Trump GREENLIGHTS Israeli Attack? Russia Arms Iran! | Seyed M. Marandi & Alex Christoforou

Prof. Seyed M. Marandi and Alex Christoforou join to discuss new reports of Trump's "revenge" strike on Iran & Israel possibly taking the lead in a new phase of escalation. Also, Russia and Iran just concluded intense talks led by top Iranian security chief amid reports that Russia has transferred military hardware to the Iran. Don't miss this must-watch stream! Alex Christoforou is co-founder and host of The Duran: https://www.youtube.com/@TheDuran https://www.youtube.com /alexchristoforou LIKE the video and Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: https://www.patreon.com /dannyhaiphong SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong Telegram: https://t.me /DannyHaiphong Support the channel in other ways: https://www.buymeacoffee.com /dannyhaiphong Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: $Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: https://paypal.me/spiritho #israel #iranwar #trump

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. Danny Haiphong here. As you can see, I am joined for the first part of our show today by Professor Saeed Mohamed Marandi to go over the latest developments. Well, Professor Marandi, I wanted to ask you right away: Of course, the midterm elections have passed. The Trump administration was essentially put on notice. And now the talk is not that there's going to be a retreat from the war, but actually that the Trump administration, in the coming hours, is going to make a decision on strikes that CENTCOM has presented to Trump. And one theory, one proposal, it seems, is to put the Israeli regime out front—to greenlight attacks by the Israeli regime, backed by the United States. And I'm wondering what your thoughts are, what you're hearing, and how Iran will respond to this, given that it feels like the 2025 model is almost taking priority at the moment, given the political situation.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, I'm just going to give up on saying, "Press the like button." Apparently, you've become indifferent to the like button. Yeah, I think it's quite possible that there will be an attack. I've been saying this since the election results came out. The United States has gathered its forces in the region, and Trump is, for whatever reason, deeply influenced, compromised, whatever, by the Zionist lobby and the Israeli regime. And their priority is their own interests. They don't care about

the United States or the American people. So they're Israel-firsters. They're more than willing to sacrifice the U.S. economy and the global economy, and they don't care what the American people want.

They don't care about the election results. So the chances of an assault on Iran tonight, tomorrow, or in the coming days are quite high. It's not inevitable, as we never know what's going to happen, but the chances are quite high. But this time, it's going to be very different from before. If the Israeli regime and the United States assault Iran, Iran is going to hit very hard, and it's going to hit across the whole U.S. coalition. And that will bring down the global economy. This is a serious matter, and it will change the face of the world because we will all be impacted severely by the consequences of Netanyahu's and Trump's actions and the actions of the Zionists.

So we will have a global economic depression worse than the 1930s. I think your audience knows this quite well, but I just want to remind everyone how serious this is. The election results, though, are important because I believe they make it much more difficult for Trump to wage a war in the long run. I think it's going to cause great anger among the electorate that voted against the war, because this election wasn't a pro-Democrat election result. The senators in Michigan and Texas and Maine—these are pretty mainstream Democrats, and they're by no means revolutionary in their outlook or seeking a fundamental change in the way the United States conducts itself across the world.

They have very mainstream worldviews—not as bad as most of the Democrats, but in many ways, they're not that different. This was a vote against war. This was a vote against genocide. This was a vote against Zionism and the Israeli regime. It's very clear, I think, to everyone why the United States witnessed these election results. So when Trump engages in war, it is going to be an insult to the American people, and he will be showing complete disregard for the will of the American people, who have already given him a vote of no confidence. And when the economic catastrophe begins to show itself, I think this could lead to instability in the United States, unrest in the United States.

And I think it will quite possibly even lead to his removal from office, because even some Republicans in the new Congress and Senate would probably feel pressure or feel that they need to vote against Trump if he does carry out an assault, and if U.S. Senator Murphy's understanding of the war plan is accurate—meaning that Trump and Netanyahu will be going after Iranian infrastructure. I think the consequences will be enormous. And so what we've been seeing in Paris and across Europe—the unrest and the protests and the riots—I think that will be just the very, very tip of the iceberg once we have a new phase or a new chapter in this war.

#Danny

Well, it seems, Professor Morandi, that according to Israeli media, Kan News and Channel 14, they're proposing this renewed escalation as a middle ground, with Israel really playing a central role for the first time in a while in this war, actually. And so I'm curious about your thoughts on that, given

everything that you said about the U.S. political situation. I think a lot of people, when they saw this, thought, “Wow, okay, well, this is a referendum on the war on Iran, and that will make it extremely difficult in the future to prosecute this war.” But Congress doesn't change for another couple of months.

And the narrative immediately shifted to, “How quickly can this war restart in a bigger way before that happens?” And it seems like the Trump administration right now is racking its brains and trying to deal with the fallout. It seems like much of his cabinet, from J.D. Vance to Marco Rubio, wants to distance themselves from the war. And I see that, in a lot of ways, as confirmation that there's not going to be a major TACO situation anytime soon. Maybe small TACOs in the interim. But what are your thoughts on this, especially the centrality of the Israeli regime again, as it also deals with its own political situation and the changes that just occurred right before the U.S. midterm elections?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Again, I don't know what is going to happen. I know that the Iranian armed forces are on full alert, and the Iranians believe that there's a high possibility of war. No one knows for sure, as far as I know. But the Iranian response will be very heavy. Iran doesn't care if it's a limited strike. Iran will strike back very hard. This will be the decisive chapter of the war. And even if the Americans and Israelis want to stop, let's say after three days, it's not going to stop. The Iranians will go on until they meet all of their objectives. And Iran will want to end this war. So if they make the catastrophic mistake of carrying out an attack and hoping that the Iranians don't have the stomach for a long war, they're badly mistaken.

