GAME OVER Netanyahu? Israel Votes War, US Strike on Iran NEXT | Lt Col Anthony Aguilar & Matt Hoh

Former Lt. Colonel Anthony Aguilar and Matthew Hoh discuss Netanyahu's major setback in the Israeli election and why the conditions have now been laid for a renewed and dangerous escalation in the war against Iran, plus much more in geopolitics. PATREON.COM/DANNYHAIPHONG Support the channel in other ways: https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhai... Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: $Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: https://paypal.me/spiritofho Follow me on Telegram: https://t.me/dannyhaiphong #netanyahu #iran #trump

#Danny

Welcome, everyone. Welcome back to the show. You can see I am joined by Anthony Aguilar and Matthew Hoh to go over the latest developments. So we begin with the Israeli elections, gentlemen. This is what it looks like right now, the spread. Netanyahu has lost significantly in this election. No majority, however, for any of the various contending parties. But Netanyahu is certainly not happy. He is alleging that the Arab parties, mainly Palestinian parties inside of Israel, have stolen the election, and he's demanding an investigation. This is all coming as we're starting to see the costs of the Iran war come out more and more, although they're still likely underestimates: $47.1 billion as of mid-October. That's the cost to the United States. And I think there is something here. The Israeli election may not be settled, really, until November 4th. That's the day of the midterm election. And then there are reports that Gulf states and regional allies of the United States have been warned that a renewed assault on Iran is going to take place.

#Danny

So, Tony, we can begin with you. What's going on here? Does the Israeli election have any significance for the war that is coming? Or what's your assessment of this?

#Anthony Aguilar

Well, the elections are surely significant, but looking at the results we're seeing now, from the pre-election polls to the exit polls and the first official counts we're seeing today from the Central Election Commission of Israel, I am not surprised by the results. Early on in the election, we saw Eisenkot's growing strength in that coalition, you know? So it really comes down to, again, those 120 seats. We knew that 61 is the number needed. We saw the early projections: Eisenkot with Yashar,

that individual party, at about 23 seats, and Likud with about 21. And now we're seeing in the exit polls that the Netanyahu bloc includes Likud, which got 27, United Torah Judaism, Aryeh Deri's Shas, and Religious Zionism.

That's Smotrich's party. They got 53, and then the Eisenkot bloc, with Yashar, the Democrats, and the other parties in there, got around 48. But yes, no majority of 61, which is how I anticipated this would go. What I did not anticipate is that this would, I think, open the door to more turbulence and potential political violence or intrastate conflict within Israel's political process, as we're also still approaching the next phase of escalation with Iran, which I think is coming. I don't think it's a matter of if. I think it's a matter of when.

The timing is coincidentally very close to November 4th, after the U.S. midterms. So I think there were some deals made between the Trump administration and Netanyahu for after the elections. But what concerns me now is that, if you look at the Arab parties, there's the Joint United List and Ra'am. And then there's also the United List, a small party, but they didn't meet the 3.25 percent threshold within that coalition of Arab parties. But they still exist. And those together make up the new government bloc. So they have their own bloc within it. It's not just the Arab parties.

There's, you know, a few of them in there in this race to 61. So when you're looking at that, what I'm really concerned about is that, going into these elections, both Eisenkot and Netanyahu said that they would not work with or incorporate Ra'am or the Arab United parties in this. Well, that's a big concern now, because what we're seeing is that those parties are now the potential kingmakers with those 15 to 17 seats that they hold. Because in order to get from 53 or 48 to 61, well, they hold those seats. You can't do it without them in some form or fashion. So now we're seeing that the moves before the election were to ban those parties.

So how does that change the equation and the outcome? If those parties are banned, meaning their seats don't count towards the coalition, the formation of a government, what seats then do count? We haven't seen what that's going to look like yet. I don't think that it's going to change in terms of the 61. So I think we're now headed towards political violence, the pointing of the finger at Palestinian Arabs. And let's remember, in this democracy that Israel claims to be, if you look at it in terms of who can vote and who cannot vote, Jewish Israelis, Palestinian citizens of Israel, and Israeli settlers or occupiers in the West Bank and East Jerusalem can vote. But Palestinians in Gaza, Palestinians in general, cannot vote.

Palestinians in the occupied West Bank and East Jerusalem cannot vote. So when you look at that in terms of this disenfranchised, isolated minority that has now become a very powerful minority bloc within this race to 61, there is no doubt that there is a history of political assassination in Israel. Yitzhak Rabin, Haim Arlosoroff, Lord Moyne—all these people have been assassinated by Jewish extremist groups. Let's not forget how the IDF was formed. So I think we're going into this very

dangerous time of internal political conflict within the Israeli government, or we're going to see Eisenkot and Netanyahu kind of come together with some type of agreement to bring the parts of the coalition together.

But that then comes with promises to people like Smotrich, to people like Ben-Gvir, to people like Israel Herzog—far-right extremists who, let's be honest, weren't satisfied with Netanyahu because he wasn't being hard enough in his pursuit of genocide and occupation. So there's that situation. But I absolutely think that this still puts us on the path to escalation with Iran, even more so now that these elections are over and there is no clear winner. It's not Eisenkot. It's not Netanyahu. We're back in this period of stewardship until someone is identified to form the government and try to get to 61 over the next 28 days.

So what we're now seeing is that Trump has the ability to negotiate, to say, "Hey, wait till after the U.S. midterms. Like I have always said, be a good boy, Bibi, and I'll help you." I think, had Israel gone it alone prior to November 4th, Trump may have been hesitant to go in because of our midterms. But now that this is over, there's still no clear winner. Netanyahu still very much holds political power. Now we're going to see that, and I think the United States is going to be more involved in it if we see this escalation happening around November 4th or 5th. And to me, again, it's not a matter of if, it's a matter of when. And that "when" is coming within the next five to six days, I think.

