

# Paul Craig Roberts: How the Iran War is Making Trump Lose EVERYTHING

## #Nima

Hi, everybody. Today's Monday, April 6th, 2026. Our dear friend, Paul Craig Roberts, is here with us. Welcome back.

## #Paul

Thank you, Nima.

## #Nima

Paul, let me start with the operation in Iran — this special operation for Donald Trump. He's presenting his case the way he described it to all of us today, saying it was a successful operation in Iran. They saved the second pilot of the F-15E, and that's one story. On the other hand, we have, what, something like twelve planes together — fighter jets, helicopters, Little Birds, you know, Black Hawks — all together, various kinds of aircraft that were hit somehow. Some were destroyed at the scene. I don't know if you saw the pictures or the footage that came out of Iran. What do you make of what happened? What's your understanding after hearing Donald Trump describe the situation?

## #Paul

Well, I don't know what happened. What struck me about that very long press conference was the—yeah, the extraordinary bravado. Everything was bravado. Trump was full of bravado. The CIA director bragging about everything they could do—just more bravado. Bravado from the war secretary, bravado from the four-star general. And then, during the question-and-answer period, more bravado from Trump, even going back to his reelection, you know, telling off the New York Times. It was so much bravado that I had to wonder about it. Was it a cover-up for a failure? I don't know. I have no idea. The official story from the White House is that the planes and helicopters that were destroyed were stuck in the wet sand.

They somehow got mired down and couldn't lift off or take off, so the American forces destroyed them to keep the Iranians from getting the technology. There was all kinds of technology built into them that the United States wanted to keep for itself. So that's the official story. It appears that the planes sent to rescue them were lighter—lighter aircraft that didn't get stuck because they didn't weigh as much. But of course, those little helicopters would weigh even less, so I don't know why the small helicopters were destroyed or why they couldn't lift off. And I don't really understand why

they were used, Nima, because my understanding is the site was so far inside Iran that those small helicopters were beyond their return range.

They couldn't go there and come back without being refueled somehow. So the whole thing—and the media—I didn't watch all of it because it was turning into more Trump bravado. And the questions from the media were marshmallow questions. No one asked anything that helped in understanding what might have happened. Nobody asked. So I didn't watch it all. But it kind of reminds me of the Obama administration's claim that it went into Pakistan and killed bin Laden, then dumped his body off an aircraft carrier in the Indian Ocean—I think it was the Indian Ocean. That was totally false. Completely false.

And yet they went through the act of being televised, watching the events live. And later they had to admit they weren't watching it live—they were listening. That was fake. And I kind of had the feeling there was just so much bravado today that it seemed excessive. And the explanation for so many of our aircraft being destroyed was never clear. It was never clear either why, if they had these confrontations with Iranian forces, there were no casualties at all—not even a scratch. One would have thought the Iranians would have dropped drones on them, or missiles, or something. So I don't know what to make of it. I really don't.

And it's disturbing that it looked orchestrated. The CIA director and the Secretary of War emphasized how important Trump was to the operation's success. And Trump himself emphasized how important he was—the one who finally dealt with Iran, who made the decisions all the other presidents failed to make. They should have done it. Well, you know, it looked to me like it was just too much of a celebration of Donald Trump, and a celebration of our untouchable military, intelligence, weapons, and personnel. You know, the two pilots were almost given superhuman powers. So I don't know—I can't say what I make of it—but it's just these strange things.

## **#Nima**

I think the alternative would be what we discussed on this podcast with Larry Johnson earlier today. His take is that it was a raid on Iranian soil because it was close to the Natanz nuclear power plant in the city of Isfahan. They wanted to go there to look at the nuclear power plant, to see if they could get that enriched uranium on Iranian soil. It was a raid. As time goes on, we've learned from the evidence coming out of Iran, and from the way they're talking about what happened, it's totally in line with a raid—some sort of attempt that failed in the end. That's why they left behind so many things before leaving Iran.

And this is the alternative, by the way, Paul, to what Donald Trump is trying to say to us. When you look at today, and the way Donald Trump is talking, again he's coming back to "48 hours." It's going to be tomorrow, on Tuesday at 8 p.m.—his ultimate move. He's going to attack power grids, bridges, everything, destroy everything. What do you make of Donald Trump—the way he's behaving, the way he's talking, even using words like "little bastards," "crazy bastards"? This is not the way to

communicate. Nobody would listen to you if you used that kind of language to talk with other countries.

