—or a side function—of his intense study of the Bible, because he was trying to understand the mind of God. Okay, another very famous occultist is Stephanie Zevi. A modern-day occultist who just recently passed away, but was extremely influential, was Rabbi Schneerson, who was the global leader of something called the Chabad-Lubavitch movement. Okay, so we don't actually need to know these people; we just know that there are these people in the shadows who are planning all this. Now, if you're not an occultist, you're interested in the movement of the stars.

You're interested in the grand scheme of humanity, and therefore you have insight into certain historical patterns that emerge. Okay, so the world we're living in—the patterns that are emerging because of empire—this is how all empires collapse. And it's something they understand, okay? But from their perspective, this isn't just game theory or just the nature of empires. For them, they believe it is actually intentional. So from their perspective, you can't really change events, but what you can do is accelerate them, right?

So when empires collapse—and these empires usually take about twenty years to collapse—that creates tremendous human suffering, right? Look at the collapse of the Roman Empire: how many wars, how much bloodshed happened because of it. And that collapse led to the Dark Ages, right? About a thousand years when civilization had to reconstitute itself. Well, why can't you accelerate the collapse of an empire in order to build a better world? Wouldn't that be a much better way of

doing things? Yes, you cause a lot of pain and death in the beginning, in the short term, but it's long-term gain, right?

Short-term pain for long-term gain. That's literally how they think. That's how these eschatologists or occultists think. Now, let's look at transnational capital. Jeffrey Epstein—if you read his emails—was actually very interested in geopolitical events because he understood that from geopolitical chaos, you can make a lot of money, right? The famous saying is, "When there's blood on the streets, buy." So Jeffrey Epstein was going around getting confidential information from people like Peter Mandelson—wait, is it Mandelson?

Anyway, he was getting confidential information from a lot of powerful people around the world to better gauge how geopolitical events would play out, okay? So transnational capital is interested in war, in destruction, in chaos, because that's the best time to buy, right? Let's imagine there's a war raging in the Middle East, or even a civil war in America, with a lot of destruction. That's great for you as transnational capital, because now you can sweep in and buy resources really cheap, right? And the faster that destruction happens, the more profit you can generate at the end of the day.

So what we're seeing in the world is a massive alliance—like this grand alliance—between the military-industrial complex, which benefits the most; these eschatologists, these occultists who want to accelerate the end of the world; and these transnational capitalists who believe that when the world burns, that's the best opportunity to buy. Otherwise, I mean, if you're transnational capital and you're sitting on billions of dollars, what do you buy? Because the US dollar is a scam, real estate is a scam, cryptocurrency is a scam. Well, you know, if you destroy the world, now you can buy up these resources—water rights, mining rights—for really cheap. And during the rebidding process, you can make a lot of money, right? So that's how these things work.

#Danny

Yeah, well, Professor Zhang, I wanted to ask you—we're getting reports that the United States, the empire, is going to great lengths to try to mitigate the massive consequences of this war. They've temporarily lifted sanctions on Russia, and they've tried to flood the market with reserves from 32 countries that are part of the IAEA. None of it is reducing prices. Actually, in the last several days, it's nearly risen back to \$100 a barrel.

And the trend actually is just up and up and up. Reports are that this energy crisis is already worse than the 1970s crisis by a factor of two—and it's just started. What happens, Professor Zhang, when Iran says their oil will go to \$200 a barrel? What happens then, when it does? Because everything we've talked about up to this point, including what you just said, will play a factor in that, I assume. So what happens then? Because that's a major economic crisis that, you know, I don't think we've really faced before—or at least not at this magnitude.

#Jiang Xueqin

Yeah, so look, the reality is that the old world—the world of globalization—is dying, and this war is going to kill it. There's really no going back to that old world. We're heading toward a new world of chaos, instability, and resource scarcity, which is actually how humans have lived for most of history. If you just go back to the 1930s and look at what happened then, well, probably the same kind of thing will happen in our world over the next few years. In the short term, what governments are going to do is try to compensate for the lack of access to cheap energy. Basically, in Southeast Asia, we're seeing more work-from-home arrangements and the temptation of four-day workweeks.

Eventually, they'll move to lockdowns, very similar to COVID as well. Because the reality is that without cheap energy, it's impossible for the modern nation-state to sustain the populations they have, right? You can't feed tens of millions of people based on food imports and cheap energy. So these nations are going to struggle, and you will see lockdowns. You will see food rationing throughout the world. There's actually no choice in the matter. These airlines are going to have to close down. People can't just fly around the world whenever they want anymore. It's too expensive and too pointless to do so. So prices will go up—will skyrocket—especially for plane fares, especially for meat. And that's the short term.