#Matt Hoh

Matt, to you. Yeah, no, I agree with what Tony's saying here, that this doesn't solve anything, and it only makes the future appear more dangerous. The big story, on the face of it, of course, is the turnout—the largest turnout they've had in 25 years, the largest Arab turnout ever. More than 80% of Palestinian Arabs voted. And we saw the Arab bloc, right, this joint list, United Arab List, go from 10 seats to 19 seats. That's massive. It's double. It's not supposed to happen. So the point Tony is making about the scapegoating of the Arabs, you know, that was there before the elections. It's going to continue. I think the main point that's going to come out of this for the Israeli parties is: how do we limit Arab participation in the future?

So the idea may be, let's get to another election and suppress the hell out of the Arabs and make sure they don't vote so we don't have this happen again. This is not supposed to happen. They're only supposed to get nine or ten seats. This messes up everything. And for people familiar with it, of course, it's a proportional political system. So if there were fewer Arab voters, well, that means more seats would have gone to Likud or to Yashar, right? Somebody may have been able to form a government here if it wasn't for the Arabs doubling their representation, right? And many are probably saying, well, we should have been doing more to make sure that it went the other way.

There should have been less Arab participation, right, than in 2022. Yeah. So I think you have that standing right in front of us. You also then have the reality of just the racism and the bad politics

that prevent, you know, Gadi Eisenkot and his coalition from making a deal with the Arab parties to form a coalition. Now, I guess there's the possibility that the Arab bloc may agree to vote for Eisenkot in a confidence vote so that he can take control of the government, without entering the coalition themselves, but essentially endorsing or supporting a minority government. There's that possibility. But the idea of Eisenkot or Lieberman or Bennett providing any concessions to the Arabs to get that—I don't see that happening.

One, they're so racist. You know, the idea of that just isn't right. But then the politics of that are bad too, because that gives Netanyahu and the right wing the storyline they want, right? This idea that these people are betraying us. They are aligning with the Arabs. They are aligning with the enemy. And this is what really frightens me. And Tony, you were hitting on this about the political violence. Where does this go? You've already got a fractured, tenuous, disjointed Israeli society. We have seen, time and again, a former general, a former Shin Bet chief, or a former diplomat write in an open letter, "The most dangerous thing to Israel is Jewish terrorism."

The biggest danger we have in Israel is ourselves. And so this idea now that you have this government that can't be formed—the only way it could be formed is by aligning with the Arabs—what would that do to reinforce that narrative of betrayal? And, you know, in a country like Israel, where you have 800,000 armed settlers, that idea of betrayal, right? The idea that this is part of our historical story, of this cosmology we live in, that there would be this betrayal from within—it kind of reinforces the idea of Israel tearing itself apart. So I'm very worried about the political violence as well. Of course, there's the continued suppression: "Hey, look, our apartheid on the Palestinians is not working as well as it's supposed to be working. We need to, you know, get back at it."

#Danny

Yeah, and Tony, I wanted to ask you: I know that you spent time in Gaza, and I'm sure you interacted with Israelis. From your experience, how does political change influence the military situation? Because in many respects, Israel is in large part a military outpost that is always at war. And I know that you saw firsthand the genocidal implications of that. Your thoughts on this?

#Anthony Aguilar

Well, yes, Israel is a colonial outpost of U.S. imperialism. That's clear. But also, the IDF is a terrorist organization. The Irgun, the Stern Gang, and Lehi came together and formed the Israel Defense Forces. They gave themselves a fancy name. They gave themselves matching uniforms, and they called themselves an army. They're terrorists, and their mindset toward this is the same. And I think what's happening now politically is going to directly influence the military situation on the ground or from the air, with bombs over Gaza, on the ground in Lebanon, on the ground in Syria, and in attempts to foment political violence by arming the Druze.

And then what we're seeing throughout the region, especially with the saber-rattling and the move once again toward escalation with Iran, is very reminiscent of the German elections of 1930 and 1932, the Reichstag elections. And in those elections, we saw the rise to power of what would become the National Socialist German Workers' Party, or the Nazi Party. And Hitler, after winning the Reichstag elections, focused all of that attention on Jews—German Jews—as the scapegoats: "This is why we're where we are, because of them." Netanyahu is taking that right out of that script and doing so with this election, just changing the name from Jews to Palestinians.

So now, in these blocs, we're seeing that if you are Arab, Muslim, and Palestinian, then in Israel, you are now the target of a political smear, the one to be blamed. So as you turn that attention toward them, let's not think that Eisenkot was going to be elected and be a bringer of peace. I mean, he's the former chief of the IDF who was the author and architect of the Dahiya Doctrine, which in 2008 killed many Palestinians. They named it after the slaughter of Lebanese in Lebanon. So, I mean, it's not like we were bringing aboard the hawks and the doves here. We're bringing far-right-wing extremists to the point where they now agree on who the common enemy is.

So could you see polarization aimed at growing this coalition to 61 by disenfranchising Palestinian Arab Muslims specifically and further scapegoating them? Absolutely. We are seeing that. And that's what's really concerning in terms of what we're now going to see: I think, an escalation again in the pursuit of the "final solution," for lack of a better term. That's what I saw when I was in Gaza—they even called it that. Phase four of the reconsolidation, going into the rebuilding—that's where we are right now, on the precipice of moving from phase three combat operations into this total occupation, part of which will be carried out by the United States Army under the International Stabilization Force and the Board of Peace. That's still happening.

