Iran FIRES at F-18, US STRIKES Qeshm Island: All-Out War Next? | Trita Parsi & KJ Noh

Trita Parsi & KJ Noh discuss how the world came to the brink of all-out war overnight as US strikes on Qeshm island were answered by Iran with several drones downed and fighter jets targeted. Why is the US going for tit-for-tat and attempting to keep the media spotlight off its "limited strikes"? What will renewed and intensified US-Israeli aggression on Iran mean for the world order? We answer these questions and much more. Trita Parsi is the co-founder and executive vice president of the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft: https://tritaparsi.substack.com/ KJ Noh is a geopolitical analyst, commentator, and journalist. 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, everyone. As you can see, I'm joined today for the first time by Trita Parsi, who's the co-founder and executive vice president of the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft and author of a great Substack linked in the video description below. But before that, Dr. Parsi, I have a big question for you. What happened yesterday? We have reports that the United States carried out a limited strike on Iran. Several missiles reportedly hit Qeshm Island, and Donald Trump verified this. Iranian sources were saying that they fired at aircraft several times yesterday, including downing another Reaper drone and firing surface-to-air missiles at F/A-18 fighter jets. This is what Donald Trump said about the strikes today.

#Danny

So that's what reportedly happened yesterday, Dr. Parsi. But maybe you can help us understand where this war stands right now, because this idea of limited strikes seems to have been a theme over the last few weeks. But there's also a lot of concern about this war escalating in the coming days. So, your thoughts on what's going on?

#Trita Parsi

First of all, great to be with you. Delighted to be on your show. So look, you have a situation in which there actually have been a lot of strikes between the two sides. The Iranians have shot down a lot of American drones. It's just not been reported. It's not been made a big deal of. Now it is, and it's also escalating. It's more than it was before, particularly with the American strikes against the radar sites. I also worry that Bradley Cooper at CENTCOM is, you know, winging his own foreign policy right now, given the fact that there is such chaos on the American side about what the actual policy should be.

He's definitely in the most hawkish camp within the administration, favoring escalation. And I do think that this is actually a worry that exists in other parts of the administration as well: that he is doing things to escalate and using these types of strikes as an excuse to get to that point. And this also shows you that Trump, you know, gets pushback when it comes to a full escalation. At the same time, he doesn't want to go with a deal. So he lands on this middle option of just continuing the blockade and economic warfare.

That is a complete fallacy. This current status quo is not stable. It is either going to escalate towards a war or it's going to de-escalate towards a deal. The idea that you can continue this for much longer is just a complete fallacy, and it's something that is pushed for by some of those who want an escalation, but they know that they can't get it through right away. So they're like, okay, let's at least not make a deal. Let's make sure that we just continue this economic warfare and keep squeezing the Iranians. Whereas, in reality, they know very well that option will eventually lead to war.

#Danny

Dr. Parsley, what do you make of the reasons why the United States has chosen this path for now? There are all kinds of reports, as you said, about all these options that are being presented to the Trump administration. Yet we seem to have been in this pattern that you just described for over a month now. What are some of the factors that are influencing the Trump administration's behavior toward Iran right now?

#Trita Parsi

The bottom line, of course, is that the United States has failed and does not have any good options. If you go back and listen to what the administration was saying when they started this economic warfare, I mean, they made all these kinds of promises that the Iranians would be crushed, et cetera, that the strait would be open. In reality, we know the strait is closed. Yes, there are some ships getting through, and a lot of those ships are apparently paying the Iranians fees to get through. So the Iranians are making money off of this. So I think within two days of starting this war, Trump realized that his plan A was not working out, and he's just been improvising this war ever since.

He never had a plan B. He was so confident, with so much hubris, thinking that this was just going to be like Venezuela, but slightly longer. Whereas in reality, we actually see one of the greatest strategic defeats of the United States. We're talking about a country whose military is supposed to be able to fight two major wars on two continents at the same time. In reality, the United States could not sustain a war against a country with Iran's technological capability for more than 40 days because it ran out of interceptors. And it could not open up the Strait of Hormuz militarily.

What does that then tell you about all of these countries that are relying on the American security umbrella around the world, whether you're in Taiwan, in Europe, or in the Middle East? That security umbrella has not only been defeated in the Middle East. Everywhere else, people are raising huge questions. There's no swift action at this point because they often don't have any options. What are you going to do? Are you just going to abandon it and stand there with nothing? But rest assured, scratch the surface, and you're seeing a lot of rethinking at this point because it's become very clear: the United States doesn't have that capability.

And this is a huge difference between the Iraq War and the Iran War. In the Iraq War, the United States won militarily within three weeks. They also achieved the American political goal, which was to get rid of Saddam Hussein. The United States failed afterwards, of course, when it came to the stabilization of Iraq and nation-building, which, frankly, never could have succeeded because that's not what the U.S. knows how to do. Here we're talking about a situation in which the United States lost militarily, was strategically defeated. This is going to have repercussions that go far beyond anything that the Iraq War did. And the Iraq War's repercussions were massive to begin with, of course.

#Danny

Great points. Well, I wanted to ask, given what you just said, do you believe what the Trump administration is saying, what Donald Trump just said there? I feel like I've heard the U.S. saying in the last couple of weeks that they've struck this and they've struck that, you know, that they've attacked, but there's no real confirmation that that is the case. Do you think these strikes may be more performative, as the kids say these days, rather than effective? Because Iran also isn't reacting very strongly to them, which makes me think they might have less significance than earlier stages of this war. Your thoughts on this?

#Trita Parsi

Okay, first of all, yes, there are plenty of statements, tweets, and infographics coming out of CENTCOM and the Pentagon right now that are not just lies, but outright exaggerations to the tenth degree. That does not mean that the United States has not hit a lot of things in Iran. It has. It has set back a lot of different things. They have destroyed a lot of launchers. What they completely underestimated, though, is the robustness of the Iranian supply chain and their ability to rebuild a lot of these things very, very quickly. In fact, when you take a look at the course of the war, you see

that despite the hits the Iranians did take—and again, we're setting aside the exaggerations by the Pentagon, but they actually did take a lot of hits—despite that, Iranian effectiveness over the course of the war has actually grown.

They're striking more effectively with their missiles—with greater accuracy, better timing, and better intelligence—than they did at the beginning of the war. So the learning curve of the Iranians has been much, much steeper than that of the Israelis and the United States. So yes, a lot has been destroyed, but it has not in any way, shape, or form strategically changed the configuration or the direction of this war. And this is, you know, something that you end up relying on when you actually don't have anything else to point to. If the Trump administration had any strategic achievements that they could put forward, I'm sure they would. But when you don't, you just list a bunch of things you've destroyed because that's the best you can do.

