

Paul Craig Roberts: Trump's America at War: A Carbon Copy of Crumbling Israeli Plans

Follow me: Substack: [https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?](https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page)

utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page X (Twitter): https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA

Patreon: [https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?](https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=)

utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=

#Nima

Hi, everybody. Today is Monday, May 4th, 2026, and our dear friend Paul Craig Roberts is here with us. Welcome back, Paul.

#Paul

Thank you, Nima.

#Nima

And let me start, Paul, with what Donald Trump announced yesterday and what the outcome of that was. He announced yesterday the Project Freedom, that he's going to open up this Strait of Formosa, and everybody's going to be able to pass through this strait. And today what we've learned, we ended up with these two lines, these two yellow lines defined by the IRGC in Iran. Wow. You know, it goes from the eastern part to the western part. And the eastern part goes to these two important ports in the UAE, Fujairah and the other one, Khor Fakkan. These two ports right on the downside of the, you know, the right side—the yellow line on the right side of the map—you see right below that line, you see the two important ports in the UAE being influenced.

And right now they're continuing to control all this area. And the main objective is that nobody is going to use the Strait of Hormuz to export oil. It doesn't matter if it's in the Strait of Hormuz or outside of that, they're not going to be able to send it because the UAE got out of OPEC and OAPEC, which is, you know, the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries. And they're getting out of the GCC countries. And so today there was some sort of chaos because the United States was trying—today, you know, early morning we learned that the U.S. destroyer tried to pass through the Strait of Hormuz. It was hit—you know, two ballistic missiles were fired at the destroyer.

The destroyer decided to get back to its foothold, its position before. Then nobody was able to pass through the Strait of Hormuz. Look at Fox News—they're talking about two U.S. ships that were able to pass through on the part of Iran, and they're saying nobody was passing through the Strait of Hormuz. That's just making... And the other point was reported on Fox News, and, you know, CENTCOM reported that they had hit six or seven speedboats in the Strait of Hormuz. Iranians denied that. Nothing of that sort had happened, it seems. But after all, looking at what Donald Trump is trying to do, what is your understanding of that?

#Paul

It's blustering. I think he's, you know, he's in a pickle. We know he's in a pickle. And he's trying to hide the fact he's in a pickle and that he is still in control, that he's the dominant figure in all of this. This is why we keep hearing that Iran is completely devastated, has no navy, no air force, no missiles, and so on and so on. So I think that's how we understand it. He's trying to hold that part of his constituency who's in favor of the war on Iran, the people who have bought into the neoconservative argument, such as the one presented by his former national security advisor, John Bolton, that Iran is a terrorist state and a threat to the security of the United States, which is nonsense.

And he's trying to hold on to these people by showing he is still the dominant figure and that he is sort of holding his patience down with Iran, to give them a chance to see reason before he finishes off their destruction. So that's my reading of the situation. I agree with Iran that they control that area and no ship can move through there unless the Iranians permit it. I don't know why Trump chooses to base his position on what knowledgeable people know to be an impossibility—that the American ships, the American Navy, can transit the Strait securely. That's not possible. So that's my take on it, Nima.

#Nima

The only tanker, by the way, that could pass through the Strait of Hormuz today was a sanctioned Iranian LPG tanker, which was passing through the Strait of Hormuz, just passing through the blockade of the United States. That was the only tanker today passing through. And the other point, Paul, is that the Fujairah port in the UAE is on fire, as we talked about, because they got hit by some sort of drone or missile. And how do you see the UAE? Because they were feeling that if they got out of OPEC, if they got out of OAPEC, as they have it in the GCC, among GCC countries, they were going to be able to improve their situation with their economy. But it seems that the situation is getting worse. Iran is not backing down. Today, Iran hit the UAE. It shows the fragility of their position right now. And how do you understand that?

#Paul

Well, I don't know why they pulled out of OPEC. One might think it was so they could sell more oil than OPEC, but it turns out that the OPEC countries have increased their output, at least according to news reports. You never know what's true.

#Nima

They did. A little bit, not that much.

#Paul

So I don't understand it at all. I really don't understand the existence of these little city-states sitting on a pool of oil. I don't know why the Saudi Arabians haven't taken them over. I don't know why the Iranians haven't taken them over a long time ago. I suppose because the Americans took them over and turned them into naval and air bases. Now that these Gulf oil sheikdoms have learned they're not secure anymore, that America has failed to protect them, I don't know that they won't make some major readjustment in how they relate to the world.