We have thousands of troops in Israel that are forming this. That is going to be part of this final solution to move all Palestinians out of Gaza. So if you bring the population against that, they're the scapegoats: "It was them." Well, we have two possibilities, right? Much like we saw in Germany with the Jews: "Get out, leave. We'll help you on your way out. Or die. But we gave you a choice." That is exactly what's happening in Gaza. That is exactly what's happening in southern Lebanon. That is exactly what's happening in the reconsolidation and the holding of the Golan Heights, and now expanding further by arming the Druze, finding the hero amidst the wolves. We're seeing that.

And so Iran, I think that's the way for Israel, once again, to pull the United States into the conflict with Iran. Will they start it and then back out again? Operation Midnight Hammer, right? Israel bit off more than they could chew. They called us in, and then they detached themselves from this war with Iran. They started it. We started it because of them, as a preemption to the preemption to the offensive preemption of what we knew Israel might do to Iran—that whole story by Marco Rubio. And now, what has Israel done? They backed out. They're like, "Hey, you got this now." We now

have reports that, amid the use of all these interceptor munitions, Israel was sitting on a lot of theirs, saying, "Hey, give us more of yours." Well, we took away protection from American servicemen and women in the region.

Americans died because Israel lied to us about their own interceptors. That's just one case of the lie. So I think we're going to see escalation in Gaza. I think we're going to see escalation in the West Bank. I think we're going to see further solidification and movement further north in Lebanon. And I think, of course, the most dangerous part is going to be the escalation with Iran, because where does that end? The question that I've been asking from the very beginning, when it was very clear that this administration had no politically feasible objective to achieve, is: Where does this end? How does this end with Iran? Does it end with Iran saying, "Okay, we just want to, you know, leave things where they lie"? No. Iran has some business to finish.

So I think the Iran conflict is going to escalate greatly in the coming days, beyond what we've seen before, while Israel starts it and then fades away, back into focusing on Gaza. I mean, nearly all of Gaza is now occupied. Nearly 90 percent of the entire Gaza Strip, the occupied Palestinian territory, is now occupied by the IDF. And now U.S. soldiers are going to move in to solidify that with these nice little humanitarian assistance camps, humanitarian assistance transit areas, forcibly displacing Palestinians to these little locations throughout the Strip for either departure or death. And the U.S. is behind it. And I think that, in terms of my oath, the oath that Matt and I took to our country and to our military, that's a sad point in history.

#Danny

Yeah, it's certainly shameful. Matt, given what Tony just said, I'm not going to play this directly because the noise pollution is absolutely terrible. But Trump said, "It's a question of when do I want to end the Iran war? They want to make a deal. Maybe they're waiting for the election or something, but that's not going to help them." And I wanted to ask you, Matt, what role have Trump and the Trump administration played in all of these developments, including this buildup to the Iran war? I mean, Tony laid it out very well. I don't know if you caught the pro-Israeli mainstream media, but every headline yesterday was "Iran war," "Iran looms over this election," "Iran war is the defining issue of this election." What do you make of Trump and the Trump administration's role in all of this? Well, they allowed it to be possible, right?

#Matt Hoh

I mean, certainly the Biden administration, the Obama administration, the Bush administrations—they were no softies. Those presidents were all willing to shed the blood of millions, to displace tens of millions for their imperial purposes. But a war with Iran, to them, was always a step too far, right? So Bush certainly had his opportunity for a war with Iran. Obama was under heavy pressure to go to

war with Iran, and certainly the same was true of Biden. And all of those men, all those presidents, recognized that that was too far. This is why, you know, you have Vladimir Putin saying in 2024 that he'd rather see Joe Biden stay in the White House, right, than Donald Trump come back into it.

Because even though he knew Biden was going to be hostile to Russia, that Biden was going to send tens of billions, hundreds of billions of dollars to support Ukraine, that was a certainty he could depend upon. With Trump, there is no certainty, right? There is no explanation for his actions. There's no predictability. You know, again, Bush, Obama, Biden—the war criminals they were—at least they had loyalties to institutions and ideologies and the infrastructure of power upon which they sat that made them definable, that made them understandable, that made them predictable to an extent. Donald Trump has none of that. His only loyalty is to himself. And that seems to change in terms of what he thinks he needs on a daily basis. And the only thing I can come up with here is this idea that Donald Trump wants to be in control.

Right. So the post you just put up there, Danny, you know, what's the emphasis there? It's his control. He's in charge. He turns the war on. He turns the war off. He turns negotiations on and off. He is promising to annihilate Iran as a country. But then the next day, he is merciful, and he's going to listen to others and let them live. I mean, this is a nightmare. Again, as criminal as the American empire has been, this is especially dangerous. And yes, Donald Trump doesn't have the body count yet of a Bush or an Obama, but certainly there's the potential for him to do things that those men would believe were untoward or criminal or too far. And so, you know, to your question, Donald Trump has enabled these wars.

You know, certainly the Biden administration allowed and supported and ensured Israel's genocide in Gaza. Amos Hochstein and Brett McGurk gave the green light for Israel to invade Lebanon. You know, but there wasn't this concern that anything was possible. And I think that's what's so dangerous about Donald Trump. He is a mad president or a mad king or a mad emperor. And this world is held hostage to his whims, to how he feels that day. And that's a really scary thing. You know, we're all analysts here. We're supposed to come up with better explanations for things. We're supposed to have theories, and we're supposed to be linking causal events and whatnot. But in this case, our explanation really has to come down to this: we are at the mercy of a mad president.

