Iran HITS US Air Defenses in Kuwait & Bahrain, Trump FIRES Nuclear Missile!

BREAKING: Major escalation has blown up and the stakes of the US's war on Iran keep rising. Danny Haiphong breaks down the latest developments. SUPPORT THE SHOW BY BECOMING A YOUTUBE MEMBER: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCOxLhz6B_elvLflntSEfnzA/join PATREON.COM /DANNYHAIPHONG Support the channel in other ways: https://www.buymeacoffee.com /dannyhaiphong Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: $Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: https://paypal.me/spiritofho Follow me on Telegram: https://t.me /dannyhaiphong #iran #trump

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. Danny Haiphong here. We're going to get right to the breaking news and analysis for today, November 18th. So yesterday, Iran hit back hard against the United States after U.S. strikes on Qeshm Island. Iran sent Shahed 136s to U.S. bases in both Bahrain and Kuwait. Here is some of the imagery from Kuwait. Here's a better image, actually. Let me pull up the better image here of the strikes Iran launched last night against Ali al-Salem Air Base in Kuwait, hitting what the IRGC says were air defense systems there. This was the image of the fire that was taking place. They also sent drones to Isa Air Base in Bahrain, which hosts U.S. forces. It was reportedly hit hard by a drone swarm last night, with some sources reporting U.S. casualties.

Well, those casualties may have been confirmed by the United States itself sending a U.S. Air Force C-17A Globemaster III to the region. This was being tracked by open-source intelligence and flight-tracking sources. The military uses “Bandage” call signs for medical evacuation flights, and that was the call sign for this Globemaster III. According to MOLA Monitor, which is a reputable open-source intelligence source, the U.S. C-17 initially landed at Baghdad International Airport with its transponders turned off. It has now appeared over Turkey. It is returning to Ramstein Air Base, where it had taken off. It's likely that they picked up U.S. casualties, probably in Kuwait, but that has not been confirmed just yet.

But what has been confirmed is that these strikes actually did take place. CENTCOM has been denying Iranian strikes against Bahrain, or at least they've denied, in large part, their impact. But this time, the U.S. mainstream media has been very quick to report that these strikes have taken place in both Bahrain and Kuwait. Iran widened the battlefield. So this is coming from the Associated Press and The Wall Street Journal. Kuwait reported swarms of drones aimed at Ali al-Salem Air Base, which hosts U.S. forces. It said there was no damage. Bahrain is saying the same thing, not offering many details at all. But a lot of sources are reporting that hits did happen. Now, Iran has not been treating the situation like it is under fire.

Iran has been demonstrating some intense confidence in the face of U.S. provocations, which they have claimed are all aimed at trying to weaken Iran and provoke an Iranian response that will broaden the war. Iran has mocked the CENTCOM commander, who's supposed to be in Israel today, actually, saying that his record of repeated damage to U.S. drones warrants a "medal of damage." And here are the numbers, because every single day, Iran is downing U.S. drones: 57 MQ-9 Reaper drones and 18 MQ-1 drones have been destroyed or captured and reverse-engineered by Iranian forces. This came directly from the IRGC spokesperson.

But another story that is not being reported on at all—and this is a huge theme of today's show, I think—is the possible nuclear escalation that the United States is currently pursuing, not just with regard to the war in Iran, but in general, as its wars get bigger and its provocations become more dangerous. Late yesterday, Pacific time, the U.S. tested a so-called cutting-edge nuclear weapon amid the Iran bomb scare and global cyberattacks. So you may have noticed in recent days, or really over the last five or six days, that there have been outages affecting various systems all across the United States and the world. On November 13th, there was the complete grounding of all airlines in the United States due to air traffic control system issues.

United Airlines, Bank of America, the big banks in the United States—so many different instances of these outages. And then you had U.S. intelligence say that there was a dirty bomb that Iran was preparing to use on Washington, D.C. And suddenly, the U.S. is testing its nuclear missile. The Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile was scheduled to lift off between 11 p.m. Pacific time on Tuesday, November 2nd, and 5:01 a.m. today, Wednesday. The test will send an unarmed payload roughly 4,200 miles across the Pacific to a target area near Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. And I'm going to get back to you soon as to why that is so significant. The Marshall Islands is where the U.S. has historically tested its nuclear weapons.

The ICBM forms the land-based backbone of America's nuclear arsenal and can reach speeds of approximately 15,000 miles per hour, with a range of 6,000 miles. And while it was stressed that this was routine, many noted that the timing of this launch should not be lost on anyone, given the escalations, the talks of nuclear weapons, and Trump's own reported stance on nuclear weapons: "If we have them, why shouldn't we use them?" So it comes amidst this tense backdrop of cyberattacks, of the dirty bomb scare. And, you know, this is indeed a dangerous, escalatory moment. But I also wanted to talk to you about what this all means, because John Pilger was a friend of mine, whom I met just a year or so before his death. He came on this show in 2022—a great Australian documentary filmmaker and anti-war voice.