## **#Paul**

It indicates to me a lot of frustration. Trump has a lot of frustration. But why, if he's so totally in charge and Iran is so totally defeated, is he frustrated? You'd think he'd be more relaxed if the conditions were as he describes them. But instead, he seems very, very frustrated—some sort of defeatist thing. He's frustrated. Well, that suggests we're not getting an accurate story of what the situation is. What I don't understand is the Iranians' behavior. If you're told you're going to be attacked tomorrow evening, and all the bridges are going to be destroyed and your whole electrical system is going to be destroyed, why in the world would you sit there and wait for it to happen?

You know, where are these attacks coming from? They've got to come from some base. Well, those bases should be under sustained ballistic missile attack right now. There should be no bases left for any such attack to come from. If it's from aircraft carriers, they should be sunk. This is the puzzle to me—it makes no sense. The Iranians are behaving like Vladimir Putin. They refuse to take the initiative. They wait, they get hit, suffer all kinds of destruction, and then they hit back. Well, that's not the way you fight a war for your continued existence. And countries that never take the initiative never win.

The army with the initiative always wins. And the Iranians, like Putin, avoid taking the initiative. They sit there, they get all kinds of things destroyed, and then it's just tit for tat, tit for tat. The Iranians are facing a war for their existence. Trump and Netanyahu have made it clear they intend the destruction of Iran—either militarily, economically, or by changing the regime and turning it into a different country. So why does Iran make proposals like, "Oh, we won't open the straits until we get an agreement that you'll never again commit aggression against us"? Well, how could they trust that agreement?

To see Iran proposing any kind of deal is nonsensical. And to see them just sit there, get attacked, and then reply—it makes no sense. They should shut down the ability of the United States and Israel to operate. That's what they should do. I think they should have already hit Dimona, and Israel would be buried in radiation and out of the fight. If you're fighting for your survival, you have to do that. You have to fight. Tit for tat isn't fighting. Waiting and taking such huge losses before you act is mindless. It makes no sense to me. I can't understand the position of Trump, and I can't understand the position of Iran.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. The reality of what's going on, Paul—what we've heard from the Iranian media today—is that they reported receiving a 45-day ceasefire proposal from Pakistan. The Iranian response was that they rejected a temporary ceasefire and demanded the following points: a permanent end to the war

on all fronts in the Middle East, including Lebanon and Gaza, with guarantees; dismantling all U.S. bases in the Persian Gulf; implementation of a new transit protocol that recognizes a new mechanism for the Strait of Hormuz—under Iranian control; lifting of economic sanctions on Iran; acknowledgment of Iran's right to peaceful uranium enrichment under the NPT; and payment of reparations for economic damages suffered during the war. These are what Iran is asking for.

## **#Paul**

Yeah, I know. It's their ten-point program. I know about it.

## **#Nima**

I think it's logical. When you look at it, they're talking about the whole region. It's not just about Iran, the United States, and Israel—they're talking about Iran, Lebanon, and Gaza. This is important.

## **#Paul**

It's logical, but it's nonsensical because it's not reality. The reality is the Zionist agenda of Greater Israel, and the reality is that the United States is in lockstep with that agenda. You look at the demonization of Iran from Trump—totally evil, evil, evil, evil, evil, evil. It's just... well, Iran's not going to get any guarantees that mean anything. What Iran could say is, "Look, let's negotiate the Zionist agenda of Greater Israel. If the Israelis will agree to abandon that agenda, we can have peace. But as long as they have that agenda, we're targeted, and we will be targeted."

And no agreement we make will mean anything as long as the Zionist agenda of Greater Israel exists. So we have to get rid of that—that's what has to be negotiated away. I don't think the vast majority of Israelis are particularly interested in Greater Israel, especially now that they see it has a cost. It would make sense if the Iranian government said something like that. But what they actually said tells me they simply can't understand reality. They have no connection to it. So, yes, it's logical and makes sense in some abstract way, but when it's totally unrealistic—that's the problem with the ten points.

It's totally unrealistic. It's not going to happen. So if they're going to say anything, they should say, "Okay, let's see what we can do about getting rid of this Zionist agenda of Greater Israel." Because we've already seen Libya, Iraq, Syria—and now they're trying again in Lebanon. They're after us. We didn't cause these wars. We didn't attack anybody. We're being attacked because we're in the way of Greater Israel. So that's the problem. We have to negotiate that agenda. Why is that agenda important? How can it be consistent with peace? It can't be. So this is why I think the Iranians don't really understand the situation.