#Danny

Yeah, and one, Tony, who has seen his investments in oil, for example, go up dramatically during the Iran war. Tony, you know, Trump endorsed Netanyahu twice before these votes. Do you see any U.S. meddling in the political situation in Israel? As Matt just said, it's obvious that the whims of Trump and his administration matter a lot. Are they trying to manage this political situation in Israel so they can get what they want out of it and not be surprised by anything that Israel may do amidst this chaos?

#Anthony Aguilar

The Trump administration has interfered in and influenced these Israeli elections and will continue to do so. I think now more than ever, what we saw on the 27th was that the bell rang and the horses came out of the chute. Now we're at the point where the United States can look at the field and say, okay, I believe that the CIA, the State Department—even the Department of War and other entities—have all had various courses of action on what to do on the ground in Israel politically to influence the outcome. I think now what we're going to see is the U.S. really pushing for the option of saving Bibi. I think that, you know, to Bibi, Bibi comes first.

And part of that manipulation and control over the United States is the condition that he comes first. So it's first whatever ensures Bibi's survival, not what's best for Israel, not what's best for Israelis, surely not what's best for Palestinians. And then what's best for Trump. And where those two roads cross is the Trump administration influencing, weighing in on, interfering in the results of these elections and what's to come by making promises and agreements and deals: "Hey, you two, do this." You know, you can do the math right now. My fourth grader can sit down and do this math and figure it out. Okay, you got A, you got B. You can't get D without C. You can't. It's physically impossible unless you change D. We'll see what comes.

I mean, we know that as the elections were closing, the Likud party submitted an emergency request to extend voting, and the election committee said no. So we're already seeing, you know, how can the sides change D? If they can't, well, then you've got to change A, B, or C. And there's very little influence now to change C because you showed all your cards: "We don't like you. We don't want to work with you. We ban you. We detest you." Okay, well, you're not going to get D without us, so how do you change D? You can't change D. Well, then you've got to make A and B fit to make 61. That's where negotiations and deals come in on who gets to be what minister and who gets to be this.

Could there be a sharing of the prime ministerial position? Yes, we can see that. So I think the United States is already interfering and will continue to interfere, weigh in, and play a role in these elections, much like we accuse many others around the world of doing. We do the same. But I think now the Trump brand of endorsement is no longer the Trump seal like it used to be. It's kind of like, "Hey, do you think you could not endorse me?" I mean, look what we saw in Brazil with Bolsonaro accepting defeat. Look what we saw when Trump weighed in on other elections, and even J.D. Vance went there to back the elections. What country was it in? It's a bloc country, a former bloc country.

#Danny

Oh, Serbia? Was it Serbia?

#Anthony Aguilar

It was either Serbia or Belarus or one of those. I can't remember, but Trump endorsed him, Vance went over there to say, "Yes, this is our guy," and he lost. I think that's Poland. I think that's Poland. Thank you, thank you. Yeah, when you look at that in terms of the Trump brand, having his approval is no longer what it used to be, you know? But I think, between Bush, Obama, Biden, and what Trump came into now, I would say he partially inherited it, but partially made it worse. You can always spoil your inheritance and do really bad stuff with it. So in terms of that, it's a throne of lies.

And that throne of lies is held together with this patina. Under Obama, under Bush, under Biden, there was this patina of international law and order, and at least, "Let's follow international law." Going to war with Iran was not a step we were willing to take, but there was sure plenty of giving Israel bombs and munitions and supporting what they're doing in this region. They're not innocent. They were a big part of getting us to where we are now. Trump basically took the patina off and said, "Here's the truth." And guess what? Now we all see it: the war crimes, the genocide, striking elementary schools, starting conflicts by assassinating political leaders—the Ayatollah—starting wars with no end, no political end state, all that.

"I've ripped all the facade off, and I'm showing you the truth." And that's who we are. That's who Trump is. So now it's no longer a matter of, "Do you know that this is wrong?" It's like, "Oh yeah, we know, and we're doing it." And that's something that really scared me when I returned home from Gaza, when I went to the U.S. Congress and talked to senators and representatives. And I said, "Hey, I was there on the ground—a former military officer, an American, not part of Hamas, not Palestinian, not someone that you can brand as some lunatic, as they like to do. I was there, and I saw it, and here's what's happening." And no one in our Congress said, "Oh my God, we weren't aware of that."

Every answer was, "We know, we know." So what Trump has done is rip that patina off the throne of lies. We're looking at it like, "Okay, this is the truth, and that is who we are and what we are doing." So I think we're going to see a continuation of meddling in the elections to formulate what's best for Bibi, what's best for Trump. And then how does that feed into continuing this war with Iran? And Mike Waltz, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, who I frequently disagree with, said something last week: he sees this conflict going on for a year or more. I agree with that—and far more than that.

#Danny

Yeah, well, they're certainly not showing any signs of letting up. And perhaps the election you were talking about within the bloc was in Hungary, possibly.

#Matt Hoh

Actually, both. I looked it up. Vance had gone to both places and, yeah, done a disservice. Yep. Exactly.

#Anthony Aguilar

It's kind of like, "Hey, can you not endorse me? Like, I don't want that seal of approval." So, yes, in Poland most recently. The one I was recalling, when Vance went out there on the stage and was like, "This is our guy," and then he lost miserably, was Hungary. Yes.

#Danny

Both of them, yeah. So, Matt, I guess I had a question in my head, but is there anything you want to react to in what Tony was saying here?