#Danny

Yeah, well, you know, do you have any insight into this? There's been a lot of mediation happening. It seems almost like a scramble. Qatar has been leading a lot of it lately. And I'm wondering, you know, there have been all kinds of conflicting reports. Some out of Qatar have said that these talks have completely fallen through. I believe there's been an official Qatari statement saying, no, not necessarily, that there are people who have intervened, right?

#Danny

Yeah.

#Danny

But to what end? Because I guess I haven't seen much from the U.S. side in particular that gives me any hope that they're serious about meeting any of Iran's requirements. I'm wondering what you think about how this has been going.

#Trita Parsi

Look, again, it's important here to make a distinction between the different factions in the administration. There is a faction that is very serious about reaching a deal, that was not in favor of this war in the first place, and that played a key role in getting the MOU back in June or July. And they are engaged in negotiations with Trump's endorsement. The question has always been, of course, on the side of both the Iranians and the Qataris, and frankly, also the Americans: Will Trump ultimately accept a deal? Will he ultimately accept what is put in front of him? And it's just Trump's style that he never really makes that clear. It may very well be because he hasn't made up his mind yet.

The negotiations actually made a lot of progress in terms of reconfiguring and amending the proposal in a way that, to a very large extent, has been designed to meet some of the concerns that the U.S. side has put forward. So, for instance, if you take a look at the MOU, the memorandum of understanding, it said that they would be dealing with a bunch of issues, such as the Strait of Hormuz and a regional ceasefire. And if all of that worked, on day 60 they would start negotiating seriously on the nuclear issue. For Trump, in retrospect, this was a huge mistake because he learned from this experience that the political cost of striking a deal is immediate. It's instantaneous.

And he got a lot of crap for it from the Israelis, from Republican hawks, even from some Democrats, whereas the actual reward for the deal would not come until at least 60 days later. This he cannot handle. We're talking about a person whose mentality seems to be closer to that of a child who needs an instantaneous reward, not a deferred reward. As a result, the Iranians put forward a proposal in September that squeezed that time frame into seven days. So within seven days, if all measures were taken, there would be serious negotiations on the nuclear front. Trump, of course, wanted that to happen right away. He actually would want to see the Iranians give a major nuclear concession right away. That's not going to happen.

Now, those seven days have been shrunk to five days, and now potentially even to two days. All of this is to meet his demand that he needs to be able to say, "I'm now involved in nuclear negotiations. I'm going to manage to get something on that," instead of making the story about how he's lost in the Strait of Hormuz and the pressure he's going to have to put on Israel to end the war in Lebanon and Israel's occupation of the southern part of the country. There's also another element to this, which is that, on the U.S. side, they're very worried that if they lift the blockade, the Iranians will sell a very large number of barrels of oil, make tons of money, and then go back to shooting at the ships.

Back to the current status quo, where there is a stalemate, but with the difference that the Iranians have refilled their coffers. And if the period is 60 days, then perhaps there's some legitimacy to that concern. If you shrink it down to seven, five, or two days, how much is Iran going to sell in two days that makes much of a difference? So this is also done in order to try to meet Trump's demands because of his fear that he's going to get criticized, because of his fear that he's never going to get to the nuclear talks. The problem is that he is living in a misinformation space.

He fundamentally misreads the situation, drinks his own Kool-Aid, and believes that he is in a much stronger position than he actually is—to the point that he thinks the Iranians should make a nuclear concession right away in order to get diplomacy, which is completely ridiculous, given what actually has happened in this war. But there are efforts now to try to find ways to reduce some of that anxiety that he and others in the system have. I still believe that it's doable. And I think one thing that is really important for the Iranians to also understand is that there is a significant amount of confidence on the Iranian side right now.

Because at the end of the day, they look at it and they see that Trump has been making threats about restarting the war for quite some time now, but he hasn't. And they ask themselves why. And the answer they reach is that it's because of their deterrence, because of their capability to blow up the rest of the Middle East, really hurt the U.S., blow up American bases, potentially blow up American ships, cut the undersea fiber-optic lines, et cetera. And I think there's a lot of truth to that. I think Iran's capacity to strike back has provided it with significant deterrence. But it's important to understand that deterrence has been enough to make sure that he doesn't start the war, at least not yet.

It's not been enough, and it won't be enough in and of itself to reach a deal. To reach a deal, it's not just deterrence that you need. You need something more. You need that diplomacy. You need that flexibility. You also need to give something symbolic to a person who, frankly, has now been humiliated both on the battlefield and in the elections. So my worry is that the Iranians are very confident. I'm not saying they're going to overplay their hand, but they think that they can just rely on that deterrence instead of thinking of something symbolic that can also be given to Trump in the negotiations in order to overcome this hurdle and actually get a yes to that deal.

#Danny

Well, that's interesting because it makes me wonder. You know, Iran has always been very open to negotiating, but negotiating on terms that, as you said, reflect the actual realities that have transpired since the war began. But at the same time, I haven't seen a rush from the Iranian side either to get into a new, revised form of the MOU. In the beginning, it was because the MOU was already signed and should have been implemented. And then it's become, okay, well, that's been torn up by the United States. It feels like they're almost negotiating with mediators as a way to show the region that they're serious, but perhaps with the knowledge that the U.S. may not be serious about giving anything big.

And I think that point about something symbolic is important because I think it shows that the U.S. really doesn't have much of an appetite to give anything and needs something to make itself look good, especially with the way Trump does things. But my question to you is this: with what's been going on with these limited strikes, do you feel like this is also maybe preparing the way for something bigger? Trump recently told the media that they haven't even started yet with Iran, that the big ones haven't come. Do you believe that this may just be preparing the way anyway for a bigger kind of strike? And if so, you already said that the limitations are there. How big and extensive could it really be? And maybe that's also factoring into why Iran isn't rushing either. What are your thoughts on this?

#Trita Parsi

On the first one, yes, the Iranians are clearly not in a rush, but they've shown their willingness to negotiate. I mean, let's not belittle the fact that the Iranians sent their president and their foreign minister to the U.N. for the U.N. meeting in September. It's the first time ever that a president of a country that is actively at war with the United States has flown to New York to speak at the U.N. I think this really showed that, at the end of the day, despite the fact that the Iranians believe they have a tremendous amount of leverage and that their deterrence is very strong, they're nevertheless open to negotiating.

And as you said, I think this is a way for them to show their sincerity not only to the region, but also to their own population and, of course, to the global community. Because the global community, at the same time, is paying a price for this war, or for the strategy that Iran has used in this war, which is to push up oil prices and spread the cost of this war. Asia, in particular, is suffering tremendously. So if you're pursuing that strategy, which in their view was not only successful but something they had to do—they had to fight that way to be able to push back against the U.S.—then you also need to show your openness to ending the war in order to make sure that the anger in Asia and other places is not directed at Iran, but at Trump for having started this idiotic war in the first place.