I don't think they're aware that the Zionist agenda means the destruction of Iran, and no agreement can do anything about that except one in which the Israelis abandon that agenda. In the meantime,

to sit and take punishment and only react after your forces have already been hit and reduced—you're wasting your resources. "Oh, come take another big chunk of our resources. We won't do anything until you do that." This isn't intelligent. This is not intelligent. This is stupid. And that's the problem, you know—it's the way Putin does. I mean, the area the Russians have been fighting over, both Luhansk and Donetsk, the two breakaway republics together, comprise 8.8% of Ukrainian territory.

## **#Paul**

And this is now more than four years in that little tiny bit of territory. The Russian army hasn't been able to clear it of Ukrainians. It makes no sense. You're watching Putin refuse to win. He refuses to fight a war. So it's house by house, street by street, tiny little village by tiny little village, casualties mounting everywhere. This makes no sense either. And I think it's the same with the Iranians. It makes no sense to take huge losses by always allowing the enemy who wants to destroy you to strike first. So, that's my rant. I can't make sense of what anybody is doing.

## **#Nima**

Here's what Donald Trump said today about the United States' objective in the case of Iran.

## **#Speaker 03**

If I had my choice, what would I do? Take the oil—because it's there for the taking. There's nothing they can do about it. Unfortunately, the American people would like to see us come home. If it were up to me, I'd take the oil, I'd keep the oil, and we'd make plenty of money. And I'd also take care of the people of Iran, much better than they've been taken care of. It's been horrible. They've killed forty-five thousand people.

## **#Nima**

He's just—

## **#Paul**

He's going to take care of the people by stealing the oil. And he's going to bring democracy by choosing the leaders of Iran. Look, when he says they can't do anything about it—Iran's the size of Western Europe. It has a hundred million people. It can do whatever the hell it wants to do. It's thousands and thousands of miles away from the American supply chain. But Iran is not fighting in any serious way. It's just standing there, letting itself get punched and punched and punched. It should have taken them out. Those bases were undefended—it destroyed them completely. I think Iran could have blocked the attack altogether.

## **#Nima**

Paul, the problem is they're not attacking Iran from those bases anymore. They're using other parts of these GCC countries to attack Iran—mostly areas far from the American bases. That's why Iran needs to find them and hit them again and again. That's the fight happening right now.

## **#Paul**

Iran needs to be realistic. Somebody ought to sit down and tell them how to fight a war—they don't seem to understand that. I mean, they're careless. Look at all the leaders who've been killed. It's carelessness, just plain carelessness. It's almost like, "Oh, they wouldn't do anything like that. Why do we have to worry about it? Oh, you mean they would kill the Ayatollah? Oh, they'd never do that. We can just have an open meeting." I mean, that kind of thinking makes no sense. I would have thought Iran would win this war, but it seems like they can't make good decisions. And if you can't make good decisions, it's hard to win. So, I don't know. We'll see what happens tomorrow at eight o'clock. Maybe there'll be another forty-eight hours.

## **#Nima**

Nothing would happen, in my opinion, because he's done this before—not only with Iran, he's done it with Hezbollah, he's done it with Hamas. You remember that "48 hours to disarm Hamas or I'm going to destroy everything"? And that didn't happen. Well, that's right. I mean, it's a perplexing situation, and we really don't know what's happening.

## **#Paul**

My suspicions were also aroused, Nima, by the announcement a couple of days ago that one of the large global picturing systems—Palantir, maybe it was—that the White House pressured them not to release any... Palantir, yeah, it was Palantir. Not to release any signs of the war. So if you're winning, you'd want it released. I can't understand how Trump can make the claims he's made but still feels he has to impose censorship so no one can see what's actually happening. So, you know, we don't get information—we get war propaganda. And there's no Western media that knows how to, or would dare to, try to get at the truth. So what do we know? We just don't know anything. And we don't even know why Trump fired all those generals the other day.

There are quite a number of them. Why? Is there some opposition? I don't know what's going on. And this should tell us it must be different from the official story. Because if the official story were true, they'd be giving us all the information—it would support their version. But when they don't, when they won't even let global positioning firms show battle areas or where claims have been made, it makes you ask, why? It must not be consistent with what we're being told. So I just don't

think we'll find out until we find out. And I think that if the Iranians don't understand that the intention is to destroy them and don't start fighting while they still have something left, they're going to get destroyed.