#Matt Hoh

Well, I think with regard to the Iran war, I certainly believe this war will go on through Donald Trump's presidency. I think Plan A for this war, for the Americans and the Israelis, was quick regime change by decapitation. When that didn't happen, Plan B was that, you know, the Kurds were going to come out of the mountains carrying posters of Netanyahu and Trump and overthrow the government in Tehran. And, you know, that obviously didn't happen. So Plan C, I think, is basically very similar to the Americans' campaign against Iraq from 1991 to 2003: the isolation, the sanctions, the blockade.

The constant bombings, the idea that we're going to stir the pot and eventually there's going to be some type of coup, some type of uprising—that, of course, didn't work with Iraq. And Iran is an entirely different country, in entirely different circumstances than Iraq was 30 years ago. The United States is entirely different and in entirely different circumstances than it was 30 years ago. So there's the possibility that this war will be prolonged, but also the reality that it will be over, that the war on Iran will end. And again, it may not be until after January 2029, but then there's going to be a new order in the Middle East, something that's already clear.

We see this with, say, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey visiting Tehran this week. I mean, certainly they were there addressing questions, concerns, and issues of the moment, whether that be Yemen or Lebanon or the Saudis asking the Iranians not to attack them if the Americans attack Iran. But also, hanging over all that was this understanding that the American imperial order that has existed for the last 80 years is going away. And nations need to start acting now in order to fill out and flesh out this new, coming order, you know, whatever that might look like. So, you know, that's something I think about a lot.

And then you refer back to these Israeli elections, right, and this idea of the uncertainty that exists, you know, again in the short term with Israel. Who's going to be able to form a government? Will

there be a government? Will there be a minority government that can't last? You know, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. But also the longer-term concerns: who will Israel and the United States have as loyal vassals in this region as you get into 2029, 2030, 2031? I mean, I think that's why—I'm sure you guys saw this story out of Drop Site News about the Emiratis possibly helping Ansar Allah in Yemen, right? I mean, I don't know enough about that conflict to say definitively yes or no, but it makes sense to me, right? And so, as these nations hedge, as they position themselves for the end of this war—which, again, I think is going to be a couple of years away—the reality is that there will be a new order replacing the American imperial order. And nations are trying to shape that now.

#Danny

Yeah, well, the UAE story actually surprised me a lot because early in the U.S.-backed Saudi war of aggression against Yemen and Ansar Allah, I believe the UAE was providing detention centers and carrying out torture. Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. It shocked me a little bit.

#Matt Hoh

They were carrying out airstrikes. I mean, that war was just as much the Emiratis' war as the Saudis' war. And then, of course, you have a split around 2017 with the STC breaking away from the PLC, and that causes all kinds of problems. But, I mean, that storyline in general, right? If we go back a decade or so, MBZ is bringing MBS to Washington to show him off, and he helps MBS overthrow MBN to become the new crown prince. I mean, this storyline is very dramatic. It's kind of, as someone else said the other day, like Game of Thrones.

And now here we are with Yemen in this position, and the Saudis have put themselves in a place where they are vulnerable again—not just to warfare from Iran, from Iraq, from Yemen, but also to the consequences of Vision 2030, this grandiose economic plan for the future the Saudis have put in place, and MBS's own missteps in terms of stepping on a lot of toes as he centralized his authority. He has also put himself in a position where this rift, if you can call it that, with the Emiratis is now possibly playing out in a proxy war. I mean, this is all quite dramatic stuff. But, I mean, yeah, it's that. Yeah.

#Danny

Now, given that regional layout that Matt just put out there, Anthony, I wanted to ask you about that. Both of you can answer this question: Why is Netanyahu so important to the United States—to, I guess we'd call it, the Zionist lobby, the powers that be inside the United States? I mean, Netanyahu's been around forever, so I guess he's the devil you know. But Eisenkot, as you said, Tony, is not a dove. He's not going to change policy around Palestine or Iran or Lebanon, on and on and on. So what is it about Netanyahu that's so attractive to those forces that are backing Trump and the U.S. powers that be?

#Anthony Aguilar

It's very similar to Jolani in Syria. You can throw a suit on a terrorist and call him a president or a prime minister. The way they do business, their intentions, and the way they're going to naturally respond to things remain the same. Netanyahu—we're talking about a guy who, back in 1994, was showing little drawings of bombs, saying that Iran is two weeks from the bomb. Whether it's his role in shaping the current political environment that put him in power or the last many decades of him being in power, he cares about his survival. He cares about his power. He cares about the power of the party, which he helped not only form but strengthen. And, you know, in doing so, he's empowered some within it who have now outgrown Netanyahu's far-right shoes and actually want to be more extreme than Netanyahu.

But as for why he's maintained his grip within the United States for decades and across administrations, you know, I think it comes down to some basics. There's dirt on Netanyahu. I think he knows where all the bodies are buried, quite literally and figuratively. I think he has been a part of so much that there's no honor among thieves, you know? He's willing to throw anyone under the bus. I do not see a reality in which Donald Trump and Netanyahu have had conversations recently or in the recent past where Netanyahu has reminded Trump where he sits in this power dynamic. You know, and I think that they hold so much sway.

And then when you look at the Zionist population within the United States and within Israel—Jewish Zionists, Christian Zionists, atheist Zionists—Zionism is simply a form of supremacy with a nice political title to make it sound like, oh, it's just about having a homeland. Well, at the cost of killing, committing genocide against, and ethnically cleansing everyone else around you. So we have a lot of that in the United States. And to be frank, it's influenced by a lot of money.