They may decide to try to become a part of Saudi Arabia or even Iran. I have no idea, but I would say that most likely these oil sheikdoms in the Gulf are thinking about the situation, you know, but they accepted American naval and air bases thinking this was security, and now they find these bases can't protect them, and they are in a losing situation. So unless Trump and Israel, by some means, can take control and become dominant, which I doubt, these countries are likely to realign in some way. I don't see how they would stay in the vulnerable position that they're in.

#Nima

Here is what Scott Besant said about the Strait of Hormuz fault.

#Speaker 03

The Iranians do not have control of the Strait. We have absolute control of the Strait. We have blockaded the ships going into or out of Iranian ports. Their economy is in free fall. And everyone says they have a high tolerance for pain. Well, their soldiers will not have a high tolerance for not getting paid.

#Nima

What is he trying to do, Paul? Because in the other interview he had, he was comparing the IRGC to Baghdad Bob. Baghdad Bob was the guy who was claiming that nothing was happening. The tanks were, you know, in the background, moving, and it's in Iraq. And right now, who's the Baghdad Bob? He's trying to say everything. You know, he says that the United States has full control of the Strait of Hormuz. How is that going to help him?

#Paul

Well, you see, I think he's trying to cover up the fact that the United States was defeated and doesn't know what to do and can't find any way out that it can say is a victory. So he asserts things that everyone knows are false. We have zero control of the Strait. And, you know, intercepting ships on the high seas is not controlling the Strait. And so what he's trying to say is our pirate activities, in total violation of all known law, international and so on, on the high seas, is controlling the Strait. Well, it's not. And also, as I have said before, and I believe, Iran doesn't need oil revenues to fight the war. And the real question is, what can it do with the oil revenues when it has so many sanctions? It can't buy weapons from Europe or the United States.

What's it going to do with this oil revenue? He says they're going to use it to pay. They don't have it to pay their troops, and so the troops are going to cease fighting for Iran. Well, this is nonsensical. If Iran sells its oil, it gets some foreign currency. What currency? Well, apparently they're not allowed to get dollars, so they get Chinese currency. What do they get? Indian currency, you know, whatever they get. Well, what do they do with it? They can't spend Chinese currency inside Iran. They can't pay the soldiers with Chinese currency or Indian currency or Sri Lankan currency. So what do they do with it? If anything, it goes in the central bank reserves. What do they pay the troops with? Iranian money. They control Iranian money.

The central bank can create as much Iranian money as they need to pay the troops. The fact that the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States doesn't know this—this is a level of stupidity that I can't imagine. When I was in the Treasury, nobody was that stupid. Certainly not Don Regan, the Secretary. So I don't know what to make of statements that are totally nonsensical. And what you just showed the American Treasury Secretary saying is just nonsensical. How do you discuss things that are nonsensical? You can't. So I come back to my point, Nima. He is blustering nonsense to cover up the fact that we've been defeated in our purpose, and we know we can't improve on our effort. And so they're going to have to dress up a win so they can pull out.

So I think that's basically what's going on. And, you know, the kinds of Americans that are super patriots, they always believe we have enemies. Everybody's our enemy. They're always trying to get us. We always have to fight them. And we always win. We always defeat them. We defeated Gaddafi and Saddam Hussein and Assad. We're going to defeat Putin. And they believe this. And so they fall for this type of cover-up because they really can't accept that we were defeated. The same people still say, well, we could have won in Vietnam, but we just weren't allowed to fight. You know, this sort of thing. There's always an American market for the kind of nonsense that the Treasury Secretary was spewing out of his mouth.

#Nima

Paul, you mentioned Vladimir Putin again and then Iran. The United States in the last five years tried to manipulate Ukraine, then tried to manipulate the Middle East. They're fighting right now basically

two of the most important countries in BRICS, Russia and Iran. And these two countries are not simple. Russia is a superpower. Iran is a regional and very strong power in West Asia. At least they know how to defend themselves. And Russia is the same way. They have learned a lot during the war in Ukraine. And the United States is not giving up on these two wars. We haven't seen any sort of sign from the administration that they're willing to do that.