## **#Nima**

I don't see anybody being capable of helping Donald Trump except Donald Trump himself simply deciding to leave everything and go back home. That's the only solution. Other than that, there is no solution. Even with this, you know, Netanyahu was telling Donald Trump, "You have to go with the ground invasion of Iran." And it happened. What happened was the ground invasion of Iran, and we saw what happened—what the reaction was on the part of the Iranians.

## **#Paul**

I don't think that was actually a ground invasion of Iran.

## **#Nima**

It was some sort of raid, but it gives them a sense of what the reaction would be—what they're going to face as time goes by if they go deeper into Iranian territory. Because all these air defense systems are mobile, Paul, they're going to come out, they're going to hit the targets, they're going to hit the fighter jets. It's going to be devastating for the big picture of what's going on, in my opinion. It's going to be more difficult for Donald Trump to get out of it.

## **#Paul**

Yeah. Well, look, you know, I respect Larry's understanding of things. But I know less about all these weapons and so on than he does. It just doesn't strike me that the aircraft they had there were the ones they would have used if it were actually an invasion. The kind of stuff they had isn't equipped for that. They would have had the A-10s, the low-flying fighter-bombers.

## **#Nima**

One A-10 was destroyed, by the way.

## **#Paul**

Yeah, but they would have had scores of them. I mean, this could not have been an invasion. It may have been testing—maybe a small group testing the situation. But even then, it doesn't look to me like it was equipped for that type of activity. And I don't really even think it was equipped for a rescue operation. So I don't know what was going on.

## **#Nima**

It wasn't a rescue operation.

## **#Paul**

I don't know what was going on because of the way it's equipped. And I certainly can't believe that we have all this fantastic equipment nobody else has, but our planes and helicopters can't lift off the sand because it's wet—wet sand. You know, you can't have super weapons that can't lift off because the sand's wet. So nothing makes sense. Nothing fits. Nothing fits. I don't think Larry's story...

## **#Nima**

In that region, Paul, just adding to what you said—there isn't that much sand, first of all. And if there is some, it would be thin; it's not going to be deep sand. It's not going to be humid either, because there's no rain there right now. It's just all made up, I think.

## **#Paul**

Well, that's what I'm saying. It makes no sense. So I don't know what happened. I think there was too much bravado. They were so determined to set a narrative in stone, they overdid it. You know, I was willing to believe whatever they said, but the more they went on and on, I thought, something's wrong. This is overcooked. When you overcook something like that, it sort of undermines it. And so I think we just don't know. I can't say what's happening other than what I've already said. And I think the main mistake was made by Iran. They should have struck first, used all their best stuff first, and knocked everything out—sunk the two aircraft carriers—and the war would have been over. But they didn't. And they... they telegraphed their moves: "We're not going to do anything until you hit us, then we'll hit back." So nothing that's happening makes any sense to me, and I can't offer any explanation.

## **#Nima**

Here's what, you know, the Washington Times said—the title was "Israel's New Nuclear Bomb." And this is important, I think, when you look at the whole Middle East, the Persian Gulf, all these Arab states together with Iran, and the significance of that. Do you think the way they're framing it—as some sort of nuclear bomb—is meant to be a kind of leverage, a big advantage for the Iranians? How do you see that playing out in the long run? Because right now it seems Qatar was the first—I'm not sure if that's real—but there was some news coming out of Qatar saying they don't want American bases in their country. If that's the case, they'd be the first country to declare that.

## **#Paul**

Well, I think you're right that what the Washington Times means is that control of oil flows out of the strait is, in some ways, comparable to having a nuclear weapon. But overall, that amount of oil—about 20% of the world's supply—is huge. Yes.

## **#Nima**

It's 20% when you include fertilizers and food security. Altogether, that's a lot—about 30% of fertilizer, 20% of oil—and the world can adjust to that.

## **#Paul**

It would be at a higher price.

## **#Paul**

And Venezuela—maybe they can pump more oil. I'm told there are some new oil fields discovered on the border between Venezuela and a neighboring country. We don't know what the Russians could do about increasing output, so I don't know how serious it is.

## **#Nima**

Sorry to interrupt you, but the problem is the oil itself—the quality of oils is different. That's why India isn't buying Venezuelan oil; it's buying Iranian oil.

## **#Paul**

Yeah, that's true. Middle Eastern oil is much easier to refine, and Venezuelan oil is very heavy, thick stuff that's hard to deal with. But still, the world could probably adjust—drive a lot less. I don't think the prices would be deadly; it wouldn't be a catastrophic situation. But for me, I don't see how the war can go on that long—a year, two years, three years. Already in the United States, there's not much support for it. And maybe that's what Trump and his crew were trying to do today—build support, make people feel proud, like we'd accomplished something. But the longer the war goes on, the less support there'll be. How the war can be anything other than the two sides throwing missiles at each other, I don't know.