Just look at the little hubbub over Macklemore on the Ed Sheeran tour, right? You know, the attention that caught. You can immediately see, kind of in the way that Matt described Game of Thrones, where the sides are going to part. And it's always with those who have a lot of money—the Rob Krafts, you know, the billionaires and trillionaires. So there's old money involved in Zionism. There's old blackmail involved in Zionism. There are some who believe it deep in their core. They are true believers.

They are zealots for the cause, like Mike Huckabee. And then there are those who are all three of those: they're zealots for the cause, they're in it for the money, and there's blackmail on them. I can picture and name people I've met in Congress, right down the line, and put each of them into a category. People like Pete Hegseth or Mike Huckabee—Christian nationalist, supremacist, racist Zionists—well, they fit neatly within that support. And then you have someone like Tom Cotton. Tom Cotton—not necessarily a Zionist, not Jewish, just, you know, a good old boy from Arkansas.

But I'll tell you: where he lives and the area he represents as a senator include one of the largest weapons-manufacturing hubs—Camden, Arkansas. They produce all of the warheads for all of these

big bombs and Hellfire missiles and precision-strike munitions. It's a heyday of money. So when you ask him, "Should we stop giving munitions to Israel?" well, no, because you're cutting into his profit. So when you take it back, it's the old things, right? Money, power, influence. And Netanyahu has a grip on all three of those with a lot of American politicians, including our president, the president's family, Jared Kushner, and Steve Witkoff.

I mean, what really bothers me, as someone who has fought for this country and has done my best to learn about the intricacies of the geopolitical situation, is that our nation is now being led into war, with Americans being killed, based on the influence of Natalie Harp, Pete Hegseth, and Steve Miller. Come on. I wouldn't put any of those three on a bus without telling the bus driver where to drop them off. And they're leading our foreign policy, in the president's ear about how to go forward. Steve Witkoff, Jared Kushner—of course we're going to side with Netanyahu in this. And that is absolutely, to me as an American, disgusting.

#Danny

Yeah, and there were reports in the Vanity Fair story on the book that was written about Jared Kushner possibly receiving money directly from Israel, even through the central bank. And I want to play this as you're answering the same question, Matt. Oftentimes, we've heard about Donald Trump being in conflict with Bibi Netanyahu over the phone—you know, angry exchanges. But I think this kind of summarizes a lot of what the relationship has been like. But to you, why is Netanyahu so important? Anything you want to follow up on?

#Matt Hoh

With regard to Donald Trump, I think he sees a kinship there, right? He sees himself in Bibi's eyes. And Bibi, I think, sees himself in Trump's eyes. And I think there's that respect. Both of them are criminals. Both of them are demagogues. And so I think there is this understanding of the symbiotic relationship, where they both benefit from supporting each other like this. I mean, Donald Trump, as far as I can recall, didn't have much of an interest in Israel and Palestine before he ran for president in 2016. And I want to say there are comments from him in early 2015, when he first started running, where he says that we need to be more fair there. We need to get around the table and have these conversations.

And, you know, he didn't seem to have, at that point 11 years ago, this fascination, this allegiance to Israel that he does now. And then what, of course, happens? He wins the primary, and all that pro-Israel money starts coming in. Then he's introduced to the Adelsons, right? I mean, so certainly there has been that influence on him, but I think he also just really likes Netanyahu and likes how he's a bully and likes how he's corrupt, right? And likes how he's able to maintain power, how he doesn't give a damn. You know, I mean, this is why, of all the historical comparisons, I think Mussolini, or particularly Mussolini's Blackshirts, are the ones that I equate most with this movement behind, say, Trump or Netanyahu—this modern right-wing movement.

I'm probably going to butcher it, so if anyone in the comments or either of you guys speaks Italian, please correct me. But the motto of the Blackshirts was, “I don't give a damn.” “Me ne frego.” I can't remember how to say it. Excuse me. And you see this idea of “I don't give a damn.” Netanyahu doesn't give a damn. Trump doesn't give a damn, and I think they like each other. And the other thing I'll say about Netanyahu is, he understands the U.S. I mean, there's that video of him from, what, 25 years ago or so, where he's sitting in that living room someplace, and he thinks the camera's off, and he's going on about how he'll always be able to manipulate the United States.

He'll always be able to control it. He understands the importance of money in politics and how Israel will never lose the support of the United States because of that ability to manipulate and control the political class and the media class. So I think that's another reason for Netanyahu's longevity. I'll be interested to see what happens with Netanyahu, though. Certainly, this election is not just a political concern for him, but a personal concern. He's got these corruption charges. There's a good shot that if he loses that prime ministership, he ends up in jail.

And then what happens to his political support? Do these political parties possibly—I don't know enough—but possibly then see Netanyahu as the reason why they lost power? That the increase in votes for the opposition bloc came from those who were annoyed by Netanyahu, who disliked Netanyahu, right? And that Netanyahu then becomes the scapegoat for the far right's loss of power. You know, is that a possibility that comes out of this, particularly if Netanyahu is behind bars at that point? But, you know, that's just speculation on my part. Right. Tony, any follow-up you have to that?

#Anthony Aguilar

Certainly. I think that Donald Trump looks at Netanyahu as someone he wants to be: a strongman. Netanyahu served in the military. Netanyahu has great stories of military grandeur as a warrior, now a politician. Same with Putin. Putin served in the KGB, a storied member of the intelligence services, with a reputation as a strongman. Kim Jong-un played 18 holes of golf and finished with a score of nine. He made two holes in one. So Trump looks at Kim Jong-un as the strongman with a great golf game.