Many in Iran believe that we have to finish the job this time. And I think that is more or less what's going to happen. The Iranians are going to finish the job. So again, if Senator Murphy's assessment of the war plan is correct and Trump moves in that direction, then I think we're going to see a global catastrophe. People who were born more than 100 years ago witnessed something like it in their childhood, but this will probably be worse than that. So Iran will be ruthless. And again, based on Senator Murphy's understanding, as I understood it from what he said, Iran will destroy the Saudi regime, the Kuwaiti regime, and the Bahraini regime. They should not expect to survive this war.

#Danny

Professor Morandi, I wanted to ask you what you make of the reports about Iran. They're going so far as to say Mohsen Rezaei has been in contact with the mediators and has put forward a proposal that includes discussions on Iran's nuclear program. There hasn't been any confirmation from Iran's side on this, but it's circulating all across social media and, of course, the mainstream media. I think the timing shouldn't be lost on us: Friday, right before the markets close, after a bloodbath in the last 48 hours on Wall Street. So, your thoughts? Is there any accuracy to this? I've only heard Iran be pretty steadfast that they're not going to really discuss anything until the seven points of the MOU, abbreviated or not, are met. Has anything changed?

#Seyed M. Marandi

No, nothing has changed. That's fake news. There has not been any new proposal by the Iranians. The Iranians have said that the United States must carry out its obligations in accordance with the MOU that Trump signed. And only then can we move on to discussing the nuclear program and the sanctions. It's not just going to be the nuclear program. It's going to be removing the sanctions. If the sanctions are not removed, then there won't be any deal on the nuclear program. So no, nothing new has happened. It doesn't even make sense. Why would Iran put forward a proposal and say that they're not going to discuss the proposal unless the Americans carry out their obligations? It's a pretty silly claim to make. But things are just as they have been. Since Trump publicly signed the MOU, the Iranian position has been that the MOU has to be implemented in full.

#Danny

The market manipulation appears to be in full swing here, then. I want your comments on all this fake news about the possibility of Iran opening up talks on its nuclear program through mediators, no less. I mean, that would be a massive concession. In this leaked agreement—which, as you say, is fake news—it was also said that Iran would accept essentially partial concessions on its seven-point program: a little bit of sanctions relief and a little bit of money, which, again, doesn't make any sense. But at the same time this was happening, Mohsen Rezaei handed a message from Mojtaba Khamenei, the Supreme Leader, to Vladimir Putin. And I'm wondering if you had any thoughts on what that was about. There have been pretty intense bilateral talks between the two in recent weeks, and I'm curious what you think that might have been all about.

#Seyed M. Marandi

This had nothing to do with the United States. There was no proposal discussed with the Russians. This was about bilateral ties and also strategic ties. The North-South Corridor project between Iran and Russia is to be implemented very swiftly. That will link Russia to the Persian Gulf, so the Russians will no longer need the Mediterranean for their trade, and it will make them independent of NATO. So they will be able to trade with Asia and Africa without going through NATO territory. They also agreed that Russia would export its natural gas to Iran and, through Iran, to countries that neighbor Iran. So these are two key projects that are going to move forward.

Obviously, the two sides have been helping each other militarily. We know Iran has been helping the Russians in the Ukraine war over the past few years, and the Russians are helping Iran too. Both countries know quite well that if Trump has any success in Europe or in West Asia, it will be detrimental to the safety and security of the people in both countries. So their coordination is very good. In fact, I would argue that the United States is the greatest catalyst in the world for promoting Iranian-Russian ties. And over the years, they've done a good job of pushing the two countries closer together.

#Danny

Yeah, there have been a lot of reports, President Omar—I don't know if you've seen them—about Russia secretly bolstering Iran's missile arsenal, even supplying what are being called hypersonic missiles to Iran. I don't know if you have any understanding of the reality of this, but most people do believe that, at this point, Russia and Iran have a pretty robust security arrangement that goes both ways. Your thoughts on that?

#Seyed M. Marandi

I think that the Russians and the Iranians do cooperate, and it goes both ways. But when it comes to Iran's missile and drone programs, I think by now people across the world know how capable Iran is. There are some areas in which the Russians can help, but of course they have their own war too. But when it comes to missiles, Iran is very advanced.

#Danny

I also believe Iran has provided Russia with some drone technology for the purposes of the Ukraine conflict.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Everything goes both ways. I mean, the two countries are generally collaborating in different areas. I don't know exactly what goes on. Whatever is secret, I don't know. But I know that the two sides are very helpful partners to one another, and for obvious reasons. And the relationship between Iran and Russia has evolved dramatically, as I said, especially since the war in Ukraine. And now I think it's probably the closest it's ever been in history.

#Danny

And on the opposite end, as there's all kinds of talk about the US and Israel restarting heavy strikes on Iran, there's also a lot of talk about the US-Israeli relationship having some problems, given the political conditions in the United States. In a lot of ways, the midterms were essentially a referendum not just on the Iran war, but on the relationship with Israel—so much so that J.D. Vance has said in private that the relationship with Israel has to be... And Trump just said that that $4 billion gift card for US military hardware is about to expire.