And how far they would go, and how would they believe that they can bring these two countries down, when they know as they go, as they continue and double down with this sort of attitude, they're going to unify the whole world—BRICS and all these BRICS countries. I'm specifically talking about Russia, China, and Iran, because China—I don't know if you know this—just yesterday, China announced that they're not going to follow. They told their refineries, you can work with Iranians, ignoring what the United States is talking about in terms of sanctions, all of that. This is a new sort of world that is shaping up before the eyes of the Biden administration. That's right.

#Paul

That's right. Netanyahu, the Israeli prime minister, sold the American president a bag of goods: attack Iran, they'll collapse in three days. And, of course, this was nonsensical. I don't understand even now why the United States military, the CIA, the National Security Council allowed Trump to act on such a preposterous proposal. I suppose they're all afraid for their jobs and afraid to say anything because then Trump will call them treasonous and fire them. So they're stuck with a president that can't listen to good advice and was taken in by Netanyahu, and now he's in a trap.

Well, the Russian situation, you know, I'm a critic of the way Putin has conducted the war because I believe not ending it quickly allowed the West to get more and more involved, and the war has expanded and expanded. And now we have a situation where we have reports that Europe is planning for war with Russia in four years. Well, you can't imagine a worse outcome of a war that Putin could have quickly ended. And if the outcome is going to be he's going to end up at war with all of Europe, this is not a good way to conduct a war.

#Paul

Now, why did Putin conduct the war that way?

#Paul

There are different explanations. My explanation has been that he wanted the war for negotiations. But what he wanted to negotiate was not the end of the war. That's not what was important to him. He wanted to negotiate a mutual security treaty between Russia and the West that would end the conflict and get NATO off of Russia's borders, end the whole regime of sanctions, and let business between Russia, Europe, and the United States start up again and get back to normal. So Putin's goal is a very large strategic goal. I think it's unrealistic because he doesn't understand the American

neoconservatives' dedication to American hegemony. They see Russia as a barrier to American hegemony, which is still the declared purpose of American foreign policy.

No one has repudiated the Wolfowitz Doctrine. Paul Wolfowitz wrote this doctrine in 1991. It had some revisions, but certainly it was in place by 1992. So you see, it's quite an old, established doctrine, and no one has repudiated it in the government. I mean, I do, but I'm not in the government and can't do anything about it. So if you have this doctrine, then Putin's goal is unrealistic. It's a good goal. It shows he has a very big strategic outlook, but it's unrealistic. He doesn't understand that it's not something he can negotiate with Washington because they're committed to hegemony. And this is the same thing we've talked about. This has been the trouble with all the Middle Eastern countries.

The reason they've been knocked off one by one by one is because of Israel and the U.S. They don't understand that the Zionist goal of Greater Israel means there can be no sovereign Arab or Muslim country in the Middle East. Israel claims all of it, and they hold up maps showing that. You know, the Israeli prime ministers hold up maps showing Greater Israel. It includes all these independent countries that have been there for a long time, particularly Iran. You know, Iran is one of the oldest of the national countries that there are. So, when you have that situation where there are goals in place that are unrealistic because they're unrealizable, but the people pushing them don't understand that.

And the people who are the intended victims of the hegemonic policies of the United States and Israel, they don't understand that it means their termination. They go try to have negotiations. Well, you can't. So I think that's the real problem. It's the real problem, and it's why all this craziness continues. In my view, what remains of the Middle East, or what they now call West Asia, what remains should have a conference, and they should say, look, we've got this problem of the Zionist agenda of Greater Israel. It means we can't exist. They're after us. They've already said Turkey's the next Iran. They've already claimed Saudi Arabia as part of Greater Israel. They're now attacking Iran and Lebanon. So what are we going to do about this?

We've got to realize that this is the problem. It's really not even Trump or the Americans that's the problem. The United States is Israel's proxy in the war against the Muslims, just as Ukraine is America's proxy in the war against Russia. Well, Putin needs to understand that the foreign policy of the United States makes no room for a Russian government that's sovereign. It can't be sovereign. It can exist, but only under the American umbrella. And that's what Greater Israel means. The Middle East can exist under Israeli rule. And so we don't have Putin understanding that. We don't have Iran understanding it. Saudi Arabia, Turkey. Iraq didn't understand it. Syria, Lebanon. And they're gone because they don't understand it.

And you can't get any real discussion about this, certainly not in the American foreign policy community. They have no awareness of anything that matters. And the officials in the Trump administration, they clearly have no awareness. The statement you just showed of the Treasury

Secretary—this is nonsense. It's incomprehensible that a Treasury Secretary could say such balderdash. And so I think the fact that the balderdash is so prevalent and the blustering is so prevalent, it shows the frustration that the Trump administration is in. Now you've got them into a war. They can't get out of it. There's nothing else they can do except use nuclear weapons, which I think they know would be deadly for them as well because, you know, the prohibition on using those weapons is strong.