Now, as to your question, what could they achieve in the next round? First of all, absolutely. There's still a significant risk that what we're seeing right now is just nothing. These are just, as they say, limited, targeted strikes, and something much, much bigger may very well end up being ordered by Trump. It would go beyond what we've seen in rounds one and two. I think here it's very important to understand the Israeli thinking, because there's a very high likelihood that, in that round, the Israelis will be back in the war. They were not in the war in the second round at the request of the United States, because the Israelis wanted to go much, much further.

They wanted to escalate dramatically. They wanted to hit civilian targets, critical infrastructure—things that are just, you know, just a list of war crimes. They wanted to do all of that. And Trump did not want to go that far, not necessarily because of a concern about war crimes, to the best of my knowledge, but because of a recognition of what the Iranian response would be in terms of destroying the energy infrastructure throughout the entire GCC. But if he now goes for a third round and he is trying to, as he says, "finish them off," "send them back 25 years," that's the language of the Israelis.

From the Israeli standpoint, the strategic objective is simply to inflict as much destruction as possible. The Israeli mindset is that they're never going to live in peace. They just need to make sure that none of their neighbors are strong enough to deter Israel. And once those neighbors get to a point where they're amassing some of that capacity, you go in, you bomb them, you set them back a couple of months, a couple of years, whatever it is. This is what they themselves have called "mowing the grass." Every once in a while, you just go in and you mow the grass. So, from the Israeli standpoint, when we see the images of Gaza, we see the destruction, right? We think of that as horrific.

We think of that as clear war crimes. For the Israelis, that is a picture of strategic victory. Benny Gantz, who is supposed to be more on the liberal or the left side of the Israeli political spectrum, had images in his campaign video of how much he had destroyed in Gaza. This was when he was running for prime minister—I think it was 2017 or 2016, or whatever, one of those years. And this is not Netanyahu. This is not Ben-Gvir. This is not one of these people. So that mindset is very much there. And if you listen carefully to what Trump is saying, he's echoing their lines: "I'm going to set them back 25 years. I'm going to set them back to the Stone Age."

Those are the things that the Israelis look at as a strategic victory. They set Iran back 25 years, in their view. They now have maneuverability in the region. They don't have to worry about Iran. Look what they did to Iraq. At the end of the day, it was a massive success from their standpoint. No one is worried about Iraq projecting force toward Israel or any U.S. ally any longer. And it will probably take another 20 years before Iraq has the capacity to do so. That's what they want. On top of that, Iraq is so weak that the Israelis built at least two military bases on Iraqi soil, either without the Iraqi government's knowledge or with its knowledge but without it being able to do anything about it.

And the Israelis used those bases to attack Iran during the previous war. Now, imagine how weak you have to be, how much you have to be set back, for the Israelis to be able to do this to you. That's what the Israelis want. And right now, it's the Israelis who are whispering in Trump's ear more than anyone else in favor of that war. So it's not the strategic calculation on the American side. I don't recall ever seeing an American president or military leader showing images of destruction in Mosul or anywhere else as a metric of success. But that is what the Israelis do, and that is now what Trump is doing as well.

#Danny

That's a really good point because, you know, I'm old enough to remember when the Iraq war and the Afghanistan war were happening. And usually, the metrics for success—even if I didn't agree with them, or a lot of people didn't agree with them, right, with this war on terror and all of this—were about who they were hitting. They would show exactly who they said they were hitting. Of course, sometimes it was actually civilians. But the metric for us was, "We're getting those guys." And this is definitely a lot different in the sense that, yeah, Israel certainly tells the world that destruction is the metric for success, whether it has razed Gaza or contributed to the damage in Iran or elsewhere.

#Trita Parsi

Well, what they're doing in southern Lebanon right now is making sure that these villages will not be habitable, that no one will live there for the next 10 or so years, because they've just completely destroyed them. I mean, these are just outright war crimes. It's an absolute disgrace in the West that this is not front-page news all the time and that governments are not constantly condemning

the Israelis for doing any of this. In fact, many countries in the West, such as Germany, are actively supporting the Israelis in all of this.

#Danny

When you look at the political dynamics since the Israeli election and now heading into the U.S. midterms, how do you see them affecting not just this war, but also the situation across the region? Because obviously, a lot has been made of the Israeli elections, and now the U.S. midterms are seen as a sea change. But do you view it that way? And if not, where might you differ?

#Trita Parsi

Look, I think it's very difficult to just dismiss this as if it's not extremely important. I think it is extremely important. I'm someone who has grown very skeptical about the American political system and lost a lot of faith in it. I used to organize seminars and workshops for the Iranian American community 20 years ago, teaching them about the civic system here, how to register to vote, and why it's important to participate in democracy. I have to say, I don't have the energy or the faith in it today to do anything like that. But at the same time, what we saw in these elections is very, very important, and it's mainly what happened on the right.

Because you saw here that an electorate that had, by and large, shown the characteristics of just being a cult and following Trump, whatever he did, had changed. Trump famously said, "I could shoot someone on Fifth Avenue, and my voters would still be with me." We have seen over time that certain principles have grown more important than just loyalty to Trump—more than anything else, the anti-war sentiment on the American right. And now we saw that manifest itself because, as Vance's tweet said, all the data shows that the Iran war and the cost of living that came out of it are the reasons why the Republicans lost. But it is not just that they lost.

This is not just what happened in 2024, when 7 million Democrats decided not to go out and vote. We're talking about people who voted Democrat in 2020 and then, in 2024, stayed home. Twenty-nine percent of them, the plurality, stayed home because of Gaza. The Republicans didn't stay home. They voted Democrat. They actively punished Trump for his lies about staying out of wars, his lies about Epstein, etc. This is very critical because it shows that the cult-like phenomenon that I personally believe did exist—but was never necessarily as strong as some people on the left may have thought it was—has actually changed. Now there were certain principles that were more important than just being aligned with or loyal to Trump.

That changes everything. Young Americans are not loyal to a party. They couldn't care less. And they're not even loyal to any politician. They're loyal to ideals and an agenda. This is very, very true among young people in this country. If we have a scenario over the course of several elections in which people are more than happy to go and punish politicians for having failed to live up to their promises or having betrayed those promises, it's going to be messy for a while. There are going to

be some crazy candidates who get elected. But over time, it will discipline the politicians and make them understand that they will get punished if they lie, if they betray their voters.