But I'm wondering if you're a little bit cautious and suspicious about these remarks and these changes, because they come at the same time as Israel and the United States are definitely planning on escalating with Iran together. So much so that I think people have forgotten: it was just a few

days ago that we heard Netanyahu has been on the phone with Trump many, many times. I believe it could be daily, but it's been at least several times in the last week alone. Your thoughts on this contradiction here?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Well, the United States plans to merge the two military infrastructures. The U.S. military and the Israeli military are to merge—their intelligence, their technology, everything. So I think that goes far beyond four billion dollars a year. And of course, it's to the detriment of the American people, and the American people don't want it. They've already voted no, but the U.S. political establishment is bound to Zionism. That's why there's no real difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. And people should not be naive about any of the senators or any of the congressmen and women who have been elected.

And I think that ultimately, if the United States attacks Iran, it will be catastrophic. But if the Democratic Party does not take a major step toward decoupling from the Israeli regime, people in the United States will recognize that the political process in the United States, with the Republicans and the Democrats, is a dead end. And when you have people like Chuck Schumer and Hakeem Jeffries at the top, then really, you can't expect much. When the mayor of New York endorses Hakeem Jeffries, that shows you the limitations of the changes that are possible within the framework of the current system.

But in any case, what is very encouraging is the fact that ordinary Americans are so politically aware, that they see through the propaganda, that they know what's going on. And they didn't have any third option, so they voted for the Democrats as a protest vote. And it says a lot about the American people. From what I've heard, white Americans, Hispanics, Jews, Christians, Muslims, people from all walks of life have voted against the war, against Netanyahu, against Zionism, against the genocide. And I think that is a very, very positive sign. And it shows that people are waking up. So even though these are potentially very dark days, there is always reason to be optimistic about the future.

#Danny

Yeah, well, I think the biggest part of what we're witnessing right now—and it's almost unprecedented in its form—is that the U.S.-Israeli war in Iran was so unsuccessful, so much of a failure, and really did expose to so many more people just how problematic the U.S.-Israeli relationship is. That has been a rolling process since October of 2023, and it, in effect, played a huge role not just in the midterm elections, but also, I think, in the way that this war is being fought now. I just look at the ways that we're getting information and reports about what's about to happen. And I do believe that the U.S. and Israel are not going to quit on Iran. They've shown no indication of that.

It's this very, I would say, piecemeal, chopped-up hesitation I see in terms of how they're going about it and what steps they'll take. Trump's options are not just military strikes, but there are all kinds of other options that, in effect, result in just waiting and waiting and waiting until the next opportunity to strike, right? Letting the economic strangulation of Iran play out, that kind of thing. And to me, it does seem like the shift in how people view Israel and the United States—and we could say globally, too—is playing a huge role in this hesitation. I'm sure it's playing a role in the hesitation over giving Israel the steering wheel while the United States kind of guides and helps. I'm sure that would be preferred by the Trump administration at this time. But it seems to be a lot more complicated now. Your thoughts on this?

#Seyed M. Marandi

Yes. Again, I don't know if there will be war. I can't say for certain. But the working assumption in Iran is that there will be war. And the belief is that the United States and the Israeli regime are planning something very sinister. And we always have to remember that this is all about two things. One is Iran's independence, and the second is Iran's opposition to genocide. It's nothing more than that. If Iran were like any other country in the region, we would not be in this situation. If it were bound to the West like everyone else, and to the United States in particular, we would not be in this position.

Of course, we would be like them, slaves to the empire, even though some of these leaders in the region pretend that they're independent. But none of them are, except for Yemen. But Iran will continue to pursue these policies. And I think there are no illusions in Iran about the nature of the U. S. regime. The Epstein files have exposed a lot to the general public. The viciousness with which the United States and the Israeli regime have carried out war against the Iranian people has exposed them to the world. The genocide, the ongoing genocide against the Palestinians, the slaughter in Lebanon—all of these, I think, have created a global awakening.

And this global awakening is not going away. Thus, I think the Zionists have made a catastrophic mistake. I believe the Zionists are actually very unintelligent people. They're not very smart at all. They are their own worst enemies. Over the past three years, through all the atrocities that they've carried out, they've undermined themselves more than anything that we could have done or had done over the past decades. They've exposed themselves for what they are. They've exposed themselves as evil, genocidal, racist, and ethnosupremacist. And Western elites have exposed themselves as being subservient to ethnosupremacists and genocidal monsters, and as facilitators.

And so have Western journalists, mainstream media journalists. Everyone has been exposed. And regional countries that have pretended to be supporters of Palestine, whether it's Qatar, Turkey, or anyone else—these regimes and their media outlets have exposed themselves for what they've done. And the people of the region know this, and the people of the region see this. People across the region support the Palestinian cause. They oppose genocide, and they oppose their governments

being in the U.S. camp. So again, the awakening that we are seeing in the West is complemented by the awakening that we're seeing in our region. And if and when the war starts and the global economy begins to collapse, these regimes will begin to collapse.

And people who have been dissatisfied with their regimes will undermine them. Again, if there is war, I think it is quite possible that the borders of countries in the Arabian Peninsula will change. I think most of their families and their elites are probably already in Europe and the United States, and a skeleton crew is waiting. Their planes—their private jets—are close by so that they can take them out when the time comes. They've already stolen their billions. They have more than enough for the next few decades. But I think the map will change. And this is all bad for the Israeli regime. It's all bad. So the Israeli regime is sacrificing the American people and the global economy, but they're also wrecking their own future.

And that, I think, is something that has been ongoing for over three years now. And I think that things will continue to go downhill for the Israeli regime in the months ahead. If we have war and there is a global depression, people across the world are going to say, "The Zionists did it. Netanyahu did it. Trump did it." And so not only will they say that the Israelis are genocidal, but they'll say that the Israelis sacrificed us for their genocide. And I think that all of this combined means that the Israeli regime simply will not be able to survive. I'm not saying it will be destroyed or collapse in one month or one year, but I think that it's inevitable that this regime will not be able to survive.