In the mid-term, you'll see conflicts throughout the world. This could include civil unrest, it could include political revolutions. Remember, most governments around the world are not democratic, and most of them are extremely unpopular. Many are actually sustained by the power of the American empire—especially in the Islamic world and in South America. So once the American empire fades, once it's no longer able to provide a material lifestyle, populations are going to revolt, and you'll see the rise primarily of right-wing nationalist movements. We're already seeing that in Europe, and that's just going to be a natural trend. In the long term, you'll see massive remilitarization and a massive restructuring of society.

One thing these nations need to resolve is the aging crisis—especially in Europe, Southeast Asia, South Korea, and Japan. Whichever nation manages to solve the aging crisis first will come out of the coming chaos as the most vibrant nation. I think there's one country that might actually have a solution to it, and that's Japan. Why? Because the aging crisis there is the most severe—it could destroy the economy. So what I think might happen is that Japan will institute a national euthanasia program. If you're over 80, you would volunteer to... I'm sorry, this is hard. But the world we're heading into, we really have to plan ahead and imagine the darkest possibilities. So yeah, it's not a pretty picture.

#Danny

Yeah, what's so interesting—I was just looking at the rankings. Two of the biggest countries, I guess we count Guyana as food self-sufficient; it's on the international rankings. But China and Vietnam are number two and three. The rest of the countries are very low—U.S., Western countries—very, very low. So in the hardest of times, it'll be very difficult for the collective West to sustain itself. And

I think that's why we see, for instance, in the collective West, in the U.S., this kind of extremism that, as you say, complements so well the warmongering—the desperate attempts to basically blow up the world are so salient.

Because I do think there's this real urge from those who control Washington—some people call them the Epstein class—to make sure their behinds are covered as things keep spiraling for the system they control. So, Professor John, any final comments? Anything you want to say about the Iran situation, the global situation as it relates to it, that we might not have mentioned so far?

#Jiang Xueqin

Right. So the Western nations—Europe, North America—are the ones who suffer the most in this age of tribulation. And a lot of the reason why is that, for the past 50 years, these nations have had the best lives. Like, if you're a baby boomer, you've had the best possible life—you probably lived better than a Roman emperor. So it was just a very unsustainable lifestyle. And these baby boomers, they're clinging to empire because it's the empire that gave them all these worldly benefits. They're leaving a terrible legacy for their children and grandchildren, and quite honestly, they don't seem to care.

People don't really appreciate the impact baby boomers have had on imperial policy. Basically, baby boomers are like, "You know what? I've got another five, ten, maybe twenty years left. I want to make sure I'm enjoying the world." And that means they want the American empire to keep going. So a lot of it is driven by this demographic of baby boomers. And their children, their grandchildren—basically us—we're going to inherit a really messed-up world. If we try to replicate the lifestyle of the baby boomers, which is materialistic, selfish, utilitarian, we'll destroy the world and destroy ourselves in the process.

So right now, the world needs to have a spiritual awakening and abandon the consumerism, the materialism, the individualism of the baby boomer generation and the American empire that have led us to this moment. And really ask ourselves: what is meaningful? What gives us pleasure? What makes us happy? The answer, of course, is family, community, and purpose. So in this age of tribulation, those who are most able to survive are the ones who commit themselves to the betterment of humanity—basically by helping their neighbors, by being open, generous, and kind. You don't have to take a cruise vacation every summer.

You don't have to vacation in the Maldives. You don't have to eat avocado every single day. What you really need—what you truly want—is to love your children and teach them to be kind, open, and generous people. What actually brings happiness and joy is helping your neighbor in need, seeing others in need, and contributing your life altruistically to their improvement. So this is a turning point for humanity, and those who cling to a materialistic, selfish, individualistic life will be the first to, um, fall into depression. And those who are incapable of a spiritual awakening will not thrive in this new world.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah. Well, Professor Zhang, it was great to have you back on the show. We'll have to do it again soon as things transpire. We'll head out of here together. I want to thank everybody who watched today, who gave a super chat, and who became members. I can pull those up really quickly as I tell you that I have both Professor Zhang's Substack and his YouTube channel linked in the video description below, so you can check those out when we're done here. I also have all the links for this channel as well—from the Substack, Patreon, and much more. So everybody, thanks so much for joining me. Sorry we couldn't get to questions; we're short on time. I really appreciate all of you for your support and for, of course, spreading the message far and wide, which you can do by hitting the like button. That helps keep this show going. Without further ado, everyone, have a good rest of your week—or weekend—and we'll continue with the updates on this floor. All right, take care. Thank you again, Professor Zhang. Anything you want to say to the audience as we head out of here?

#Jiang Xueqin

No, thanks for watching.

#Danny

All right, bye-bye.