I really don't think the American population would go along with a massive invasion of ground troops. It would take huge numbers. So how can the war go on and on? At some point, everybody runs out of missiles. The Iranians, contrary to what Trump says, seem to have the most and can continue the longest. But still, I just don't think it can be a long-term war. Maybe in some minor way—like Hamas throwing a few little rockets over at Israel every now and then—and that went on year after year after year. But it wasn't really a war. So it looks to me like either Trump is going to use the Air Force bombers, unload all over Iran, destroy whatever they can, and see what happens.

Or else he's going to declare that they accepted his deal. But you see, that's hard. How does he break loose from the Israel lobby? From Netanyahu? Netanyahu's not going to let Trump exit. The Israel lobby isn't either—especially after today, with the way Trump was praising the Israelis, talking about how devoted he was to them, how devoted America was, and how Obama had supposedly chosen Iran over Israel, which is BS. He didn't do any such thing. But you can't endorse Israel that strongly and then turn your back on them and leave. So I don't know. Declaring victory would have to be a victory for Israel, too.

## **#Nima**

It's not a victory for Israel. They're just getting destroyed. The censorship is unbelievable in Israel, Paul. They don't let anything come out of Israel. There are some areas—not the rural ones, I mean Tel Aviv and Haifa—that are getting hit like Gaza. They look like Gaza today. But nothing is coming out of Israel to inform people what's going on there. They're totally getting defeated by Hezbollah in the southern part of Lebanon.

## **#Paul**

Yeah, I saw that the Israeli minister had revised their invasion plans in Lebanon, saying they didn't have the means to do what they'd planned. Doesn't surprise me. They never have had. But you'd think, with Israel suffering this punishment—which they must be, because of the censorship, you can't see what's happening—it must be bad. You'd think Netanyahu would be... what's his position? You'd think something would be coming from them. Now, the fact that it didn't suggests to me that he has Trump under his thumb and acts through Trump. So Trump is acting for Israel. And I don't see how Trump can pull out.

## **#Paul**

I mean, if he pulls out—really pulls out—I mean, he can say it and not do it. But if he actually does, there's Israel there. And what is Israel going to do? It's now got three fronts: the Houthis, Hezbollah, and Iran. And Israel is out of interceptor missiles and can't protect itself from incoming ones. So I don't see... I can't predict what's going to happen. It looks to me like a stuck situation. I think if Iran would actually fight—take the initiative, work out a plan to defeat them, and fight—that would end the war. They would be defeated. If Iran refuses to defeat them, like Putin refuses to defeat Ukraine—he wants a negotiated settlement, he'll take all kinds of humiliations to get one and avoid a military victory—then it just drags on. The Ukrainians are now hitting the Russian oil export facilities. Well, if Iran would take the initiative and win the war, it'd be over.

## **#Nima**

Paul, when you talk about initiative, do you consider Iran's nuclear program—if Iran goes in the direction North Korea went, I mean producing nuclear weapons—is that going to change the balance in the region?

## **#Paul**

Yeah, it would make it more risky to attack Iran. It doesn't mean there couldn't be a surprise nuclear attack on Iran. You know, having weapons means people have to think you're willing to use them, that you're always poised to use them. But if you've got them and they think you're not really all that interested in using them, you can be sneak-attacked and lose the weapons—you lose yourself. I don't know, it seems to me the whole trouble is that the Muslim world, the Middle Eastern Muslim world, has never come to terms with the Zionist agenda of Greater Israel. They don't seem to know about it.

## **#Nima**

Paul, just to be specific, I think it's not the Muslim world—it's about the elites. It's about the leadership of the GCC countries, in my opinion. When you get to the people, to public opinion, they're totally opposed to the kinds of policies their governments are pursuing in that region.

## **#Paul**

Well, they don't do anything about it. They should overthrow the governments. But you see, there's no sign. I would have thought that for 30 or 40 years there would have been a lot of complaints among all the Arabs about this Israeli agenda of taking the whole Middle East. And I would have thought that the Arab League would actually be a league—that they'd understand everyone was targeted—and they would have come together and found some way to block this, to defeat Israel. They never did anything, nothing. And they've been knocked off one by one, one by one. Everybody else stood around: "Well, get him, not me."