#Danny

And I think a huge point to emphasize, Professor Morandi, is that a lot of the reasons why we're in this situation have to do with the U.S., Israel, and these regimes that you just noted all committing or being complicit in war crimes. I mean, what was it—overnight, this morning over your way? You know, Yemen just experienced a war crime by the Saudis. I believe they hit a market and killed children. Israel continues to kill Palestinians in Gaza. I believe children were killed yesterday, or, depending on the time zone, it could have been today. But nevertheless, that's the reality.

#Seyed M. Marandi

Sorry for interrupting. These Wahhabi and Salafi takfiris, they're tools of Zionism. And they've been funded by the Saudi, Emirati, Qatari, Kuwaiti, and Bahraini regimes and others for decades. And sadly, Erdogan has been funding them. But they've exposed themselves. They've exposed themselves. They never stand up against the Israeli regime. They are always in the pockets of these Arab family dictatorships, these oil- and gas-rich dictatorships. And again, just like Zionism, these takfiri groups, these people who follow the takfiri ideology, they've been exposed as well. When war breaks out between Iran and the United States, people across the region cheer for Iran as Iran is striking these regimes that are complicit and are helping the United States.

And people are cheering on Yemen as they respond to Saudi atrocities and to the Saudi regime after it started the war. So people are waking up. This is a global awakening. It comes with great pain and great suffering. And in Taiz, the Saudis have carried out a major atrocity today, just like the Israelis do. They're very similar. The Saudis strangled Yemen for a decade, killing hundreds of thousands of people. They tried to starve the people, just like the Israelis did in Gaza. And those who supported the Saudis, morally speaking, they're no different from those who supported the Israelis. But people are waking up. One shouldn't take the propaganda machines of governments too seriously. People on the streets know what's going on.

#Danny

Professor Mohamed Morandi, thanks so much. Everyone should definitely give a big like. We have plenty of show to come. Alex Christoforou is backstage right now. But Professor Morandi really helped out today as the show hit some snags. So everyone, thank him with a big like, as he requested early in the show. And Professor Morandi, I will see you soon, actually. I'll see you this weekend. Take care and have a great night. Thanks so much again. Bye-bye. Bye for now. All right, let me remove that, everybody. Let me see if I can do this correctly. There's my camera. Oh, I do not like that overlay. Let me put Alex in here now. Alex, thanks so much for joining me today. Can you hear me all right? Yes. How are you doing, Danny? Good, good, good. Good to see you. Oh, wow. So, everyone, hit the like button.

Alex Christoforou of The Duran is here, and we're going to get into some other stories. My first question to you, Alex, is this: there's a story that's been going around following a meeting that Vladimir Putin had with Mossad. They say that Russia has agreed to supply Iran with 90 helicopter missile launchers. That's what's reported in The Guardian today, according to leaked documents. But I'm curious about your thoughts on that meeting. It was three hours long, and there was a message from the Supreme Leader. And, of course, we know that we're on the brink of war again, or at least an escalation of it. So what are your thoughts on this, and what's Russia's role in the conflict here? My thoughts on the meeting with Putin?

#Alex Christoforou

They're most likely preparing for a resumption of the conflict. That would be my best guess. I think most people are thinking along the same lines. Military officials were at this meeting. I can't see any other reason for this meeting taking place.

#Danny

Yeah. What have your thoughts been on the Russia-Iran relationship as this war has gone on? Because it seems that in the last month or so, there's been a lot more talk, a lot more activity between the two. And now there's a direct message from the Supreme Leader to Vladimir Putin himself. What are your thoughts on this?

#Alex Christoforou

Well, if I'm not mistaken, they have an agreement, don't they? A military agreement. So, you know, there's that. And I think Russia's involvement is along the lines of that military agreement. I don't know if it's at the level of an alliance, but they have an agreement in place for both countries to work together on military capabilities, and I think that's what Russia is doing. I think there's no doubt that Russia and China are helping Iran.

#Danny

Yeah, and a lot of the narrative about that is that it's some kind of new axis of evil. And I think there's a lot of fear about that in the West and the United States, but the Trump administration has made very little note of it.

#Alex Christoforou

Iran's part of BRICS as well. I don't know about this axis of evil stuff. Iran is part of BRICS. Russia has an agreement with Iran. I mean, why would they not help Iran? I think the more important help that they're giving—okay, you have the military side of things, but there's a lot of help that's being given to Iran on the energy side of things. They're even talking about some sort of a pipeline from Russia to Iran to increase the amount of energy that Russia provides to Iran. I think there's help on the economic side of things, on the monetary and liquidity side of things. And I think there's a lot of help on the food side of things as well from Russia. So, you know, they're providing Iran with assistance in a variety of ways. Some may even argue in ways that may be more important to them than direct military assistance.

#Danny

Right. No, that's a really good point, because I think Mohsen Rezaei himself, the leader of the Supreme National Security Council, emphasized the gas pipeline as perhaps the most important thing and was very appreciative of that kind of assistance and technical cooperation.

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, and the West cannot, you know, talk about an axis of evil or have any complaints about Russia helping Iran or China helping Iran. I mean, you know, in Ukraine, what the collective West and NATO have given to Ukraine is orders of magnitude greater than anything that Russia or China are giving to Iran. And I think Iran has asked for assistance, but not for much assistance. I mean, unlike Ukraine, which is going to Europe or to the United States asking for assistance, I think Iran has not asked for so much because they have a very capable military with very devastating weapons.