He published a documentary called The Coming War on China in 2016. And he talked about the Marshall Islands and why they were so important to the U.S.'s nuclear arsenal. He actually went to the Marshall Islands and filmed why and how it came to be that generations of people there are

contracting and will contract 500 different forms of cancer. It's because, from 1946 to 1958, the U.S. exploded the equivalent of one Hiroshima bomb every day on the Marshall Islands, contaminating the people and the environment. Sixty-seven tests, I believe, actually took place during that time.

And it should not be lost on anybody—and this is why I'm bringing up this missile test today—that while the United States has fewer total warheads than Russia, at 3,700 to Russia's 4,400, it was the first country to ever use them, in 1945. Those figures are from Plowshares, which is a U.S.-funded, Washington-based foundation that has absolutely no love for Russia, China, or other nuclear states. That's when the United States went nuclear and actually used them, not just when it established a nuclear weapons arsenal. It used them twice in Japan. And that's not all, because I wanted to bring this up for people who say, "Oh, Danny, this is clickbait." Absolutely not.

When the United States tests a nuclear missile, like it just did amid a massive escalation like the one the United States has taken part in since February against Iran, it has to be noted that this is a dangerous moment. And it's even more dangerous that, at the moment, Donald Trump and his administration are trying to play diplomacy with Russia and China while making these escalations at the same time. And that trilateral summit between Xi Jinping, Trump, and Vladimir Putin that is happening or will happen within the next 12 to 24 hours should not undermine the significance of what it means for the U.S. to just casually test its nuclear-capable missiles in moments of war.

Because the United States has not only used nuclear weapons twice—we have to look at history—it has also threatened to use nuclear weapons several times since then. I can't even list them all, but two big ones happened to be during the Korean War. At the very beginning of this war, Harry Truman was facing political pressure to deploy nuclear weapons. During a press conference on November 30, 1950, Truman hinted that nuclear weapons were an option. He said the United States would take “whatever steps are necessary to meet the military situation.”

While Harry Truman did not use a nuclear weapon during this war, the U.S. instead decided to carpet-bomb most of Korea with napalm, destroying 80 to 90% of everything that existed in the Pyongyang area during the Korean War. China entered the war, and both the Korean people and Chinese volunteers died while pushing the United States to the brink and ultimately forcing it into that settlement in 1953, that so-called armistice. So while they didn't use them, they threatened to use them. And the great Daniel Ellsberg reported that the United States...

#Danny

almost used a nuclear weapon as well during the Taiwan crisis in 1958, right after the Korean Armistice. U.S. military planners pushed for nuclear strikes on mainland China in 1958 to protect Taiwan from an invasion by communist forces, said Daniel Ellsberg of the Pentagon Papers. U.S. planners also assumed that the Soviet Union would aid China and retaliate with nuclear weapons—a price they deemed worth paying to protect Taiwan, according to the documents first reported by The New York Times that Ellsberg posted online, right?

This was right before he died, actually. He posted a portion of a top-secret document on the crisis that had only been partially declassified in 1975. So he was 90 at this time. And of course, people know him for his leak of the Pentagon study on the Vietnam War, which was a huge turning point. So the United States has used these weapons before, and it has thought about using them again. And you have a president, Donald Trump, and you have an administration, and you have a Washington foreign policy establishment that are all committed to escalating things in this direction. Iran is not intimidated, though. Iran posted this recently.

It posted this before reports of this nuclear missile test by the United States, saying that it is increasing the range and capabilities of its own missiles. Many people note that Iran has ICBM-like missiles of its own. Maybe they are capable of carrying nuclear warheads, maybe not, but they are not equipped with them. They have missiles that go as fast or faster and travel the same distance. So here, the Iranian military posted that they are increasing the range of their missile arsenal to 5,000 kilometers. Those are the latest developments. And I want to add in a little bit of history here because, without that history, we are not prepared for what is coming next, because this war against Iran is escalating already.

There were a lot of, I think, misguided hopes that talks would bear fruit. And then what did you see? You saw Marco Rubio immediately pour cold water on J.D. Vance's so-called attempts at talks recently on the tarmac—not even at an official press conference or anything—when supposedly Trump had tasked him with coming to some kind of diplomatic settlement with Iran. The United States is indeed confused in this conflict, which is why you have NBC News, for example, reporting that the U.S. is indeed trading attacks every day with Iran. But one thing you may note about these attacks is that they are not a full-scale or large-scale operation. They've even been called, in some circles within CENTCOM, so-called self-defense strikes.