And if the United States lets that genie out of the bottle, it's let it out in a way that's going to come home eventually to the United States. So I don't think the threat of nuclear weapons is very real, particularly since this is a war of choice. It's not like Iran attacked and has the United States and Israel by the throat. Iran was a country that was attacked, and all it's done is respond. And as you know, I'm critical of the way Iran has fought. Just when they were winning, they quit and accepted a ceasefire. They should have gone on and won, and the whole thing then would have probably changed the government in Israel. And they may have been able to get a government that would agree to abandon the Zionist agenda of Greater Israel.

Well, I think Iran's lost that opportunity. So you can see my position comes from the fact that we have two unrealities here. Greater Israel—the whole thing is impossible. The area is too big for a tiny state with 7 million Jews. It can't possibly. And then the American claim that they have hegemony over the world—well, this is a joke. They have hegemony over Russia and China and India? It's not. It's inconceivable. So these agendas are so unrealistic, and they get people in trouble. And no one, even the ones suffering, like the Russians and the Iranians, they don't understand the agenda that's operating. And so they always talk about negotiations. But how do you negotiate?

The agenda is you don't have a right to be a sovereign state. How do you negotiate that? You can't negotiate that. And so no one acts in a realistic way. And it's this lack of realism across the board by all of the participants that makes the situation dangerous. So, you know, I've expressed these views on your show, and I kept hoping they would find their way into a more general discussion. And then the policymakers would start to see that this is not a dead end. It's a path to a big war. And that will be the nuclear war. And that's the thing we don't need for sure. I mean, nobody benefits. So thank you for asking me these questions again and giving me the opportunity to present my take on it. But that's it.

#Nima

Paul, today one of the UAE officials said that the Islamic regime in Iran will regret May 4th, the day that the port was hit by a missile or a drone—May 4th, 2026—just as Hamas did after October 7th. That's a promise. Do you think those people—I don't see anybody panicking or being intimidated by this sort of argument on the part of, you know, Emirati officials—but do they really care? Do you see anybody caring about the fate of the UAE being sacrificed through this process of defeating Iran, being sacrificed, totally destroyed?

#Paul

Most likely, what is going on there is some official who banked on American protection. It's not there. He's frustrated. He doesn't know what to do, and so he screams out in defiance a threat that's unenforceable. He can't possibly, that place can't possibly present any kind of threat to Iran. And if the American bases along the Persian Gulf are so damaged, they're not likely to be put back in operation. Then this particular person you quoted is in a bad situation because they're going to have to make an accommodation with Iran, and yet here he is threatening them. So he's making himself vulnerable, not Iran.

#Nima

Yeah. Paul, do you see Donald Trump going to China on May 15th with the current situation?

#Paul

I don't know. No. If I were the Chinese leader, I would cancel the invitation. It would be a humiliating blow to the Americans and would underline the humiliation they've suffered with this stupid attack on Iran. I don't see anything China has to gain from this. Trump will make a lot of propaganda about how they beg this, they beg that, and they're eating out of his hand, and he'll use it to embarrass the Chinese, most likely. I mean, maybe not, but the bombastic way he is, always trying to look like he's the one in control, he's most likely to post things that imply that, you see, we are still the greatest, even China succumbs. So I don't know what the point of this is supposed to be. China has many advantages that they could explore over the United States. If they blockaded Taiwan, there wouldn't be any more chips available.

Imagine what that would do to all of the artificial intelligence companies in the United States. I mean, they can stop sending any rare earths. They have all kinds of things they can do that don't involve any conflict. They're no different from the sanctions we put on people. So if our sanctions haven't caused wars, then the Chinese can sanction us without causing wars. And the Chinese sanctions would actually work. They would devastate the high-tech operations in the United States and bring us to our knees fairly quickly. But the Chinese seem to choose a path of never using their force or their power and just kind of waiting everything out, expecting their opponents to destroy themselves. So it may well be that China just doesn't want a ruckus and will have this meeting. Because I don't think China is really in the mode of combating the United States with propaganda advantages, propaganda upsets.