#Danny

Well, I wanted your thoughts on how the political situation in the United States now is going to impact the conflicts that I know you and Alexander cover so much, both on your individual channels and on The Duran. Maybe we can begin with Iran. You know, J.D. Vance had that huge tweet. Marco Rubio may be out. It seems like there's a lot of shuffling that might happen in the U.S. administration after what was essentially a midterm wipeout of the GOP. What are your thoughts on how that could affect the war in Iran? Then we can move to Ukraine.

#Alex Christoforou

I think the war in Iran is on its own trajectory, whether it's a successful Republican midterm or a blowout in the midterms. I think that one's already heading towards a resumption of the conflict. If Trump and the Republicans had won, I think we would have gotten the conflict. Trump and the Republicans got demolished, and I think we're going to get a conflict. Unfortunately, I think that one was already on its path. Maybe you can make the argument that Trump is now looking to really hit Iran hard because he can't stomach a loss to Iran, given what's happened in the midterms.

You also have the dynamic that if the United States were to negotiate with Iran or continue on a negotiating path with Iran, Iran might feel more emboldened given the midterm results, and they might make fewer concessions or no concessions to the United States. You can make that argument. But I think the Iran conflict was going to happen and is going to happen, no matter what the outcome of the midterms was. That's just my general impression of things.

#Danny

Well, I think that leads to an interesting question, then: why and how? Because, as you know, Alex, the mainstream narrative about U.S. politics is that people go to vote for their representatives and that those representatives are supposed to reflect their will. But what you're saying, it seems like, is that there's something a lot deeper than that going on with this conflict, and maybe with war in general, that goes far beyond elections.

#Alex Christoforou

Well, look, first I want to say I hope I'm wrong. I hope that the Trump administration, upon reflecting on the midterm results—because the midterms were very much a referendum on the Trump administration and his policy of war with Iran—will say, "You know what? Let's negotiate. Let's back off." I hope that is the case. I don't believe it is the case. And I think most people watching this live stream, Danny, don't believe that's the case. But with that being said, elections and their results in the United States or in Europe really do not have much to do with what the people want and what they are asking for from their leadership.

Don't take it from me. Listen to what Annalena Baerbock, the foreign minister of Germany, said three years ago. Listen to what Chancellor Merz said a month ago. Listen to what the Italian defense minister said a week ago: "We don't really care what the people want. We don't really care how the people vote. We know better." That's what Baerbock said. That's pretty much what Merz said. That is exactly what the Italian defense minister said. So why should it be any different for American politicians? I mean, they're also going to work from the mindset of, "What do the people know, and what do we care what the people want?"

If Trump was really concerned about the price of oil and gas, if he was really concerned about the price of diesel, then he would have lifted the sanctions on Russian energy right away. If Congress was concerned, they would have lifted the sanctions on Russian energy right away. After the whole diesel deal between Trump and Putin a month ago, Kremlin spokesman Peskov's exact words were, "Look, if the United States is really concerned about the price of diesel, and they really want the price of diesel to go down long term, they would lift the sanctions."

But they didn't do any of these things. So, I mean, you know, the whole diesel deal, the whole narrative about trying to bring the price of diesel down in the last month before the midterms—it was what it was. It was politicking. It was meant to make the American people believe that the Trump White House was trying to do something, when he really wasn't trying to do anything, because the decision had already been made with regard to Iran and also with regard to the war in Ukraine. Even if Trump wants to get out of it, even if we assume he wants to get out of it, he can't, and no one's going to let him. And that's if we assume he wants to, if we give him the benefit of the doubt.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah. Well, I know you commented on this in a recent video you did—the whole diesel deal. Those ships were diverted somewhere. I mean, there's a big problem with that too. It seems like there's so much politicking, as you said, that it's actually not going as planned. What are your thoughts on this and, you know, the broader energy question? I mean, the Trump administration could have just followed the MOU, and that probably would have done a lot for energy prices back in June.

#Alex Christoforou

Five months later, here we are. He signed the deal in Versailles for Iran, an MOU, and he walked back from all of that. The diesel deal with Russia and these four tankers are stalled. That's how it looks. Dmitriev says this is not the case. The Financial Times is reporting that they are stalled. If you look at the ship tracking, it does appear as if two of those four tankers are definitely stalled. One is moving towards Brazil. The other one is kind of stuck or floating around in the Mediterranean, right, waiting for instructions.

What happened, I think, is pretty simple. The message was sent to the companies in the United States: “Do not take that oil.” Plain and simple. If you take that oil, then, you know, all kinds of problems are going to come your way with the sanctions because it's Russian diesel, all of that stuff. So I think the message was sent to them, and they're kind of wondering, “What do we do?” Right? And so the ships are kind of just there. There are two tankers I'm not sure about. I just want to say that. It does appear as if the other two tankers are definitely stalled.

#Danny

Yeah, what a mess. I mean, it's like politics turned on its head in many ways. And that leads me now to the Ukraine conflict. When I saw that the Democrats had this big sweep, a lot of people were very euphoric about it. This channel is for sure not partisan to any of the parties. But realistically, my immediate thought was, even if the Democrats have any interest in disentangling themselves from the Iran war in the next couple of years, they have such a deep commitment to Ukraine. And so my initial thought is, well, that conflict, however it can come back into the U.S.'s foreign policy lexicon, will do so. And I'm wondering if you share that thought, just given all that we know about how Democratic Party regimes have governed in recent years.

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, I mean, you know, the Democrats are just as much warmongers and war hawks as the Republicans, maybe even more so. So I don't have much faith that the Democrats are going to de-escalate any of the conflicts, including Iran. The general rule of thumb is that Democrats are more hawkish when it comes to Europe and Russia. They have a more visceral hatred of Russia, a more ideological hatred of Russia. The Republicans and the Republican neocon side of things generally lean more toward the Middle East and Iran.