I mean, can you even believe that? The United States is responsible for what happened to the Minab school—over 160 or 170 young girls alone, I believe, killed in that double-tap strike that has been blamed on AI, as if the United States military does not have a record of doing this to civilians, whether it's in Afghanistan, Iraq, Vietnam, Korea, or in its dozens of other military interventions. But still, the United States takes part in that war crime and has taken part in attacks against civilians on many occasions, dozens upon dozens of times, on the so-called boats in the Caribbean. This is just the Trump administration. This doesn't even count the Obama, Biden, and Trump drone strikes that have killed civilians, or strikes against Russia by Ukrainian forces, which are guided by the CIA. I mean, we can go on and on and on.

But the United States military does have a penchant for targeting civilians and, it seems—and this should be the conclusion—a huge motivation to do so. Nevertheless, the United States has been a bit confused, it looks like, in terms of how it's going to take part in this war against Iran. It seems like there are many forces that want to escalate: Israel being one, Admiral Bradley Cooper of CENTCOM being another, and Pete Hegseth being another. You never really know what Donald

Trump actually wants, but it doesn't matter because the force of the elite consensus in Washington is that there will be no legitimate, quote-unquote, peace deal.

And I think one has to note that the United States has not come up with peace deals in its wars at really any point in its history. What happened in Vietnam? Not a peace deal. What happened in Vietnam was, in fact, a rout and a complete evacuation that needed to happen due to military realities. Korea? An armistice. Still technically a war, no matter if Donald Trump wants to meet with Kim Jong-un, if Kim Jong-un shows up at APEC, which I'm not sure he did. I don't think he actually did, but nevertheless. The reality is that the Pentagon doesn't acknowledge its own strikes, in large part because I don't believe it wants these strikes to be a defining moment and a defining factor and characteristic of what its war was and the legacy of it. So NBC says, "For months, Donald Trump has vacillated from declaring that the Iran war is over to saying the U.S. has won to saying he wants to strike a deal to insisting he will end it soon."

"But his contradictory pronouncements belie a continued low-grade conflict that is largely playing out in secret, with the U.S. military quietly striking Iran and Iran hitting back nearly every day, according to two U.S. officials and one person familiar with the matter. Most of the strikes have not been publicly acknowledged by the Pentagon, particularly over the last couple of months, said U.S. officials. Iran has attacked commercial tankers in the Strait of Hormuz, as well as U.S. Navy ships and military sites in the region. Some of those attacks, not all of which the Pentagon has publicly acknowledged, have put U.S. aircraft and personnel in danger." So it's even worse than I pointed out. And we've seen this. Iran just published the video of the downing of the F-15 by its air defenses, its heat-seeking air defenses.

But we have had many reports, and I've published them on this channel, of F-35s squawking emergency signals over the UAE area, over Oman. We've had many instances where tankers have been hit, and the report has been that there was a U.S. Navy escort for that tanker. But it's really important to remember that when they say the U.S. Navy, they're not talking about warships, because if you look at the U.S. Naval Institute map, it will show that the USS Washington, the Bush, and now the Theodore Roosevelt are far away. They're not escorting anything in and out of the Strait of Hormuz. They're far out in the Arabian Sea near the end of the Omani coast, or they're even further out in the Indian Ocean. But I believe they've been creeping more into the Arabian Sea and trying to get closer. And that's where Iran's anti-ship missiles come in to push them back.

But nevertheless, when they say "escorted tankers," they are not talking about warships escorting tankers as if there's, like, a tugboat, right? This isn't a tugboat scenario. There isn't a destroyer or something of that sort pulling these tankers along or protecting them. No, no, no. These tankers are being escorted by fighter jets overhead, hugging the Omani coast. And I believe—my hunch, not being a military expert—is that they are trying to hug the coast so that these fighter jets occupy Omani or UAE airspace. They're trying to hug that coast so that the risks and the costs of firing at

these fighter jets are higher for Iran diplomatically and, of course, possibly politically, if, you know, they not only hit a U.S. airman or a couple of airmen, depending on the fighter aircraft, but also end up hurting, for example, civilians.

This is what the United States does. The United States and Israel always talk about "human shields this, human shields that." But who was it that was hiding in the hotels during the 40-day war in places like Bahrain and Manama? Who was it? Was it Iranian forces? It was the U.S. military personnel hiding in the hotels there in order to escape the drone attacks that were occurring against them. So, again, it's worse than they're letting on. This escalation is a lot worse. In recent days, the military has disclosed several attacks, including the attacks that we just talked about. But then, on Tuesday as well, U.S. military officials confirmed that U.S. fighter aircraft struck an IRGC missile launch site. That followed a drone attack by Iran that targeted a U.S. radar system in Bahrain. Iranian sources said the drones hit the system, but CENTCOM said they intercepted them.