And it's not enough for them to rely on personal loyalty, loyalty to the party, or fear of the other side's candidate, as both the left and the right have so often done. I mean, remember what was being said on the left all the time: "You've got to vote; otherwise, Trump becomes president." Not that you yourself have an agenda, a vision, anything. Just be afraid of the other guy. It's the same thing the Republicans have done in Michigan, etc. If the American people reject that over the course of several elections, it will discipline politicians to recognize that they have to actually live up to their promises and not betray their voters. That gives me a sliver of hope.

#Danny

Yeah, me too, especially when we know figures like Marco Rubio, who we talked a little bit about before the show, are angling toward a presidential campaign. And I don't know if there's a more snake-like neocon than Marco Rubio in the political establishment. I know you have a hard stop, too, but any final comments before I let you go?

#Trita Parsi

It's just great to be with you, and I'd love to come back on. I love the conversation. For anyone who wants to follow me, they can go to the Quincy Institute's website, which is quincyinst.org, or they can follow me on Substack, which is very easy: tritaparsi.substack.com.

#Danny

Yes, and that will be in the video description below after this show, everybody, so you can check it out then. Well, Dr. Parsi, I appreciate it. Thank you. I'll be in touch. Take care.

#Trita Parsi

Thanks so much. Appreciate it. Have a good one.

#Danny

All right, everybody, we still have a big show to come, so do stick around. We are going to have KJ Ngo on the show in just a moment, once he comes backstage. So do stay here, especially if you're here for KJ. Hit that like button. Hit that subscribe button, because YouTube is peeling away subscribers. It's doing that thing it does where it says people are bots everywhere, and it essentially keeps subscriber counts frozen because it will literally remove people, whether they're actually bots or not. Bots do actually happen on YouTube, but at the end of the day, their AI editors are far from perfect, believe it or not. So everyone, hit the like button, and then subscribe if you have not

subscribed yet. Well, that was a great conversation. As we wait for KJ to come on, I'll just let you know about one update that should be noted.

I don't think I've noted it on my shows, but it is now fully clear that the USS Theodore Roosevelt is in port in Singapore right now. This is how grueling it is, and we've covered it on this program—how grueling it is for the U.S. Navy to be conducting operations against Iran like it has in the region. And so it has had to sail, you know, a thousand-plus kilometers. Now it's in Singapore, and it's going to head to the CENTCOM area of operations right after that. Could be any moment. And that means probably mid-November it'll be there. Some say, though—and I've been hearing this a lot, and I'm not so sold on it—that the United States Central Command is looking at Monday for a possible resumption of big strikes against Iran because of some new moon. Almost like this is Twilight, the movie, if you've ever watched those films. But I was dating someone at the—

#Danny

The new moon theory is that, oh, it's going to be very dark. And I just don't buy that that's when the United States is going to strike. I think they're trying to keep it intentionally unpredictable because, one, they don't want to actually foreshadow this, as much as everyone is trying to figure out when. And two, the limitations of what they can do, I still think, are causing logistical problems, which therefore lead to delays. And I think they're trying to get it just right, because I do believe the plan, from everything that we've heard and everything that we can see, is that they want some kind of three-day period of strikes, which will supposedly cause massive damage to, you know, Iran, but not enough damage to garner a massive response from Iran.

And I think, actually, what we're not hearing—and I can guarantee this is what's happening—is that through the mediators, they're trying to communicate that they would like this strike to be more symbolic. Maybe Iran is just being nice to the mediators right now. We already know that the United States went to the mediators or tried to call Iran directly and ask for a strike on Pickaxe Mountain without any retaliation. They would like it to be more about showing that the U.S. still has the ability to project force. And then they will stop for an extended period of time so that negotiations can actually take place.

And hell, maybe they're even sweetening the deal and saying, "Hey, if you let us do this, maybe we'll actually be serious at the negotiating table." Of course, this is so-called speculation. What we can really infer from here is the behavior of a very desperate empire. And so you can't take anything off the table. And we have to realize that there's a lot in store that we just don't know, and we won't know for a while. We're getting to KJ Noh now. He's an author, journalist, and activist, a geopolitical commentator and analyst. KJ, it's really good to see you. How are you? Good to see you, Danny. Yeah, yeah. It's been too long. Well, KJ, you know, we already spoke about Iran. You can make any comments you want about where we are in that situation.

But I also wanted to bring up something that nobody has really been covering, which is Joshua Wong and his role in the war against China. People may remember him from around 2019, when the United States was backing massive color revolution protests in Hong Kong in order to destabilize China, or at least as one part of that effort. Joshua Wong was a big part of that, and now he's been convicted of colluding with foreign powers and sentenced to 10 years in prison under Hong Kong's National Security Law. What are your thoughts on this, given that we're in a landscape where this kind of model for waging war has become, it seems, more abundant but also more difficult for the United States of late? And that has led us, I think, to more intense kinetic action, like against Iran. So what are your thoughts about this, and what is its significance?

#KJ Noh

Well, Danny, I think it's a bit of both. Where the U.S. can get away with a color revolution, it will. And we can talk more about that. You can clearly see color revolutions happening in other places. And then where it can't, it will use kinetic force. But always remember, these things go hand in hand. They're a form of hybrid warfare. The U.S. will swing back and forth between these two different tactics. Sometimes it will combine them. But in the case of Joshua Wong, he's probably the paradigmatic example of a useful idiot who has gotten his, you know, comeuppance. Essentially, he is going to be, you know, a middle-aged man by the time he gets out of prison. But from 2014 onwards—and I would say from 2010 onwards—he was groomed by Western powers and catapulted into a leadership role in a series of color revolutions that the United States was attempting in Hong Kong. And if you want, I can go back a little further into the history of Hong Kong.

#Danny

Yeah, sure, please, because I think it's all relevant. Oftentimes, we look at these issues, like Iran or the Middle East or anywhere else, and we don't really draw lessons or connect them. And I think Hong Kong's history is a really big example of how the hegemon works and how Western hegemony in general works. What's your take? Please help us understand how we got to this point.

#KJ Noh

Yeah. Well, I mean, it's a long history. It goes back over 150 years. But essentially, the Western powers, primarily the UK, started to use Hong Kong as a staging ground for drug trafficking. Why did they do this? Originally, they started trafficking opium. The Chinese had banned the trafficking of opium. The British refused all Chinese arguments and entreaties when the Chinese said, "You know, this is bad for our society. The things that we trade with you are good for your society: porcelain, tea, and silk. And what you're introducing into our country is absolutely noxious. Can you please stop doing this?" And the British refused. And so the Chinese confiscated British opium and burnt it.