#Seyed M. Marandi

And I use the word "lean."

#Alex Christoforou

They all benefit from war, and they're all fine with the conflicts. I'm just saying that one party tends to lean more towards the Atlanticist partnership, the NATO partnership, Europe, and “Putin is bad,” while the other party tends to lean more towards the Middle East and Iran, and “the mullahs are bad.” But they're all hanging out at the same clubs, at the same parties, sipping the same champagne and eating the same shrimp cocktail. They're all in it together. But I think that what we'll see from the Democrats is maybe the appearance of trying to give Trump some trouble when it comes to escalating with Iran or prosecuting this war with Iran. But just the appearance of it. I would be shocked if they were to block or vote anything down when it comes to the actual conflict, the actual war. Ukraine, they're going to escalate. I think they're going to escalate hard.

#Danny

Yeah. Well, I can see it now, Alex. I don't know where the war on Iran will be at that point. It could be where it is now. It could have escalated. It could be in some, you know, no-man's-land in between. But regardless, I can see it now, right? The Trump administration makes decisions on Iran, and the Democrats in Congress say, "He's just so bad. He's just so evil. He's doing what no president has ever done, which is ignore Congress's will, and they're doing it anyway." I can see that, but with nothing done about it. And I could see this being true, too. You know, the elections aren't over.

The congressional elections, yes, have ended, but they're looking at the presidency. You know, they're looking at consolidating Democratic Party majorities for the long term. So, you know, I could see that working very well for the Democrats. And this is typically how I've seen them govern: they like to be out of power so they can say that the Republicans are the big bad. And then, when they're in power, they like to do a lot of dealing on a lot of joint issues and then claim gridlock or no power over certain things. Your thoughts on that?

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, they're going to use it to their political advantage over the next two years as they head into 2028. They understand that the American people do not want the war with Iran. They want the war with Iran, or at least the majority of the Democrats are fine with the war with Iran. They're going to want to escalate the war in Ukraine, but no doubt they're going to position themselves as a type of opposition to Trump's war of choice against Iran because it's going to benefit them politically. But will they actually work to put a hard stop to the war against Iran? I just don't see it. You know, they've been wanting this war with Iran for 40 years.

The political establishment, the deep state in the United States, is way above the lawmakers. Who are the lawmakers compared to the permanent state, the permanent establishment? They're managers. And the permanent state, the permanent establishment, has been wanting this war with Iran for 40 years. In Trump, they finally found the president who said, "Okay, let's do it." I just cannot see them letting go of this. I hope they do. I want to say that I really hope they do, and I hope I'm wrong. I hope I'm wrong. I hope you're wrong, and we get a de-escalation on Iran. I really hope so. But I just cannot believe that they're going to let it go.

#Danny

Yeah, well, our friend Professor Jeffrey Sachs wrote a recent piece saying Democrats know that peace is good politics. And, you know, one thing that you raise about the permanent deep state is that, given that reality, there could be real political benefit in many, many more months of a war on

Iran. The Democrats can kind of wring that towel more and more as a talking point about how they are the ones who need presidential power now in order to truly stop it, because the madman, the orange man in the White House, cannot be stopped simply through a congressional majority.

I could totally see that being the case, but you just said they're going to try to escalate the Ukraine conflict in a big way. How could that happen, though? Because I think with both the war in Iran and the Ukraine conflict, there are some material limitations. How do you think a Democratic Party regime could escalate the conflict in Ukraine, given all of these factors? I can't forget the GOP—there are plenty of Ukraine hawks there too—but I'm talking about who's very impassioned by it.

#Alex Christoforou

Look, the escalation is not going to change the trajectory of the war. It's not going to help Ukraine win. That's the first thing to note. But what it might do is extend the conflict. Maybe. I think a lot of the conflict right now depends on how Putin wants to take it. I think right now Russia is in such a commanding position in the conflict that they're going to dictate how it moves going forward. Having said that, what the Democrats in the United States can do to try to make it difficult for Russia and inflict more pain or more damage on Russia is work on getting money to Ukraine. Ukraine needs money. It needs a lot of money. And I understand that Trump has to sign off on things. But they can figure out ways to get money to Ukraine. That's the first point.

And Ukraine is broke and busted. And Europe is broke and busted. So Zelensky needs money. He needs money for the conflict. But more importantly, he needs money to stay in power. Because if he doesn't have the money, all these forces around him—all these Banderites and all of these opposition forces and these other oligarchs—are going to eat him up. So that's the first thing that the Democrats can do. And the Republicans are not going to resist this. The Republicans also want to keep Project Ukraine going. They definitely want to inflict damage and pain on Russia. The other thing that they can do is work with Turkey on opening up the Black Sea. They can work on Starshield. They can pressure Musk and the Pentagon, right, for Starshield.

So they can open up Starshield in order to launch precision deep strikes into Russia. That's another thing that they can do. That's going to be disastrous, but they can do that. And of course, you have the Tomahawks. The Taurus missiles from Germany and the Tomahawks from the United States—these are the weapons that they have still not given to Ukraine. They've given everything else. When people talk about, "Oh, well, Biden held back and Trump held back"—no, the United States has given everything to Ukraine. Every freaking weapon that they have, they've given to Ukraine, outside of the Tomahawks and nukes. But that is the one weapon that the U.S. can give to Ukraine. Does it make a difference? No. Is it going to change the outcome of the war? No. But does it cross a very big Russian red line? Yes. So they do have ways to escalate.