The continued exchange of fire is unfolding as Trump weighs resuming major combat operations in Iran, with advisers outlining a potential narrow window for doing so that closes in eight weeks, supposedly. So again, whatever that means, right? We have to extrapolate. What does that narrow window mean? Why is eight weeks so important? It may be because of the holidays. Well, I'm guessing what they're talking about is that Congress will change. But again, Donald Trump has already said to all of us that he doesn't care about Congress, that he will go full throttle against Iran if he wants to, with executive action, and Congress will have nothing to say about it.

The problem, though, is that it would become optically more difficult if Congress does pass the War Powers Act and tries to take action against Donald Trump for violating it. So there are consequences to be had. There's no guarantee that Trump really cares about it. But the fact of the matter is, we have to understand—one may ask, why is Iran hitting U.S. bases in Bahrain and Kuwait again? What is significant about this? Well, I think what's significant about this is that U.S. forces are actually operating out of these bases in a condition of disarray and destruction.

Iran has largely destroyed these bases already, but because the U.S. doesn't really have any other alternative for coordinating these so-called limited strikes, they're still using resources at these bases to try to do so. And we have to remember that the acting U.S. Navy secretary already said that Iran blew the hell out of the primary base in Bahrain, the Fifth Fleet naval base, which was the major logistics hub. There's no more logistics support coming out of there, which is why the USS Bush, Washington, and now the Roosevelt will have to resupply at Diego Garcia. Tao, I believe his name is—yes, Hong Tao—said in an interview that they blew the hell out of Bahrain.

The secretary of the Navy admitted this back in September. So why hit it again, right? Well, there was a recent report, too, out of Kuwait that the Pentagon ignored warnings about the dangers of Iran's drones. And we just saw what Iran was able to do. As soon as the U.S. war started, troops were killed. And I just want to read a bit of this because I think it's really important. It says, "From a distance, the Iranian drone resembled an arrowhead pointing downward as it dove out of the sky.

Its propeller, powered by the kind of motor typically used in dirt bikes and lawnmowers, produced a high-pitched wail."

It struck mid-morning on March 1st, the second day of the U.S.-Israeli war against Iran, hitting a logistics center in Kuwait used by the U.S. military. Dozens of personnel from the Army Reserve were working in the office building there. The incoming drone, a variant of the Shahed, slammed through the roof of the building and detonated its payload. Six American service members were killed and more than a dozen wounded, several of them critically. It was the deadliest attack on U.S. troops in the war. It'll be hard for survivors to forget the drone's distinctive noise. And the Pentagon had already ignored their warnings based on experience in Ukraine.

So the U.S. military knew about this technology for months before the Iran war began. A group of senior American officials, worried about exactly the type of drone that killed six soldiers in Kuwait, told me they had repeatedly urged commanders in the Middle East to deploy the new Ukrainian technology, which was supposed to, you know, give troops warning that this was going to happen. So, again, on and on and on. Back on September 2, we saw photos emerge of how badly damaged these U.S. positions were from these drone attacks. That was, I believe, the AWACS E-3 Sentry that was destroyed. That was in Saudi Arabia. But here is Camp Buehring. That is what it looks like now. I mean, there might be some repairs being done.

U.S. forces are still operating to some degree here, as indicated by the C-17 Globemaster medevac. But I think it has to be noted that, again, Iran is striking these bases not just to prove a point, but to continue to degrade the U.S. military and make it impossible for them to conduct operations from a short distance. Because if there is a major escalation again, an actual operation is likely to have to take place from as far away as where those aircraft carriers are, you know, or from Israel. And Israel, of course, is licking its chops. Every day, even today, Israeli media is saying that they are planning some kind of secret operation.

I believe they have a June 2025 war, 12-day war model that they're trying to cook up. I don't know if they have the intelligence for that. I highly doubt it. I highly doubt Iran is not, you know, 100 times more prepared. I believe they are prepared for such a thing. But I do believe that the conditions on the ground have forced the Israelis and the United States to fight the war in a completely different way from how it began with the February 28th strikes against Iran. So, you know, that is where things are at the moment. I think what we have right now is that the hawks, as our friend Alastair Crooke has said many times before, are winning right now.

And it doesn't matter, in my estimation, how much the United States, the Trump administration, plays at diplomacy, which they are right now. You know, Xi Jinping met Donald Trump at the airport at the APEC summit in Shenzhen. He met him at the international airport there. They're going to have the trilateral summit. Donald Trump is saying that he's focused entirely on economic matters, but that Iran and Ukraine are all on the table to be discussed. In my estimation, this playing at diplomacy doesn't change the reality that there have been so many developments just in the last 24

to 48 hours that show that, although some people believe the U.S. is ruled by the whims of Donald Trump, it is ruled by permanent interests that are very much committed to the ongoing escalation of these wars—all of them, not just the Iran war.