And then the British used this as a basis to launch a war against China, which we now refer to as the Opium Wars. And as a result of China's loss in the Opium Wars, they had to give Hong Kong to the British. Hong Kong essentially became a trading port, or more accurately, it was a platform for trafficking opium into China. And then, for 156 years, the British controlled Hong Kong as a colonial outpost, as a colonial apartheid state, you know, where the British would reign like emperors and colonial masters, and the Chinese in Hong Kong were essentially dogs to the British. In fact, you know, there's the famous scene in a Bruce Lee movie where Bruce Lee kicks down a sign which says, "No Chinese or dogs in this park."

So that was how the British treated them. Essentially, it was a colonial outpost. It was a platform for drug trafficking. It made the British immensely wealthy. And that opium trafficking was also responsible for the rise of the great American Eastern opium oligarchy—you know, the Roosevelts, the Perkins, et cetera. Columbia, Princeton, you know, all these Ivy League schools were either built or developed with opium money. But anyway, the British had taken Hong Kong as a permanent colony, but they had expanded into what we refer to as the New Territories, which is the peninsula part extending onto Chinese territory. And they had leased this for 99 years. And that lease was set to expire in 1998.

#KJ Noh

And the British realized that if they lost the New Territories, then Hong Kong Island and the tiny bit of Kowloon would essentially not be able to sustain themselves. And so they went into negotiations with the Chinese and said, "Can you extend the lease on the New Territories?" And Deng Xiaoping essentially told the British—more accurately, Margaret Thatcher—to go F themselves. In fact, he literally spat into a spittoon when Margaret Thatcher offered to continue British control over Hong Kong. Now, at the time, the British really did not want to give up Hong Kong. It was this neoliberal paradise.

It was a colonial playpen. The British came and went and did whatever they wanted, and the Chinese were treated like dogs. For example, in the 1960s, when they protested, the British shot them dead in the streets. Over 30 Chinese protesters were shot dead. So the British, not wanting to give up this colonial playpen and this neoliberal no-man's-land, actually considered holding on to Hong Kong by force. Remember, in 1982, the British fought the Argentinians, and they held on to the Falkland Islands as a colony. And Margaret Thatcher originally spoke to her admirals and said, "Well, could we pull a Falklands here?"

And her admirals said to her directly, "Hong Kong is not the Falkland Islands, but more importantly, China is not Argentina." And specifically, the Falkland Islands are about 500 kilometers away from Argentina. And so the Falklands War was actually a naval and air battle. But Hong Kong Island, at its closest point to Kowloon on the Chinese mainland, is about 1,000 feet away. A bad swimmer could cross it doing the backstroke. I mean, it is that close. It would essentially be a land war. And they

told Margaret Thatcher, "You know, we cannot fight and hold Hong Kong. We would be committing suicide." And the Chinese actually wouldn't even have needed to fight.

All they would need to do is cut off the water and electricity, all of which comes from Chinese territory. And so Thatcher was finally forced into negotiations over Hong Kong. Deng Xiaoping agreed, you know, very graciously, to what was called "one country, two systems." That is, Hong Kong would reunify with China because it's always been part of China. And for 50 years, they would maintain the British system of governance—the "two systems" whereby the British structures would remain largely intact, including the British judiciary. And until very recently, Hong Kong still had British judges sitting on its courts. Right.

So that was the agreement, and Hong Kong was turned over in 1997. And then, from that point forward, it was a kind of nonstop process of attempting subversion and color revolution. And these attempts came to a head in 2014, when the Hong Kong legislature, the LegCo, attempted to implement universal suffrage for the election of the chief executive. And the color revolutionists opposed it to the max. Now, the thing to understand here is that for 156 years, Hong Kong had no democracy. It was a colonial apartheid state. You couldn't elect a dog catcher in Hong Kong because there were no elections.

The emperor of Hong Kong, the governor, was appointed by the queen of Britain. And so when these people claimed, as the protesters did at the time, "We want British democracy," or some version of that, you know it's a color revolution because of the inordinate cluelessness and the indoctrination of the people who are making that claim. But anyway, starting in 2014, there was what we call the Umbrella Revolution, and they occupied a key part of Hong Kong. It's like the Wall Street of Hong Kong, called Central, the Central Plaza. They held it. And then they, you know, carried out all kinds of movements and maneuvers and protests that eventually fizzled out.

And then it was rekindled in 2019 when the LegCo tried to implement an extradition law. Now, why was this extradition law brought to the table? A Hong Kong resident took his girlfriend to Taiwan. And in Taiwan, he killed her, cut her up into pieces, stole her credit cards, went on a shopping spree, and then came back to Hong Kong. And nothing could be done about him because the Hong Kong police did not have jurisdiction, because the crime was committed on Taiwan Island. And so the grieving mother of the victim asked the legislative body to pass a law allowing for extradition.

And prior to this, Hong Kong had almost no extradition laws whatsoever. It was kind of, as I said, like a no man's land for spooks and passport bros and businesspeople, et cetera. It was this kind of no man's land. And so they passed very, very carefully structured and worded legislation that would allow extradition of criminals in the case of non-political crimes—not political crimes, but purely criminal acts—where all the standard safeguards apply. That is, double criminality: it has to be a crime in both jurisdictions, et cetera, et cetera. The color revolution leaders took this as a pretext to demand the overthrow of the Hong Kong government.

And for over a year, they essentially waged a reign of terror, which is to say that not only did they, you know, hold civic spaces hostage, but they essentially destroyed the city. They smashed into the legislative building. They tore it up. They bricked people to death for daring to attempt to clear the roadblocks. They set a man on fire because he had chastised them for, you know, holding the city hostage. Of course, they destroyed stores. They burned stores. Anybody who was not supporting them, they would go in and dox them and burn them and destroy their stores and spray-paint their faces and beat them in the streets.

At one point, they hogtied a Chinese journalist and beat him for hours. And every time he would pass out from their beatings, they would pour water on him, revive him, and beat him again. And they televised this. It was a sheer reign of terror. And they literally terrorized the entire city, everybody in it. And of course, we also saw the Azov Brigade. The Ukrainian Nazis went there to lend their support. When they were starting this color revolution, they were showing "Ukraine on Fire," the kind of pro-Maidan film. And all of them were saying, "We want to be like Ukraine," which, ironically, turns out to be an incredibly stupid thing to say. But anyway, throughout all of this, starting around 2009, remember, Joshua Wong was the face of the Umbrella Movement in its early stages.

Because he was young and, you know, innocent-looking and clearly very gullible, they put him forth. He was on the cover of Time magazine twice. He was selected as one of the 100 important global thinkers, and I put "thinker" in scare quotes because clearly he wasn't thinking at all. But in 2009, he was involved once again as a kind of a fluffer for this brutal color revolution. And not only did he do that, but he actually went to Congress, to the U.S. Congress, and he lobbied for sanctions against China. And so later, when the Hong Kong riots were eventually dispersed and fizzled out, he attempted to get asylum in the United States. He tried to actually go into the U.S. consulate and get asylum, and he was actually denied.