#Danny

Yeah. That's another great point. Again, I'm kind of harping on this because I thought your recent video was very good at breaking down the U.S. political situation. The Democrats don't have a two-thirds supermajority on their own to override a presidential veto. But there are a number of pro-Ukraine Republicans, and I'm sure they can organize around Ukraine funding alone. And I could see many arguments being made, like, you know, the Iran war is not a moral war. It's not a war that's helping the economy. But look, we've been supporting Ukraine all this time. And when we were in power under Biden, the economy was a lot better.

So obviously this war isn't affecting that, and so let's give Ukraine more money. But also, the point on whether it's weapons or, you know, trying to massage certain companies, especially the big guy, Elon Musk, who we know is not a partisan guy—he will go where the wind blows. Yeah. You know, I think those are all great points. And I'm seeing it now, Alex: a return to a major increase in Russophobic, anti-Russian sentiment. I think this is the most dangerous thing—to build up popular, not support so much, but at least maybe a popular malaise over this issue, as people are just so overwhelmed with the economics of the Iran war.

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, Russia's a good go-to for fearmongering, no doubt about it. You're already seeing that in Europe. I mean, you're seeing it in overdrive in Europe. So why wouldn't something like that carry over to the United States? But look, Trump, he's trying to work certain angles with Witkoff and Kushner and then Dmitriev, and they're not talking about a European security architecture. I mean, they're not really getting to the root causes. Everything is very, very superficial, and you're not going to negotiate a European security architecture in a matter of a month. These are very serious, very complicated negotiations. And the Europeans are never going to go for it anyway. So, you know, Trump is giving the appearance of being very close to a deal and wanting to put together a deal. Does he have the power to do it? Does he have the mandate from the political establishment to do it?

#Seyed M. Marandi

No.

#Alex Christoforou

He had his chance. He had his chance in Alaska. He had a deal. He walked away from it.

#Danny

Right, right. Is it true that the Trump administration and Witkoff and Kushner—you know, they've made several trips to Russia, they've had several phone calls—is it true that the deals they keep promoting, or at least the terms the U.S. keeps promoting under their tutelage, still include this idea

that there's going to be some kind of security arrangement that includes NATO forces, European forces in Ukraine? Which is, like, what, one or one-A on the "absolutely not" list for how Russia sees the end of the conflict. Is that true? Does that keep happening? Because when I follow the Iran conflict, too, I see the same thing. It's like you sign the MOU, you have this deal, and then they keep on pushing for terms that Iran will never agree to. Is this happening with Russia as well?

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah. I mean, it's kind of baked in the cake for the Europeans. If there is a ceasefire, then they're going to put troops in Ukraine. I mean, for them, it's a given. Agreement or no agreement, they've already decided on it, with France and the UK taking the lead. They're going to put troops in Ukraine as a ceasefire peacekeeping force. I mean, that's what it's all about. The negotiations with Russia, whether it's from the Trump side of things or the European side of things, are all about trying to get Russia to agree to a ceasefire. This is what they're aiming for. They need to get a freeze in the conflict.

They need to get a ceasefire because if they don't, Ukraine is crumbling, and the entire Ukraine project is going to fall apart. We're in the first week of November, and things are already catastrophic for Kiev and for many cities in Ukraine. Russia hasn't even started yet. The winter hasn't even set in yet, and things are very, very bad. So they're desperate to get a ceasefire. That's what they're really trying to do, and they're working all angles. They're working the Dmitriev, Witkoff, Kushner angle. They're working the Trump-calling-Putin angle. They're working the Melania angle as well. I mean, they're working all angles to try and get to a ceasefire.

#Danny

Yeah, well, I saw that. What's the town called? Oleshny? Is that how you say it? Oleshny, yeah. The ceasefire for Melania—that was something that I found a little odd, but at the same time, it definitely goes in line with what you just said about trying to get a ceasefire. It almost feels like they believe getting a ceasefire here is an introduction to a full ceasefire across the entire conflict zone.

#Alex Christoforou

It was a good thing. I mean, you evacuated people and you saved lives. That's a positive. That's a good thing. But they're now starting to talk about expanding that type of arrangement and that type of ceasefire. They're already talking about it. It's a no-go for Russia. And they were very clear with Oleshki. They said, "This is specific to this situation." And it was a town controlled by the Russian military that was being shelled by the Ukrainian military. So they did evacuate the people—at least the people who agreed to be evacuated, around 750 residents. And now the office of Melania Trump is starting to call for ceasefires in various other frontline regions.

I don't see Russia agreeing to that. But that is the game. The game is to try to nudge and push Russia towards a ceasefire on the front lines, but even more importantly, in the air, in the sky. And to lift that blockade of the Black Sea as well. That's demolishing Ukraine's economy. For four years, they were telling us that Ukraine was winning the war in the Black Sea. I remember all the UK media: "Ukraine has won the war in the Black Sea." It was a huge story. "Ukraine has defeated Russia in the Black Sea." Yeah, well, there's now a blockade that's in full force, and it's working in the Black Sea.

#Danny

Well, as we get to the last few minutes here, Alex, your take on this. I've had many people come on this show and say that they look at the actions of Europe in particular, and they view those actions in recent weeks, months, and, of course, throughout this conflict as now leading to direct conflict with Russia—that that is what they're preparing for. And that is why we hear these emergency announcements. That's why we see this militarization and the various things that they're proposing and even doing with regard to Ukraine. Do you believe that this is where it's heading? I mean, I know that you follow European politics quite closely. Is that where this is all headed?