We saw what happened to the Kerch Bridge in recent days. Ukraine attacked the Kerch Bridge in the area of Crimea. It didn't destroy it fully, but it took it out of operation with massive damage. And that was done with a direct attack on this bridge with U.S.- and NATO-provided weapons and logistical and intelligence support. It was likely done with personnel from NATO countries because this was a far more sophisticated operation than what is usually done. And that's why it isn't hit very often, but it was done. Ukraine launched an unprecedented strike on the Crimean Bridge. This happened right before the APEC summit. And then, of course, the nuclear test also happened right before the APEC summit. And these escalations in Iran are happening right before the APEC summit.

Do you see the strategy of tension here? Do you see how the United States empire is, on the one hand—and this has to be noted—trying to promote the imaginary illusion that it is taking part in real state-to-state diplomacy, multilateral mechanisms, et cetera, through this? But at the same time, it's doing that while steadily escalating on all of these fronts, including on the NVIDIA, Jensen Huang, and all of that front too. That was a U.S. intelligence operation: getting Jensen Huang out to escalate the tech war on China because they believe Jensen Huang was too friendly toward China, even though he wasn't selling NVIDIA's top-tier chips to China.

And there are plenty in the hawkish anti-China establishment who liked the fact that NVIDIA was trying to get China hooked on lower-grade technology, lower-grade AI chips, so that it could never advance its own chips. But China has seen right through that. China had actually banned a lot of those chips from NVIDIA and was not importing them in large numbers. It has already been on its own self-sufficient path toward producing its own AI semiconductor chips. That production is only growing, and it's a result of this tech war. So the strategy of tension, the escalation ladder that the U. S. is creepily climbing up, continues, right? And it continues because Donald Trump's wins, while they have some influence over how the immediate situation looks, right?

Immediately, the escalation against Iran, these talks at the APEC summit—all of this looks like something different from what it actually is. It looks like there's confusion and contradiction, when in fact the permanent interests in the foreign policy establishment are continuing their path of destruction. They're just doing it at a pace and in a form that they can stomach, that they can tolerate right now. Because the fact of the matter is, it's difficult to tolerate losing and increasingly chaotic military ventures. This is the real contradiction.

Not whether the United States empire wants to conduct endless wars, not whether it will or will not, but whether those endless wars are feasible and whether the blowback and the consequences of them are tolerable to the elites. And this is why you had the Iran war transform from the 40-day war, which was full-scale, or at least close to full-scale, kinetic action, to what it is now. That's why you have the Ukraine conflict as it is right now. It's because the U.S. simply cannot tolerate being in

direct confrontation with Russia at the moment. But this attack on the Kerch Bridge shows that, at any point, the United States and NATO will go up the escalation ladder when they see fit.

Now, it's also important to note that the whims, the interests, the actual desires of people mean nothing here. The Democrats will say, "Oh, well, Ukrainians need more help. They want our help. So that's why we need to stop Russia and stop focusing on the Iran war." The Trump administration will say, "Well, you know, Iranians have no leaders. Nobody likes them. They've killed all these people." And then, of course, Trump will completely ignore the polling numbers about how unpopular the Iran war is, how unpopular he is, and say, "Oh, we're the hottest country of all time," blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. All of this shows publicly how little people's desires matter. What do you think they say in private? How do you think they behave in private?

But it must be noted that the United States—its ruling class, its elite—doesn't care about what people think. Even after Russia had held the referendum and Crimea voted to establish itself as part of the Russian Federation and to, you know, break away from any kind of U.S. and EU dominion, polls said that Crimeans preferred Russia over the United States, over Washington, over Europe. And polls had said this beforehand, too. This is from Forbes. So, 73.9% said joining Russia would make life better for them and their family. And this was after. So, in February 2015, when asked, "Do you endorse Russia's annexation of Crimea?" 82% responded yes. Another 11% answered, "Yes, for the most part."

So, as Brian Berletic has demonstrated and shown in many videos, the vast majority of people in Crimea already viewed themselves as ethnically Russian. And they supported becoming part of the Russian Federation, especially after the Maidan coup happened there. But the United States doesn't care. So the United States and NATO support Ukraine's attacks on the Kerch Bridge. They claim that they are going to wrest Crimea away from Russia. But the reality says something a lot different, and that has to be noted. But this is true in all cases. The people don't matter. Do you think that people in the United States want nuclear tests?