He looks at these people as people that he wants to be like. And two points real quick, going back to—I won't forget this because I was in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, watching the 2016 presidential election campaign, when Hillary Clinton is on stage and Trump is kind of stalking behind her. And he gives that famous line, when she talks about putting someone in jail, and he's like, "Because you'd be in jail." Almost like a rap battle, right? But in that same town hall-style talk back in October of 2016, the question of Israel came up. And he even said then, because there was the juxtaposition of what Hillary Clinton said: "Well, they're allies. We have to continue to support them."

And Trump, being the non-company man, the non-politician who's going to tell you like it is, as we all wanted, said, "Well, yeah, you know, I know Bibi. I talk to Bibi. I tell him, 'Hey, you got to be fair. Got to be fair, Bibi. You know, you can't have it all your way. You can't have it this way.' I talk to them both. And, you know, they're not going to get anything from me unless they learn to behave," right? What happened to that guy? What happened to that guy? It was only 10 years ago. And then, you know, I think it's funny—the motto you mentioned, the full translation, what it translates to is, "Don't let the bastards grind you down."

And the Italian form of that is "Non farti schiacciare dai bastardi," which is hard to say. But if you take it to its Latin form, it's "Illegitimi non carborundum." And the only reason I know that—I'm not a linguist, and I don't speak Italian—is because when I was in 2nd Battalion of 1st Special Forces Group, our battalion motto was "Illegitimi non carborundum." And people used to always say it at the end of their speeches. And I'm like, "You do know that that is the motto of the Italian Blackshirts. You do know we shouldn't be saying that. You might as well just end it with a 'Heil Hitler.' Like, what are you doing?"

#Danny

No.

#Anthony Aguilar

And I'm like, "Yes, that is what that means." "But it sounds so good." And I'm like, "So what? Come up with something different." But there's this romanticism. We see this in the military. I don't know if Matt experienced it in the Marine Corps, but I experienced it in the Army, where you see mottos and symbology. I mean, heck, in 3rd Special Forces Group here at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, one of the battalions has the Totenkopf because they're the desert battalion. So they have the Totenkopf. And I'm like, "You do know that that is not appropriate to have as your symbol." "Well, yeah, but that's what we embody." The same thing, like when I was in Gaza, right?

The Infidel motorcycle gang, with the Crusader cross and 1095, following the edict of Pope Urban to eradicate all Muslims from the earth—those are the guys that the United States has hired to provide food to Palestinians. And you look one level past it, and they're like, "Oh, we don't mean it." You do. You do mean it. Pete Hegseth, with the tattoos he has on him—he means it. So it's time that we start looking at these people like, "No, they mean it." And that's the road we're heading down. So, yeah, it's very concerning to me when you see the ideology and the romanticism of the strongman and what Trump wants to be.

He always shows that picture of himself in his military uniform at that military college. I don't even know what it is—a boys' camp? I don't know what that high school was that he went to, where he showed himself in his uniform. He's like, "See, I have military experience. I've got more military

experience than all the generals." Remember when he said that in 2017? Yeah. He believes this. You know, I was not only hoping for no new wars under Donald Trump because that's what he told us, but I was also hoping for no new wars under Donald Trump because, man, would we be screwed. And we are.

#Matt Hoh

Yeah, you know, the things that Tony is pointing out—in the Marine Corps, we have scout snipers, and "SS" was their logo. And not these really colorful, curly S's, but the stylized lightning-bolt style, right? I mean, either you're too dumb or you're in on it. Remember, Graham Platner had the Totenkopf on his chest. And, you know, I believed his excuse about not knowing about it as much as I believe that Bill Clinton didn't inhale. Right? You know, I mean, this idea that—you really think I'm that stupid?

I don't believe you are. And the danger here that Tony's articulating is this idea of righteousness, the historical righteousness that underlies or girds what these people believe in. So there's no reason at all for objective explanations or exploration. There's no reason whatsoever to be reflective or to examine, because when you're pushed by something that historic, you know, then there is certainty. And certainly you see that on the right in the U.S., the right, say, in Brazil, the right in Israel, you know, and it is incredibly dangerous.

#Danny

Yeah, well, I mean, I'm so glad you all are bringing in your experiences with this, because it's not every day that we hear reports, for example, that there are generals and commanders who are spreading this idea of a crusade and that these are, like, the end times. And that's why the Iran war is so important, because it will fulfill the rapture and all of this. But I think for people who are outside of it, it is quite strange to know that this entity, the United States—its security forces, its military forces—is deeply engaged in this. It's just incredibly problematic—not just ideologically, but, of course, you know, in terms of the political and military aims that we see every day now.

You know, we see it all the time. Look at who we support in Ukraine. Look at who the United States military supports in Ukraine. It's crazy. It is, I think, quite telling of where things have gone. But, you know, we have about eight minutes left. Tony, first to you. You know, the regional situation is going to get really bad when the Iran war restarts in a kinetic way. Do you have any reaction to what I said? And then, how disastrous is it going to be for the economy, for the region, now that this thing is seemingly going to restart after the midterm elections?

#Anthony Aguilar

I'll try to wrap this up here. I usually did my little concentric rings of how this has grown, but now it's gotten to the point where the tick is in and we have Lyme disease. So what appendage do we

cut off? We're no longer seeing if the tick is infecting us. It is. So I'll just go ahead and circle the whole thing there. Looking at what we have in Yemen, I think the success of Ansar Allah, the inability to find a military solution on the ground, and the pursuit of airstrikes—with Pakistani support and U.S. support, but no one willing to go on the ground—have led to us seeing Ansar Allah bring the STC out of the PLC. Because remember, the PLC became part of the Hadramaut tribal coalition and parts of the STC, which are not necessarily friends, but were friends against a common enemy.