Like, it would be an upset if he said, we think that Trump is unreliable and treacherous and has attacked Iran twice while he's holding peace negotiations, and we just don't want to deal with him, and he's not welcome. Well, this would be a very forceful thing in the world. It really would be. It would actually, I think, have a great effect in promoting peace because a lot of countries would then

be less supportive of American militarism. But I don't think they'll do that, so I don't expect it to mean anything or that anything real will come out of it. Trump will probably bluster, and the Chinese will have simply sat through another event without taking advantage of it. Because if you take advantage of it, then you come in conflict with the opponent, and they don't want to be in conflict.

#Paul

So that's my take on it.

#Paul

I don't think any of these meetings ever mean anything, because the meetings don't relate to reality.

#Nima

Like Alaska?

#Paul

Like Alaska, yeah. Whatever came out of that? Nothing. I can't even remember now how long ago that was. And, you know, all of those Russian negotiations that happened have turned into deals between the Russian guy, Dmitriev, who represents the oligarchs, and Kushner and Witkoff, who represent American business, and they're conducting negotiations in order to make business contacts. They don't talk about the war or Putin's goal of a mutual security agreement. You know, the Russians — it was some years ago I was invited to Moscow to speak at a conference of the Russian Academy of Sciences on "Can there be a new Yalta?" And what they meant was the agreement of Stalin and Roosevelt and Churchill, which sort of divided up the world between them. And they wanted this Yalta thing renewed. And I told them, I said, look, you can't get that as long as the Wolfowitz Doctrine is the American foreign policy, because it says that the United States claims hegemony over the world. So we're not going to give you part of it.

#Paul

And they simply got mad.

#Paul

because it broke up their delusions, their illusions, their hopes. And they couldn't confront facts. I said, look, go look up the Wolfowitz Doctrine. It's a fable. It's United States foreign policy. You can see what it is. And they just wouldn't. No, we're not going to acknowledge that. That hurts our hopes. It ruins our delusions.

#Paul

Well, this is the way.

#Paul

Now, look, if the Russians can't get beyond that, how is anybody else? I mean, they're not stupid people, you know. They're highly educated. They have a great educational system. But if they can't face reality because it's just too much against their hopes, what's anybody else going to do?

#Nima

Paul, when you talk about the Wolfowitz Doctrine, we know what was the outcome of the British Empire. The British Empire, the situation that we are living in right now, mostly in Eurasia with the case of Ukraine, coming to the case of the Middle East — basically all these GCC countries were created by the British Empire. So you don't have any sort of regional power or superpower in that region. So the outcome, when I look at the British Empire and I see the Wolfowitz Doctrine being somehow extracted from the British Empire, I see when they're talking about no superpower, no regional power, it's going to be divide and conquer. It's going to make little states that are not able to defend themselves. So it's basically the same sort of idea. Isn't that the case?

#Paul

Well, the intention of the neoconservatives was to break— you know, they broke up the Soviet Union. You know, Russia has lost the vast territories of Central Asia — Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Georgia.

#Paul

All of this was part of Russia.

#Paul

And then they lost Ukraine, the Baltics, Belarus. You know, Belarus is now sort of in a unity with them, but it's a separate country. These were all just Russian provinces. So the collapse of the Soviet Union let the Americans cut the size of what was Russia and the Soviet Union in half. And now they think they can continue because the Russian Federation is made up of different kinds of ethnicities. And there's a huge Muslim element involved. And so the neoconservatives think that they can destabilize the Russian government and further dismember the Russian Federation.

And it will be a collection of smaller states, and they won't be capable of having any sort of national or even regional power. So what you're saying is true. Now, I don't know that this was the specific

intentional policy of the British government, or it was just something that happened, because the rule of India — that was a private company. And it was, I don't know, it may have been a couple of centuries before the British government took over the rule. India was being ruled by the trading company that went there. And the same for much of Africa. You know, it was Cecil Rhodes that was ruling Rhodesia, not the British government.

And so, and of course, the Middle East, after World War I, because Turkey lost — they were on the German side and they lost — and so they lost their control of the Middle East, and the British and French got it and they divided it up. And they drew the boundaries of the countries in a way that made sure there were enough Shiites and Sunnis in a state that it would be disunited and easier for them to rule. And these things have happened. And you're right that this was, or is, an intention of the neoconservatives. And maybe they realize now that it was unrealistic. I don't know. Or they may still think they can break up the Russian Federation.