Do they want an ICBM test that they're not even being told about? Only the Daily Mail and various reports on social media are talking about how the U.S. just launched an intercontinental ballistic missile test at a time when it has made threats, and prominent people like Tucker Carlson have reported on them. Some people say it's just fearmongering, but regardless, the situation is so grave that we have to talk about the use of nuclear weapons against Iran, even if it's fearmongering. Trump officials have definitely talked about using quote-unquote “tactical nuclear weapons” on Pickaxe Mountain. The fact that we're here and that you have these nuclear tests is a signal of grave danger and a huge, serious escalation.

And people in the United States, if they were polled on that, what do you think the numbers would be? I don't think they would be very high in favor of these kinds of things. I think, actually, there would be far more support for an end to all of this altogether. So again, it must be noted that people's interests, what they want, do not factor in. Because what really matters here is not just the

political careers of people like Trump—and more so the people around him, since Trump will be on his way out—but who profits from this. Yesterday, I had Stephen Kinzer on, who talked about the military-industrial complex and those multinational corporations, monopolies, the financiers, the Vanguard groups.

These are the forces that make their money off of wars, and it just so happens that this model of war profiteering is cannibalizing itself now. It's becoming a self-cannibalizing process because the U. S. military and U.S. hegemonic status in the world are not able to remain stable or grow under conditions of endless war profiteering. War profiteering has created, yes, massive military budgets, massive government contracts for weapons manufacturers, which barely produce the weapons that are necessary for the wars in the first place. Yes, they have made lots of profits for Wall Street and the military-industrial complex, but they've done great damage to the very prestige that the United States needs in the world to remain a hegemonic power, which is why you have China, you have Russia, you have Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin today.

They met for, I believe, three hours before the Trump-Putin-Xi summit. You have the fact that China is hosting the APEC summit. And if you look at the data and the numbers, it's China that does not have a trade deficit with countries in the Asia-Pacific, in ASEAN, and with APEC countries. And it's China that has built real infrastructure in these countries. It's China that is talking about actual growth and actual integration and growing in prestige, while the United States comes as a visitor and is a lot weaker on the world stage. It has diminished its prestige by disrupting and really destroying oil and energy markets worldwide. It is trying to arrest development in those very countries in ASEAN and APEC through tariffs, which have only led to greater cooperation with China in the first place.

So this is the reality: the United States' warmongering, its military and economic warfare, is actually weakening the U.S. empire in many respects, even as those forces that profit from all of this continue to make big profits in the short term. This is a really important contradiction to keep in mind because it is one that will shape the future trajectory of this world order, this changing world order.

How does the United States respond to the fact that it does not have any good options against Iran, against Russia, or against China, and that each and every action it takes has a reaction that creates new problems for the U.S. empire that it can't surmount? It cannot surmount the problem of China's rise in the tech industry, in AI. The Jensen Huang–NVIDIA scandal is an outgrowth of this. Jensen Huang simply wanting to make money and to have access to the Chinese market with its lower-tier chips—that in and of itself is seen as a threat by large portions of the China hawk foreign policy establishment, not least Marco Rubio, who likely engineered that whole thing, or at least was the head of the snake that engineered that corporate coup. So on and on and on, there are problems that are insurmountable.

How does the United States address the fact that this arms race it created with Russia is now blowing back big time, to the point where Russia's missile arsenal, nuclear and non-nuclear, is far more modern, far more capable now? And ultimately, it has created a dynamic where the U.S. has trained its lapdogs in Europe to become so rabidly obsessed with war that they risk Russia using these weapons against them and destabilizing the entire European world order. Russia won't do that by choice, but that will happen if Europe continues on this path toward endless war with Russia. So this is ultimately where things stand. It is not a good position for the United States to be in, even if people like Elon Musk can become a trillionaire under this system, even if the Pentagon budget can increase to $1.5 trillion, $1.7 trillion.

And that's true even if you have the Zionist lobby, the military contractors, all of them continuing to make very profitable ventures out of these conditions of chaos. Chaos has opportunities, right? Disaster capitalism has opportunities for profit. But what often isn't talked about—and that's why this channel is here—is how there are major consequences to that overall way of approaching things. And the problem is that the United States empire is constructed in such a way that it sees no alternative. There is no alternative.

It's not simply a moniker that was an outgrowth of the apex, the climax of the neoliberal era after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, with the renowned Francis Fukuyama—I don't want to call him great—who, as a top intellectual and so-called realist scholar, declared that it was the end of history and there was no alternative to U.S. domination and, of course, the finance- and rentier-led, debt-ridden system that it continues to impose on the world. But "the end of history," or "there is no alternative," should actually be applied to how the U.S. empire operates.