#Alex Christoforou

Look, there are very powerful people in Europe—they are a minority, but very powerful—who do believe that if there were to be a war between Europe and Russia, even without the United States, Europe would easily win. I can tell you that. Take it to the bank. They really do believe it. And the reason they believe it is because they are ideologically inclined to believe it. They have such a visceral hatred for Russia, and that clouds their judgment. But it's also being reinforced by the intel that they're getting, the data that they're getting. And the data that they do receive, first and foremost, is from the Ukrainian military. It's from British intel.

And it's also from the media, the mainstream media. A lot of people forget that the leadership in Europe—and I know this as a fact—the prime ministers, the presidents, the foreign ministers, base a lot of their decisions and their policies on what their advisers hand to them from the mainstream media: the articles, the stories, and the clippings that they're getting from CNN, The New York Times, and the Financial Times. And so they're reading all of this, and they're being briefed on the situation in Ukraine. And what are they hearing? The Russian economy is collapsing. The Russian military is not moving. It's in a stalemate. Ukraine is advancing, and Ukraine's winning the conflict.

This is what they're hearing: Russian losses are 1 million or 2 million or 3 million—whatever the mainstream media is running with. So they're hearing all of this, and they're already inclined to hate Russia. And they believe that they can defeat Russia. So their thinking is, yes, when and if we go to war, it will be fairly easy. This is why they're coming up with all of these schemes: you know, when Russia attacks, we're going to devastate them with air superiority and air power and drone power.

Okay, so this is a minority, but a very powerful minority. The majority in Europe, maybe not as powerful, are loving the grift. Okay, so it's a good gig.

Everyone's doing very well from it. A lot of power is also being concentrated in the center. They're making out very well from the conflict. The problem is that eventually, as the people who are in it for the grift see Russia winning—clearly winning—and can no longer hide it, my fear is that they'll move over to the war party in order to cover up the grift, and we're going to move towards a conflict. And if you do get a conflict, you know, who are the Europeans going to run to when things go bad? They're going to run to the United States. But there is a very, very powerful minority that does believe they can defeat Russia. And there is a majority that is in it just for the grift. Yeah.

#Danny

Great points, Alex. Well, everyone should know that your YouTube channel and the Duran's YouTube channel are both in the video description below. So everyone who isn't already following Alex there should definitely support his work and the Duran's work, because there are few better places to go for an independent view and ongoing coverage of the most important geopolitical developments in the world, especially around the Ukraine conflict. Alex, thanks so much for joining me today. I look forward to having you on again, hopefully very soon. Any last words before we end here?

#Alex Christoforou

No, it was a big day in a big week of news. You know, we'll see how everything works out as we head into 2027. Don't expect many, many geopolitical changes, is what I would say. I don't anticipate big geopolitical changes, given that everything's now in Democratic hands, except for the presidency, of course. That could change in 2028 as well. We'll see.

#Danny

For sure. Alex, thanks so much again. I will talk to you again soon. Take care. Have a great rest of your night. Thank you. You too. Take care. That was a great show, everybody. I appreciate everyone who came today. I want to say thank you to Carlos for the super sticker. Thank you to Yosef Adalion, who said, "We voted for Democrats to put guardrails on Trump. If they fail to stop this war and put the U.S. first, I can see an uprising coming to replace both." I would 150 percent endorse that because, well, you know, it's not my politics. I don't believe that Democrats can put guardrails on Trump, in large part because they created Trump. They are part of the establishment.

I should say it's one of the two sides of the war party in the United States. But I understand the sentiment. I understand why people did it, because we're told these are our two options. And obviously, when people are told there are only two options, they're going to pick the one that isn't Donald Trump and isn't the GOP. But at the end of the day, it would be a welcome sign, and well overdue, if there were a big push to develop and organize an alternative to both of these parties. So

I appreciate that. And then you also said, “This is eerily similar to that movie Civil War.” That's scary. I don't know what movie you're referring to. The Avengers? I don't know. But I hope it doesn't go that route.

Well, yeah, the United States is certainly in big trouble, not just internally in terms of its ruling-class politics, but in terms of the rest of society as well, trying to figure out how to develop that alternative I spoke about before. The reality is that, despite increasing agreement on various issues, like bettering the lives of people and, you know, being against genocide, there are also big divisions in economic conditions and various social relationships along the lines of race and otherwise. There are all kinds of views that majorities of people, I believe, agree on. But those divisions just absolutely make it difficult, and that's why we are in the situation we are in. It makes it difficult to unite on a broad basis to really change things and avert internal conflict, especially among the exploited classes in the United States—conflict with each other, which is something that has been a huge theme in the United States over the course of its history.

So thanks so much for coming in, everyone. Trita Parsi apologizes. He might come on tomorrow. I don't know. I'm going to try to get him on. He had a last-minute commitment, so he apologizes, but he will be on the show soon. Everybody, hit the like button before you go. I'll be back, likely at 2 p. m. Eastern tomorrow. It might be earlier if I get Trita on before then. But K.J. Noh is definitely on the agenda as well. So, K.J. Noh tomorrow, November 7th. Everyone, thank Seyed Mohammad Marandi for his last-minute appearance. He did very well on this show and, of course, is a really good friend of mine, as well as to so many who are looking to further the cause of peace.

So hit the like button, as he requested of you before. All the links in the video description below are there to support this channel: Patreon, Substack, and much more. And I'll see you tomorrow, Saturday, November 7th. Bye-bye. Oh, also, thank you to Sam. Thank you to all of the moderators in the chat. I don't know if Ware was here today. I didn't see them. But I appreciate anyone who moderated the chat today. Patty, I see you. Anyone who moderated today, thanks so much for your help. I hope to see every one of you tomorrow. Take care. Bye-bye.