Indeed, there's internal opposition now to Putin that's never been there because of the high interest rates. You know, he protects this central bank director that's got 18, 19, 20% interest rates. Well, this is killing the economy. It's killing jobs. It's killing living standards. And at the same time, he's conducting a war that's now in its fifth year, which is inexcusable. They could have won this thing in a couple of weeks. He could end it tomorrow just by using force. But he refuses. Like I said, his goal, in my view, is to keep the war alive because he's hoping to use negotiations to get a mutual security agreement, not to end the war.

He doesn't care about the war. He has a bigger plan. Well, this is starting to cause problems. Putin's approval rating dropped 10 points. His party's approval rating dropped 10 points. It's now, according to news reports, on an equal standing with the Communist Party. Well, they could lose the Duma elections this September, I think it is, or sometime this fall. And the way the Russian system works, the party that wins gets to appoint the ministries. That won't affect Putin because his term as president is independent of these elections. But he'll end up with a government that's not his. That's what happens in France. The French president can end up with all his ministers being of the opposition party.

And so this would basically put a cap on Putin's ability to act, to do anything, because he wouldn't have the Duma. So I think the neoconservatives still have these hopes. And it amazes me that Putin didn't realize that he is creating vulnerabilities for himself and for his party. All these vulnerabilities would disappear if he stopped protecting this central bank woman. And if he just said, well, you know, we've fooled around long enough, we've got to end this war. I want it over by next Friday. And the generals would have it over. And then all of the declines in the polls would go right back up. It would all be over.

And I think it would also show the American neoconservatives that there really isn't any prospect of unseating Putin or dismantling the Russian Federation. And that would be good, because as long as they keep their own delusions, illusions, pressing Russia, sooner or later they could do something

that really causes a bad response. And so we really come back to it, Nima. The whole difficulty with analyzing the situation and responding to your questions, anybody's questions, is there's such a disconnect between thinking and behavior and reality. They don't understand reality, or they won't accept it. And so they are dealing with things that aren't the real problem. So, you know, I could probably explain that better, but I think you know what I mean.

#Nima

Yeah, yeah. Paul, Donald Trump said to ABC that Iran hasn't violated the ceasefire. They only shot a few missiles, most of which were shot down. Very little damage to the UAE. The damage, I think, was somehow significant because these are the two important ports that the UAE had outside of the Strait of Hormuz. They could send oil. And after all, Paul, if the situation with the UAE is not going to be that much of a concern for the Trump administration, let's assume what would escalate the war drastically the way that Benjamin Netanyahu wants it. Here is the solution suggested by Naftali Bennett.

#Speaker 04

The reality is that Israel is a democracy, it's the best ally America can have. And NATO's not helping. Imagine for a moment we don't exist, okay? And you've got the Middle East festering with jihadists and Al-Qaeda types and ISIS and Hezbollah. We know what will happen. They're going to hit the Twin Towers, 9/11. You were in New York when that happened. I was in Manhattan when it happened. I saw those buildings on fire. That's what happens when you say the Middle East isn't our problem, we don't care. So the radical Islamists will come to the big Satan, to Manhattan, to California, to America, but with nuclear ballistic missiles. And by having Israel, you do not need to send hundreds of thousands of boots on the ground. Yeah, you know what he's arguing—he's basically threatening the United States with a false flag operation again in the United States. Do you understand that, Paul? Go ahead.

#Paul

Yeah, it was fear-mongering. You see, as far as I can tell, Nima, the so-called Muslim radicals, these are all creations of the CIA. We created them in order to destabilize the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. And bin Laden was our guy. He was the head of that organization, a CIA operation against the Soviets. And it's clear as day he had nothing whatsoever to do with 9/11. No Muslims had anything to do with 9/11. It was an inside job by the American neoconservatives to create the new Pearl Harbor that they said they needed to invade the Middle East and destroy the countries in the way of Greater Israel. So that's what 9/11 was about. And the war on terror is a hoax. There wasn't any terror. It was a war to get rid of Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein, Assad, for Greater Israel, just like the current war is to get rid of Iran for Greater Israel.

So, and some people blame Israel for it. I think that is not likely, but they did know about it because they had Mossad agents on site with cameras set up to film when the buildings came down. So they knew in advance, which is because the American neoconservatives, they're overwhelmingly Jewish, and half of them, I think, are joint Israeli-American citizens. So they certainly would have told the Israelis. Furthermore, some firm had to have wired those buildings. It's now been proven conclusively that Building Seven was wired. There's no other way it could have come down at free-fall acceleration. And the other two buildings, they also came down at essentially free-fall acceleration into their own footprint. So...