Because to understand the U.S. empire is to understand these developments today—why the U.S. may be striking Iran right now in Bandar Abbas. I'm going to confirm those reports later in our second show today, and I'll let you know about that right at the end of this program. But the "there is no alternative" moniker really speaks to how the U.S. empire operates, how it's constructed, and who rules over it. That's the question that we should be asking. Because these wars are not simply somewhere else. The chaos that people experienced in the last week, from, you know, NVIDIA to all of these cyber outages—Microsoft, United Airlines, the FAA. We can go on and on: the banks, Apple.

There are so many examples of that chaos. But that chaos, the fact that we know nothing about it, and the fact that these powerful people we rely on for information say, "Yeah, it's all a coincidence"—that's all an outgrowth of the overall powerlessness that actually shapes our world in the U.S. and in the West. The people in France have risen up in part against that. In Spain, with the general strike, they've risen up in part against that, in part against this ruthless austerity, the corporate theft of their livelihoods, and the diminishment of their standard of living. But it's even much broader than that.

You see it in all cities across the United States: increasing surveillance, increasing policing, the repressiveness, the fact that you have really no power in the United States and in the West that corporations and the state apparatus don't dictate in large part. Sure, go, you know, eat what you want if you can afford it. If you get sick, you might not be able to treat yourself. If you need somewhere to live, you might not be able to afford it. We can go on and on and on. And of course, there's also the factor of race and supremacism, which the U.S. is still very much built upon and still very much enforces—not just in its world politics and foreign policy. There's the dehumanization of the people of, let's say, Iran, Palestine. We can go on and on and on. Even Russians, right? To make their targeting, to make their deaths, to make their mass murder far more palatable.

But it happens in the United States and in the West, too, with scapegoating, with violence, incarceration, surveillance regimes, and the huge gap in standards of living between certain sectors of society and others. This is the kind of system that the U.S. empire has constructed to, of course, keep that profiteering going, but also to keep control over it as seamless as possible. I argue that it's this exceptionalist mentality, this utter divide, this power structure that creates super-exploitation for certain segments of society in the United States—a harsher form of oppression for certain groups, for example, Black Americans, compared to the rest. It's that which creates that kind of faux, fake social peace that really is just a cauldron ready to bubble over and boil over.

And that is why it is really difficult in the United States to demand and get a real, class-unified movement—a movement where, yeah, you have more people than ever suffering in ways that, in large part, they never understood before from prior generations. You have a race to the bottom that encompasses the entirety of the population. It's not about me sowing divisions. People are like, "Danny, you're talking about race. You must be sowing divisions. How could you?" No, it's about the actual makeup of society and who creates these lines—lines that have huge consequences and then prevent an actual unified class movement that can bring together the broadest number of people to change and affect conditions that are intolerable.

So what ends up happening in the United States, especially in the neoliberal era, is not an improvement in standards and conditions. What actually happens is a growing tolerance for worse and worse conditions. And that is far more dangerous, given what we cover here on this channel. Tolerance for nuclear missile tests, tolerance for wars like what has happened against Iran, against Russia, trade wars, tech wars against China. Tolerance for that has led us to this moment. And now we are entering a period where fewer people are tolerant of this. Fewer and fewer people are willing to stomach this in the long term. But the question is, what happens after that? What happens?

What happens when these intolerable conditions ultimately create a moment of catharsis in the United States? We don't know. We don't know. But that's where we're heading. Because these crises—everything that we've covered today, from U.S. bases being targeted again to nuclear missile tests to the history of U.S. nuclear provocations—all point in that direction. And the reason why I cover them is to create an intolerance for these things, because that's what we need. We need to

understand why this is all happening and that it's actually happening. I just pulled up a report that the Pentagon is trying to keep its bombings secret from you. It's trying to do that.

I mean, it's been trying to do that for so long, at times when it hasn't actually declared an official war against a state actor. For example, throughout the war on terror, especially during the Obama period, but really throughout the whole time. When the U.S. was ejected from Afghanistan in 2021, everyone was like, "Oh my God, how is this happening?" Everyone forgot that the U.S. was waging war in Afghanistan, or at least that had become normalized. And even if people didn't approve of it—which a lot of people didn't, especially during the Bush era—even if people in the United States didn't have an affinity for it, they had been taught to tolerate it. And Obama happened to be one of the biggest weapons for achieving that.

The reason why we have Trump, why he behaves the way he does, and why we have him twice is because the neoliberal regime put in front of us Barack Obama, who was what I call, and what my mentor Glenn Ford called, the most effective evil of the empire. And why was that? It was because his whole brand was about rebranding how empire actually happens and works to make it sellable to larger portions of the population—portions of the population that at one point would have opposed war and were out on the streets against the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. And it was Barack Obama who came in and retooled these wars so they were tolerable. They made it okay to target U.S. citizens with drone attacks, which happened in Yemen, actually. Anwar al-Awlaki was killed in Yemen by the Obama administration, and he was a U.S. citizen.