So this is why I say it's an object lesson for every useful idiot, because you will be used and discarded. So anyway, as a result of that, first he was charged in Hong Kong with unlawful assembly. And then later he was charged with subversion, for which he was sentenced to four years. And then later, another charge was added, which was collusion with foreign forces. And this refers to when he went to Congress and literally lobbied them to sanction China. I mean, this would be criminal in any jurisdiction, in any place in the world. So anyway, he is in prison for a very, very long time. He'll be, I think, 40 when he comes out. But, of course, the U.S. and the Western mainstream propaganda press are saying, you know, once again, this is an example of human rights violations.

It's not. Anybody who did that in any country—in particular, going to a foreign legislature and asking them to bring down sanctions on your own country—would be committing a criminal act in any jurisdiction, in any country in the world. So all of this shows that, first, the U.S. grooms its color revolution leaders at a very, very early age. It will milk them for every piece of drama, including

after they are imprisoned or taken out of play. And it shows the kind of unrelenting hostility that the West, the U.S., and the U.K. still have toward China. They will milk anything to attempt to delegitimize China and the Chinese government.

#Danny

Yeah, very thorough, KJ, and really important for a lot of people who have come to this channel to follow the war in Iran. You know, looking at what happened in Iran before the February 28th strikes, during those three or so months when there were so-called protests—some people called them that, but they were really riots—I could see a lot of the same kinds of themes. Although, to be quite honest, it was far more violent in terms of what these forces were doing there in Iran during that—what was it?—roughly November, December, January period.

December 2025 and January 2026 were the height of it. So this model, KJ, is certainly one that, while incredibly important to the hybrid war on China, is seemingly part of the hybrid war in general for, I guess we call it the collective West when we look at the long history, but really with the U.S. now at the head of it. Joshua Wong—I mean, people may not remember this, but I believe it was in 2019—he visited Congress. He had a nice talk with Nancy Pelosi and Marco Rubio, got lots of photo ops. They put him in the chambers, celebrated the Hong Kong democracy protests, et cetera. So I see a lot of parallels here, but what are your thoughts on this?

#KJ Noh

Yeah, you're absolutely right. I mean, it's a kind of object lesson, not simply in how to avoid being used, but also in how color revolutions work. If you look at color revolutions, there's a very, very clear pattern. Let me just preface this by saying that color revolutions can be confusing because they're designed to confuse and mystify people. You know, they're engineered to look spontaneous and organic and indigenous and sovereign. And even the people directly involved may have really good intentions, and they may not realize that others are pulling strings. So they may be sincere and well-meaning, but the people behind the scenes are certainly not.

So you have to bring a certain kind of pattern recognition, and sometimes you need a little bit of distance in order to see what's actually happening. But there are a few earmarks that you can look for when you want to discern if something is a color revolution or not. The first thing to look at is when the protests start. You look at the triggering incident and you ask yourself: Are the demands related to the incident, or are they unrelated or all out of proportion? And also, is there continued escalation of demands? And what you saw, for example, in Hong Kong was this constant escalation of demands. They were all out of proportion to the extradition law.

The extradition law was actually withdrawn, and they continued to escalate their demands. They weren't concerned about the extradition law. It was a color revolution just looking for an excuse. And you saw the same thing with the Umbrella Revolution protests in the beginning. Like, originally,

Joshua Wong started out opposing high-speed rail. There was a high-speed rail line that was going to go from Guangzhou to Hong Kong, and he came out, you know, opposing that. You know, this is the high-speed rail that everybody wants and appreciates, but he started out opposing that. Of course, that didn't gain any traction.

And then they just kind of jump from one cause to another. So it's an agenda looking for a pretext. And we can see that generally in color revolutions. You can see the triggering incident, and then you can see that the demands are out of proportion. And then you can see that even if the demands are addressed, they still continue to escalate. Often they become very, very maximalist. And then, very often, simultaneously, you see a massive escalation to civil disruption, sometimes sabotage, insurrection, and violence. Clearly, as you saw in Hong Kong, massive terroristic violence.

But this is, you know, the key part of the color revolution playbook: you want that civil disruption because this sends two messages. One is that things are out of control. So if a government can't deliver the goods—that is, basic social order—then it has no business being in power. So that's the message. It's a message of delegitimation. And on the other hand, if the government reacts with a firm hand or overreacts, as the Western media will always portray it, then this overreaction is used as a cause for further protests. And then it's also used as a way of challenging the moral authority and legitimacy of the organization.

And the thing that you can also note is that when Western governments exercise extraordinary violence—for example, think of the Yellow Vest movement, where I think 11 people were killed and, you know, scores of people were blinded—that is never framed in the mainstream media as delegitimizing. The head-bashing and the head-cracking by Western European governments is just business as usual. Whereas if it's a country that has been targeted for a color revolution, then even the slightest reaction, even a sneeze from that government, is considered to be an authoritarian overreaction. And once again, you saw that in Hong Kong. But the idea is to create a legitimation crisis.

And then the third thing, which should be the most obvious thing, but sometimes people ignore this, is: Is there foreign interference or support? Clearly, in the case of Hong Kong, it was all over the place. Not simply media support, but there was massive, massive support from the U.S. government. They actually passed legislation supporting the protests and threatening China. So is there support from foreign governments? Is there support from NGOs? Is there funding from Western NGOs—the usual suspects: the NED, USAID, Soros, Ford, the Atlantis Foundation—or Western European governments? Once you see that funding, that is indubitable proof that this is very likely a color revolution.

And anybody who ignores that or tries to dismiss that, I think you need to view them with extraordinary suspicion because they're essentially covering up what is the smoking gun. And then the last thing you can note is that often these movements claim to be leaderless. So this is a very, very strong signal. Danny, you and I have done a lot of activism and movement work. And you and

I, we know there's no such thing as a leaderless movement, certainly nothing that's effective in taking power. But when they claim to be a leaderless movement, what that allows them to do is hide the real leaders. And these are the real leaders who are in Washington or Virginia. And it also avoids critical scrutiny of their background and agenda.

And then the last thing, you know, and this is also important, is that it gives a sense of empowerment to the protesters. It makes them think that they're driving their own agenda. You know, kind of the way that your dog thinks it's driving the car when you're driving. For example, in the original color revolution in Yugoslavia, Otpor claimed to be leaderless. But of course, we know that the leaders were in Washington. So this is another very, very strong signal: when they claim they're leaderless, that's usually a sign of a color revolution. And then one last thing is, you know, who's praising it or congratulating it?