#Nima

We call it, in civil engineering, controlled demolition. It means that you destroy the building in a way that it doesn't damage the surrounding buildings.

#Paul

That's right. I witnessed one years ago as an engineering student. So when I saw it, I said, "That's controlled demolition." Well...

#Paul

Who wired the buildings? There are not many companies. And as far as I know, there have never been buildings as tall as the two towers that were brought down by controlled demolition. This was a risk. They don't usually bring down 100- and 104-story buildings, because there aren't any—maybe a handful in the world. So it required a lot of competence and also a lot of confidence that they could pull this off. This never happened before. Well, where did that firm come from? There are not many. And notice that nobody on the commission to investigate 9/11 called in the demolition companies. There can't be more than a handful, and say, hey, what can you tell us about this? Is this a controlled demolition? Were you the one who wired the buildings? Who wired it? And I think it was probably an Israeli firm, because, you know, the buildings were under the control of the Jew, Silverstein.

And so they had access. And the security system was also under the control of the neoconservatives. But still, again, you see, it's hard to explain that. I mean, Israel doesn't have skyscrapers that they have to bring down in order to build something else. And there's no experience with bringing down buildings like that. I don't think there's even any experience bringing down buildings as tall as Building 7. But we do know for a fact, it's not debatable, that a building like Building 7 of the World Trade Center cannot fall at freefall acceleration into its own footprint unless it's a controlled demolition. Because what controlled demolition means is each floor has to become unglued just prior to the floor above it hitting. Because even if the floor above has enough mass and force to crush the floor, it takes some time.

#Paul

Whether it's a second or a split second. But the end result is it's not freefall acceleration. Well, that was, and that's not debatable. So we know it was wired. And if it was wired, then the other two are likely to have been wired. So none of these questions were ever addressed. And, of course, the Mossad agents that were picked up filming it—it was all set up. So they had to know. They were kept a couple of months and never questioned by the commission and sent back. And so, yeah, the War on Terror was an orchestration created to send America to war for Greater Israel. And they hid it by calling it a War on Terror. But the terrorists are CIA-organized. And so we were warring on the people we then used to overthrow Qaddafi. And the same people we then used, we sent to Syria to try to overthrow Assad. These were the terrorists organized by the CIA that we were having a war on.

And, of course, no one ever exposed it. The media wouldn't say a word. Nobody in Congress would dare open their mouth. And those who did—for example, the scientists at Brigham Young University who collected the dust from the World Trade Center and proved beyond all doubt that it had reacted and unreacted nanothermite in it—well, nanothermite is what they use to bring down the buildings. And so he gets fired from the university. And that then was a message to all the other physicists: don't say a word. You'll lose all federal funding. Your physics department will be shut down. Your career will end. And the administrations knew that, that it couldn't lose the federal money. So everybody shut up. The same thing with high-rise architects and structural engineers.

Eventually, Richard Gage had 3,000 of them who said this can't possibly have happened according to the narrative. These buildings were intentionally brought down. It took him years to get that, because if you are a structural engineer or a high-rise architect and you take a position like that, most of your clients are going to think, oh, you're on the terrorist side. You're taking up for the terrorists. We're not going to do business with you. And your business fails. So I think the government knew that the people who would see through this would silence themselves, because as physicists, they would lose their positions in the universities. And they made sure—the first guy that said anything, he was finished. They also knew that architects and engineers couldn't say anything without losing clients, because people would say, you're on the terrorist side.

And they knew, too, that if you were in journalism and you said anything, you'd be branded and demonized or ignored because everybody would be afraid. So even people who came up and proved a case, nobody would say anything about it because they'll get us too. They're not just going to get him; they'll get anybody who takes it up. So that's the way it works. The same thing worked with the assassination of John Kennedy, with Robert Kennedy. It was easy to see through this, but it was too high a cost. And so everybody just shut up. That's a real problem because even people who know the truth can't be effective, because it's too costly for anybody to acknowledge it. And, of course, the situation is worse if everybody is too unrealistic to be realistic.

#Nima

Thank you. Thank you, Paul, for being with us today. A great pleasure, as always.

#Paul

Okay, thank you very much. See you next week.

#Nima

I'm going to send the link.

#Paul

Thank you.

#Nima

See you. Bye.