And so, you know, three countries are no longer organized countries. It's this sort of blindness in the Muslim world—Middle East, or what you now call West Asia—to the Zionist agenda. Now, the Israelis haven't tried to hide that agenda. They stand up, the prime ministers stand up and hold the maps. They hold up the maps. So it's not like they're hiding it, but it's kind of like the Arabs just never heard of it. Well, I think that's the reason for all this trouble—all of this. The whole first quarter of the 21st century has been the destruction of the Arab West Asia for Israel, for Greater Israel. That's what it all is.

The war on terror was a disguise—a cloak—that hid Israel's use of the United States to advance Greater Israel by destroying the countries that were in the way. Seven countries, five years. Well, even that didn't wake up the Arabs. And so it tells you, it's almost like they simply cannot comprehend reality, or accept it, or maybe just don't want to know. And this, of course, brings me

back to Iran. You'd think Iran would have been complaining for decades: "What's this Israeli agenda of Greater Israel? I mean, what does it mean for us?" And they gave up the whole propaganda advantage. This would have given the Arabs, the Iranians, a huge propaganda advantage. Instead, they got positioned as terrorists.

So I see it as a failure of the Muslim Middle East. I'm going to keep calling it the Middle East because that's what it's been called all my life. I just don't know what to make of that. And still, the Iranians haven't said a word about it. So we have this situation where, you know, Trump claims the Iranian government doesn't represent the people, and that the people are begging him to keep bombing Iran—"Bomb, bomb, we want this government destroyed. We'd rather be killed by your bombs than live under our government." You know, that's what he was saying today. That's what Trump was saying today. I mean, this has to be nonsensical—just like his claim that the Iranians shot and killed 45,000 people who protested, and that the Iranians killed women.

### **#Nima**

He protested that he sent them arms. He said today that he did.

### **#Paul**

I know. And the Iranians kill the women who don't wear the veil? They don't do any such thing.

### **#Nima**

It doesn't exist.

### **#Paul**

It doesn't exist. Well, of course, Americans don't know. Trump can say whatever he wants because people here just don't know. All they know is that Iranians are terrorists, because that's all they've ever heard. So we come back to Greater Israel. It would have been a huge propaganda advantage for the Muslim Middle East, and they never used it, never mentioned it. And this, to me, is a huge puzzle. It's almost like the Arabs were fatalistic and said, "They're going to get us sooner or later, so in the meantime, let's just have fun—spend our money, have mistresses in Europe, castles in England, buy Ferraris, have our own jet planes. Let's just have a good time, because they're eventually going to get us anyhow. And why resist?" Maybe it's some kind of fatalism. I don't know enough about the people, the cultures. But it's peculiar. It's very strange. And as you can see, we really can't explain anything.

### **#Nima**

Yeah. Well, I think the reason he's increasing the number of people who've been killed in protests in Iran—he said there are already, right now, 45,000—is because these numbers aren't produced by Donald Trump. They're produced in Israel and pushed through the Trump administration, because they want to downplay what's happened in Gaza. You have to have some numbers coming out of Iran to overshadow what's happened in Gaza. That's the main agenda, I think, behind these absurd numbers they're putting out. That's part of it.

## **#Paul**

I agree. It'll be interesting if we speak next Monday—more will have happened, and we may have a better idea of what the real situation is. But to sum up, right now Trump declares an amazing victory, and yet there's censorship everywhere, and we can't see it. Yeah. And there's no real explanation for this narrative of the pilot's rescue. What we saw today was excessive bravado, going way beyond what would be sufficient. And we see the Iranians still...

## **#Paul**

Being reactive rather than proactive, which makes no sense. It makes no sense. So it looks like maybe there's some constraint on them, or maybe they just want to prove that they're gentlemanly, and they don't strike unless they're hit. And so they don't realize it's a war—it's just a collection of strikes. It's not a real war; it's a collection of strikes. You strike us here, we'll strike you there. I don't know how the thought goes, but we'll see. I don't think there's anything more to say beyond what I've said and what we've discussed at this time. We can make all kinds of speculations, but there has to be some realism, and we haven't been shown the realism. We don't know what it is.

## **#Nima**

Yeah, exactly. Thank you, Paul. As always, a great pleasure.

## **#Paul**

Okay, I'm looking forward to next week.

## **#Nima**

We're going to have a lot to talk about, in my opinion. Something may become clear. The situation is so fluid.

## **#Paul**

Send me the link.

**#Nima**

Sure, sure.

**#Paul**

I'm going to send it. See you soon. Bye-bye.

**#Nima**

Bye-bye.