You know, if you have Amy Goodman praising it, if Slavoj Žižek, the clown of imperialism, praises it, these are pretty good signals. And of course, if the MSM chorus, you know, chimes in, this is a pretty good signal of a color revolution. But you can note the lack of self-awareness, you know, the vacuous language, because it's all clever branding. It's just a lack of self-awareness, and essentially, you're being sold a product. So, for example—and I'm going to wade in where I shouldn't, but I think it's important for us—the recent electoral victory in Serbia of the student list has very, very strong signals of being a color revolution. So once again, let me go back over, you know, some of the patterns that you should be looking for. They claim to be a leaderless movement.

As we said, this is nonsense. And there's no such thing as a leaderless movement, at least one that's effective, right? You can be more or less horizontal, but there has to be coordination, division of labor, etc. All of these things are necessary. So that's the first signal. The second signal is the foreign interference. And Brian Berletic has done yeoman's work in showing the money trail. Follow the money. He's shown that they've been funded up to the wazoo. The media and the NGOs and the organization—they've all been funded up to the wazoo. And I would argue that anybody who wants to dismiss Brian's really, really diligent research on this is, you know, running a number on you.

So that's another strong signal. But in the foreign interference, you'll see funding, you'll see flak—that is, you'll see attacks against the opposition. You'll see fluffing. You'll see massive amounts of fibbing. And then you'll see a lot of fetishization, like, "Oh, you know, new, amazing student assemblies," like they haven't been tried before, like student assemblies are a new thing in the Balkans. They've been tried all over. You know, I'm sure you and I have both been part of student assemblies. And once again, student assemblies don't bring down a government unless there are other forces involved. So, yeah. Once again, look at the funding. Brian Berletic—go to his channel, look at his work.

I think he's demonstrated beyond a shadow of a reasonable doubt that Student List was funded to the tune of millions by the U.S. government and other usual suspects. And we have to understand: in transnational geopolitical subversion, there are no free lunches. Those who pay the bills set the

agenda. They will demand their pound of flesh. And people who argue, saying, “Oh, we took money from everybody. We set our own agenda. We're self-funded”—that's either naive or dishonest. Certainly, it shows a lack of self-awareness. So if you follow the money, you know whose agenda the movement serves. This is a U.S.-funded and fed color revolution, as far as I can tell, certainly as Brian has pointed out.

And then, you know, the last thing, as I said, is you have to look at the trigger, the cause-jumping, because usually there's a trigger and then there are pie-in-the-sky demands. And there's sometimes a kind of cause-jumping. So most people claim that the protests started with the collapse of the canopy at Novi Sad railway station. Sixteen people died. It really was a tragedy. But actually, it started earlier. It started with a mass school shooting. And school shootings are terrible. They're tragic. They happen all the time in the U.S. But in the U.S., when you have a school shooting, you don't usually hear a demand for the government to be brought down, because school shootings are hard to attribute directly to a government. No sane government encourages or uses school shootings.

But anyway, he was being crucified for the school shooting. And what they did was actually a model for how to prevent school shootings. They put in all kinds of policies, all kinds of safeguards, you know, massive efforts to prevent the circulation of weapons, etc. So there was a kind of model legislation that was implemented to prevent further school shootings. And there has never been a school shooting since then. But first they accused him of being responsible for the school shooting. He wasn't because, as I said, these things are not policy. But the government at the time took responsible action and implemented model legislation.

And another thing that he did was release information on the shooter. And he was crucified for releasing information on the shooter. The shooter was a minor, 13 years old. Now, if he hadn't released that information, of course, there would have been allegations of a cover-up. But because he released it, he was then charged with releasing confidential information. So you can see there's no way he could have won here, and it just continued to escalate. And then Novi Sad happened. And then you saw the standard color revolution playbook kick into place: you know, massive civil disruption, blocking of streets, you know, massive threats, violence, the media fluffing, and also the continually escalating demands. As far as we can tell, the Novi Sad train station canopy collapsed because it was old.

Now, we don't know how thorough the inspections were, but the people who were responsible were fired and punished, and the Minister of Construction resigned. But as I said, the trigger is just a pretext. And so they never accepted this. They said, "Release all the documents." Vucic released every single document and put them online. They were available for everybody to see, and they just would not give up. And there was a continual demand for him to resign. So this is, you know, one of the early patterns to note: when you see the jumping from cause to cause, you're looking for a pretext, you're twisting and milking it, jumping to the next, and then you're constantly escalating demands.

So the demands transitioned to a demand for a scalp. Now, he did not know what was going on with a concrete canopy, but this was the way that it escalated. And, of course, the larger picture of this—and I think this is really important—is that Serbia really is a long-suffering state, and the people have suffered greatly, in extraordinary ways. And they've suffered since the breakup of Yugoslavia. Essentially, Yugoslavia was a holdout after the fall of the Soviet Union, when all the Eastern European states, you know, became liberal, capitalist Western countries. Yugoslavia held out, and it tried to hold out as a socialist country. And because of that, it was broken up.

This is literally where we get the word "balkanized," you know. And so it was fractured. It was fractured along ethnic lines. Specifically, an enclave was carved out called Kosovo. And then Serbia was bombed for 78 days on a pretext, essentially because they wanted to destroy the government and take down Milosevic, who was still trying to hold on to some notion of Serbia as, you know, a multi-ethnic socialist state. All of this is an oversimplification. It's much, much more complex, but we know that Serbia was in NATO's crosshairs right from the beginning. And so then they had a color revolution, you know, led through Otpor. And that was supposed to deliver everything.

That is to say, NATO integration, EU integration, neoliberal austerity and reform, as well as the recognition of Kosovo as an autonomous state. These things didn't quite work out. And Vučić took back power, and he was balancing against Europe, the EU, while still maintaining good relations with Russia and, most importantly, with China. In fact, he was bringing the Belt and Road to Serbia. And that's when the daggers came out. And that's when the color revolution project started. You could see that this was a revolution looking for a pretext. And they have been successful. But I refer to this as the sweet bread revolution. I don't know. Have you ever had sweet bread, Danny?

#Danny

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

#KJ Noh

Okay. So we know that sweetbread is not sweet, right?

#Danny

Yeah.

#KJ Noh

And it's not bread, right? And there is some stuff that, if you knew what you were getting into, you might reconsider. It's essentially the glands that discharge stuff in a cow. That's what it is. But anyway, the student list has no students. There are no students on the student list. It's essentially a kind of black-box cover. And it's like sweetbread. It's neither sweet nor bread. The student list isn't

students. And essentially, they're probably going to carry out the US/EU Western agenda that Vučić had, for a decade and a half, managed to forestall or balance or play off, etc. Essentially, this is a lynching of Vučić. And I fear—and I say this with all sincerity, because, once again, Serbians have been a long-suffering people.