That pits Saudi Arabia against the UAE. So I think what we're going to start seeing in Yemen is more friction between the UAE and Saudi Arabia directly because of the way coalitions are now forming after the offensive, in the next phase of consolidation in Yemen. We're also going to see more and more harsh, tyrannical treatment by Israel in the West Bank, including Hebron, and especially in Gaza, as well as in Lebanon and Syria. The world will see it, and we will largely do nothing about it, unfortunately, unless we change our ways as a country and as a world. I think we're going to see Israel starting to push more to arm and militarize the PFF, the Druze—the People's Freedom Front or the People's Fighters Front—in Syria.

We already know that there's this bubbling friction between Jordan and Syria over the last two days, following the alleged IS attack in Jordan and strikes from Jordan into Syria. Syria is saying, "Hey, we're not cool with that." Jordan is saying, "Hey, sorry, eat it." And then Jordan struck again last night. So we're seeing that heating up. Then there's also, of course, the overall conflict involving Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey, and Pakistan, with this Mecca alliance and this new Badr agreement, which is a memorandum of understanding for military-industrial trade between certain nations. These alliances are growing, and the United States is being pushed out, unwilling to give up its colonial past. We are on a crash course toward a very harsh winter. Mm-hmm.

#Danny

"Winter's coming," I guess, if we want to tie it in with that. Yeah, a little GoT, yeah. Matt, to you—your final thoughts.

#Matt Hoh

I unfortunately agree with Tony. I think we are in the early innings, the early phases of this war. This is a war that will deepen. I mean, you see Egypt's parliament voting to get involved in Yemen. Egypt's role in Yemen was catastrophic for Nasser's government, you know, in the '60s. You know, in Egypt, they call their involvement in Yemen Egypt's Vietnam. But you see the Egyptian government wanting to get back involved in some way.

#Danny

Now, what that will be, I don't know. I don't think they're going to send ground troops or anything.

#Matt Hoh

But this war is going to continue to cause crises, hardship, and resulting political fractures, not just in the Middle East, but throughout the world. We just had a report the other day that zero percent of fertilizer is getting out of the Persian Gulf, and that sulfur now costs twice as much as it did before the war started. This is not only an energy crisis, but a food crisis. And of course, it's not just the Persian Gulf; it's the Red Sea as well as the Black Sea. This year, the highest numbers of mariners killed and ships hit have been in the Black Sea, not in the Red Sea, not in the Persian Gulf. Something like 575 ships have been hit in the Black Sea.

I mean, you put that together, and the crisis can be not just an energy crisis, but a food crisis as well as an inflation crisis. I mean, you talk about what percentage of any commodity you can think of is now in a supply deficit because of these blockages in the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Black Sea. My God, can we come up with something that's not having a supply shortfall right now in terms of commodities? And then the other aspect, just to touch on, is my agreement with Tony, too, that we're going to see the Israelis really push to finish off, or to at least make significant progress with regard to, the Palestinian issue, as well as Greater Israel. We saw Benjamin Netanyahu this last week repost a tweet that references, "We've only got two years of Donald Trump left."

And so I think whichever government comes into power, whatever we see happen in Tel Aviv, we are going to be looking at an Israeli government that understands its time is limited to do as much as it wants with regard to Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem. So we're going to see an acceleration of settlements, as much ethnic cleansing as they can carry out, as much collective punishment as they can inflict, and as much of the “decisive plan,” as they call it, as they can implement to achieve annexation of the West Bank, as well as the continued destruction of the Palestinian people in Gaza. And then I think in Syria and Lebanon, we're going to see the Israelis trying to formalize, right, make somehow permanent, that presence there, whether it eventually leads to settlements or it's just some type of free-fire zone that serves as a buffer zone for them. I think that's what the next couple of years look like.

#Danny

Well said. Very well said. That's a great place to leave it, I think. And I'll definitely have to have you both back on very soon. This is a great show.

#Anthony Aguilar

Sobering, but well said.

#Danny

Very sobering. Yeah, definitely. I've been thinking a lot about how a lot of Israel's and, of course, the U.S.'s actions in the last couple of years—three or so years—have been all about acceleration and all about rushing to an endpoint that you might not reach. But ultimately, the destruction speaks for itself.

#Matt Hoh

And I think that's a good, positive way to leave off: the previous Israeli government would say, "You know what? Under a guy like Trump, we can get away with a lot. But, you know, if the Democrats take Congress and the White House, we're still going to be able to do a lot." But that's not the case now. Whatever Democratic president comes into office in January 2029, if they do so, they are going to come in with the understanding that, well, maybe they were able to get through their election, because they're all going to be Zionists. Whichever Democrat they run, even AOC, they're all going to be Zionists to a degree. In 2029, they're going to be thinking about the 2030 midterm elections already and knowing that they will lose control of Congress, if they have it at that point, if they do not take into account Democratic Party voters and their concerns about Palestine.

Right. I mean, I think the change in American politics is a bit of a positive way to look at it. And that's because of programs like this, Danny, right? The American public didn't change their opinion on Palestine and Israel because NBC News told them to. I mean, the Times, God bless them, they stuck to that Zionist narrative as well as they could, you know? But it's because of media like this. And so I think that's maybe a good way to end the program: hey, things aren't great, but we have made progress. There has been a change, and we've got to keep fighting because the other side is not going to stop fighting.

#Danny

Well, thanks for that, Matt. And thank you, Tony. Thank you, Danny. Everybody, hit the like button before you go, and do check us out tomorrow at 1 p.m. Eastern time with Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson and Larry Johnson. I'll see you tomorrow, everybody. Hit the like button, and I'll see you then. Bye-bye. All right. Thanks.