Not only was that made tolerable, but so was the surveillance, and so was the National Defense Authorization Act, a measure which said it was okay for a U.S. citizen to be detained under a military tribunal if they were deemed to be a terrorist. It was Obama who did that, and that has not changed since. Because, you know, let's be honest: when one president does something and sets that precedent, that precedent continues onward. And that's why you should be very cautious about the Democrats coming in. We're about to close here soon, but be very cautious about enthusiasm. Not because I believe that it isn't a good sign that people voted against Donald Trump and his administration, his regime, in the midterm elections. It was a kind of referendum against his administration.

Not because that's a bad thing, but because we are once again in this cycle where you have two evils who control the U.S. political system at the behest of those who control them. People call them the Epstein class. I just call them the ruling class, the monopolists, the corporatists, the capitalists, the warmongers. You know, people came out and voted for the other one, for the other evil party who works for them. And now they're going to come in and make whatever bare-minimum changes they can—for example, maybe putting this disdain for Trump's Iran war into the political lexicon, perhaps through a war powers vote. Although I wouldn't get too enthusiastic about any of that, or this idea that there's a timeline for the war in Iran, because ultimately what the Democrats will do is they'll try to reshape it and retool it so that it looks more tolerable for the population and so their donors and those who actually control them are satisfied.

There will be factors like the global economy and wanting to at least keep it from completely crashing, as well as the fact that there are those who disagree about how to destroy Iran, but they do not disagree on destroying Iran. The same goes for China. The same goes for Russia. We will likely see a huge shift toward McCarthyist attacks against Russia and, of course, the people who are speaking out, like this channel here, and saying that the Ukraine conflict was provoked by the United States and NATO, is a U.S.-NATO war, and should be stopped. So people like that will be targeted again as the Democrats try to push through more funding to Ukraine and try to revive Russophobia and anti-Russia hysteria that has been muted, not by changes in the mentality of the ruling elites, but by the fact that they're just too mired in other things to focus on it.

So we should be not just very cautious, but already critical of these forces that claim they are going to do something different when, in fact, they work for the same people. They work just in a slightly different way—not necessarily in impact, definitely not in trajectory, but in form. So we get maybe a different form of the same thing. We may not even get that. So again, this is where we're headed, you know? In the next couple of months, the current Congress will be through, and the Democrats will come in in January. We'll have to see where things are at then. Everybody, thanks for coming to the show today. All right.

Hit the like button. That helps boost the show in YouTube's algorithm so that it continues to be seen after we are done here. Also, do subscribe to the channel if you're not subscribed, because right now, during the holidays—and this always happens during this time of year—YouTube steps up its AI detection of so-called bots. I shouldn't say it begins doing this, because it's always doing it, but it steps it up. And while there are bots on YouTube—I have to say, they do exist—a lot of this actually ends up scrubbing real people because the AI, of course, is not only imperfect but, in many ways, very flawed. So subscribe to the channel and hit the like button.

That's the most important thing for the algorithm. But subscribing to the channel will help mitigate what are ultimately subscriber losses. So I'm announcing this for people who might check and say, "Oh, I'm not subscribed anymore." Please subscribe again. Unfortunately, this is what happens. But hit the like button, of course. All the places to support this channel are in the video description below. Do subscribe, and if you are able, consider going to the video description and also supporting on places like Patreon, Substack, and more. You can also become a YouTube member through the link in the video description below.

We love our YouTube members here. I love our YouTube members here. They're very supportive and, you know, very active here. For example, Aubrey is always here. I want to thank all the moderators. Patty, I see you. I don't know if Where is here. I don't see him, but I see David. Thank you. Thank you, Sam, for moderating today for this early solo show. The big announcement is that later today, I will be on with Ben Norton and K. J. Noh to go over the developments of the APEC summit and the trilateral summit between Trump, Putin, and Xi. So I'll do that. "Did they really launch a nuclear 157?" Yes, they did.

Of course, it was unarmed because it was a test. But they did launch and test the nuclear-capable Minuteman III, which is actually the most important missile in the U.S. nuclear arsenal. But nevertheless, today, November 18th, at 9 p.m. Eastern Time, do come through to that show as we cover more on the Putin-Xi-Trump summit, APEC, as well as the latest developments in the war, because they are moving fast. And I'm going to bring that to you then. All right. See you then. November 18th, 9 p.m. Eastern Time. Hit the like button before you go. Patreon, Substack, YouTube membership—all that is in the video description below. And I will see you all again in about nine hours. Bye-bye.