But I see this as really, you know, kind of a bad turn. We won't know until a few months later what the actual composition of the government will be, who will be put forth as a candidate. But I'm very, very concerned. But all of this is to say, this fits a pretty standard pattern of color revolution: the trigger, the funding, the foreign fluffing, the violence, the leaderlessness, you know, the support. All of these things signal that this is very, very much a Western operation. And of course, there are people muddying the waters. You know, they say things like, "Well, you know, Vučić was sending arms to Ukraine." He wasn't. He was selling arms to other countries, and those countries may have shuffled them into Ukraine.

But there is no direct, you know, transfer of arms to Ukraine. Why? Because, you know, Vučić valued his relations with Russia. As I said, he was balancing relations with Russia and China while still trying to keep the EU at bay. So anyway, all of this is to say it's a complex picture. But I think it's important for us to really bring a critical eye and an awareness of patterns to recognizing color revolutions, because this is not the first one, and it's not going to be the last one. And also to understand this continual escalation towards hybrid war and the continual hostility of the U.S. and the EU against any country that holds out against their hegemony and refuses total and complete submission to their agenda.

#Danny

Yeah, definitely. And, you know, KJ, as we head to the end here, I think one really interesting thing about color revolutions is that you named all these factors we can look for to identify them, so we can actually distinguish between a legitimate people's protest or social movement, et cetera, and an agent of regime change, of U.S.-led hybrid warfare. One thing that I've always noticed—you used the specific example of Joshua Wong with the high-speed rail—is that there are almost always two things you can tell by what these color revolutionists supposedly want. Either they actually want something quite reactionary.

Like, they want to stop investment. They'll claim it's like a Communist Party plot, in terms of China, or they'll claim it's Russia, right? Russia is coming in—and they did that during Maidan, right? Russia's coming in and ruining Ukraine, blah, blah, blah. Or they'll, you know, advocate for very vague kinds of demands, even if they're economic in nature. They won't actually say anything. It's not like in France, where the protesters will literally tell you, "They're cutting education. We need money in this part of education. We need heat in our schools," this kind of thing.

No, they'll say, "Oh, it's corruption." They won't say, "Oh, well, we want to take care of these corrupt officials like China does. We want to make sure the economy works for people, so we need to get rid

of corrupt leaders." No, they just say, "Corruption. It's all corruption. It's the whole government that's corrupt." But they won't say what, why, or how. Or they'll say, "Oh, well, the economy is so bad." But they usually come from countries that are being sanctioned by the very powers that are supporting them, and they don't have any problems with those powers—like what we saw with the so-called rioters in Iran.

It began with, "Oh, the economy is not doing well." And then you come to find out that they're burning markets and attacking public security personnel, not even police. They're killing them in cold blood. So you end up seeing this kind of dichotomy, these very contradictory ways of framing even just the demands, which, you know, seem like they're being written by people who are not actually interested in real, substantive change. They're trying to find ways to make us believe that they are, while staying really in line with those forces that are backing them. Your final thoughts as we close out here?

#KJ Noh

Yeah, if I may use an analogy, Danny, it's like, you know, when one person in a relationship has decided that they're going to break up. There'll be one party who's always finding fault, and it's not about anything that's actually being done. Essentially, that relationship is destroyed. That's what they're acting on. So the demands will be non-actionable, or they will be vague. Or even if they're actionable demands, once those demands are met, they will continue—for example, in the Hong Kong anti-extradition riots, when the extradition law was withdrawn.

And there'll be a continuous escalation of demands that are all out of proportion. They're maximalist demands, at the same time that they're tremendously vague. And this is an early signal that you are in the throes of a color revolution. Generally, when people make demands and those demands are met, then usually, you know, there's some kind of meeting of minds. But here, there's no desire for any accommodation. The idea is to overthrow. And so that's how you can tell. So you're absolutely right, Danny. Look at the demands, look at the trigger, and look at how they relate to each other.

Look at the foreign fluffing and funding. Look at the demands. Look at the lack of self-awareness. All of these things are strong signals, and I think it's something that we need to be aware of, especially those of us who do alternative media. People can very easily be swept along because it looks good. You know, they're designed to look good. They're designed to be attractive. They are marketed campaigns. But we have to go deeper than that, look below the surface, and also bring critical pattern recognition to these types of situations. Otherwise, we are, pardon my French, screwed.

#Danny

Yeah, it's a really big problem too because, you know, you talk about psychological operations. It also serves as that when we're constantly being told by our very own, dare I say, enemy class that this or that force is doing something very noble and aligned with what we all believe in, when, in

fact, that's not what they're doing at all. It reminds me, too, of all the ways in which, during the later stages of the Cold War, the United States CIA would study people's revolutions in Nicaragua, et cetera. And they wrote whole manuals about how to try to emulate that.

But with mercenaries who would then do really horrible things to people, they would try to build up popular support through terror by emulating certain tactics. And I feel like that's what's happening in color revolutions. There's an emulation of tactics that, of course, people are going to use when they're hungry, poor, oppressed, you know, finding their living standards declining elsewhere. But they're going to try to use those kinds of tactics for different ends in places where the U.S. and the West, of course, have a deep interest in destabilization. And that's what makes it so tricky.

And we've even seen this in the last couple of decades. I think Libya and Syria were huge watershed moments for this because they started out supposedly as color revolutions. But truthfully, they had to move very fast to a very violent, kinetic kind of proxy war because it turns out that when you try to do that with governments that maybe aren't doing a lot of the things that you're saying they're doing, the revolution side doesn't work that long. You know, you've got to turn to violence. You have to bring the pain. So, KJ, this is a great show. Any final words before we head out?

#KJ Noh

Yeah, you want to turn violent before those needs are met or before people come to their senses. But once again, you know, we have to follow the money, look at the funding, look at the fluffing. And if you follow those threads, I think that usually gives us a pretty good sense of what's going on.

#Danny

Definitely. KJ, this is a great program. I want to make sure everybody hits the like button before they go because that helps boost the show in YouTube's algorithm. I also want to let people know that they should subscribe to the channel. Around this season, actually, YouTube gets quite handsy with its AI bot recognition tools and will literally take real people off the subscriber rolls. So check your subscription. Make sure that you are subscribed here if you've chosen to do so. I want to thank everyone who gave a Super Chat or became a new member here at CBR. Thank you, Farzana Neen, Carlos, and Angelo. Appreciate your support. Again, hit the like button, everyone. I'll be back tomorrow with Professor Seyed Mohammad Marandi at 1 p.m. Eastern time. Yes, 1 p.m. Eastern time, November 8th. And I'll see you then. Everyone, thank KJ by giving the show a big like, and see you tomorrow. Bye-bye.