

# **Brian Berletic: Iran SMASHES Trump's MoU Deception, New War Front Just BLEW UP!**

Brian Berletic of the New Atlas just predicted the collapse of the MoU deal between the US and Iran, explaining that Iran's defiance in the face of deception has exposed the dangers of trusting the Trump-led US empire as preparations for a war on China intensify behind the scenes. The New Atlas: <https://www.youtube.com/@TheNewAtlas/> 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](https://chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com) Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritho> #iran #iranwar #trump

## **#Danny**

The current situation is that the memorandum of understanding between the United States and Iran is already collapsing. Talks are on very shaky ground, and a lot of this has to do, of course, with Israel and its attacks on Lebanon. It's not even worth commenting on ceasefires around that issue. There's no such thing as a ceasefire when it comes to what's been happening against Lebanon by the Israelis and the United States. A lot of people are talking about the Trump administration brokering peace and how they need to enforce the terms of the MOU. How do you see it?

## **#Brian Berletic**

Well, we have to try to figure out what the United States is actually trying to achieve. Does anyone actually think the United States is trying to achieve peace? The answer is obviously not. The only reason the United States would ever agree to anything even closely resembling peace is because they need to freeze a particular part of their global objectives, because they're not able to move them forward, and they're in some ways maybe worried that they're going to be moved backward. So that's the only reason they would ever, ever agree to peace. And even when they agreed to peace, as you were saying, the ceasefire—there was a ceasefire leading up to the memorandum of understanding being signed. I guess it was technically signed.

But they were violating the ceasefire all along. And as you mentioned, Israel is violating the ceasefire, has been, and is now violating the Memorandum of Understanding. Because the first point, if my understanding is correct, was that the war was supposed to stop on all fronts, including Lebanon. And if you zoom out and look at the entire region, it isn't just a U.S. war on Iran. It is a U. S. war on Iran and all of its allies in the region. And that included Syria before its collapse in 2024,

Yemen, Ansar Allah in Yemen, and of course, Hezbollah in Lebanon. And so when Israel is continuing its war against Hezbollah in Lebanon, that is the U.S. continuation of its overall war on Iran across the entire region.

So how can you have a memorandum of understanding or any sort of peace when you are still, in fact, waging war against Iran? And people will make the argument that, well, Israel is doing this. Israel and the United States are two separate things. But as I've always pointed out, in terms of material reality, Israel would not exist as it does today without constant and complete U.S. support. They are incapable of large-scale military operations without constant and continuous support from the United States. So this would not be happening unless the United States wanted it to happen. If they really wanted it to end, they could pull the plug, and Israel would.

I mean, we remember many junctures where the Israelis would have to stop in the middle of one of their wars of aggression or one of their episodes of genocide. They'd have to sit there and wait for U. S. bombs to be delivered so that they could continue their aggression and their genocide. And so that just shows you how dependent they are on the United States, and that at any point the U.S. could say, no, we're not delivering those bombs because we actually want peace. And that's what would happen. And then there would be peace. They're physically incapable of continuing without U. S. support. If they are continuing, it's because the U.S. is supporting them to continue.

## **#Danny**

It's quite a peculiar position, or maybe we should frame it as an incredibly contradictory position for the United States as the so-called hegemon, where it has this agenda—and it's been trying to enact it—of isolating Iran, of course, isolating the rest of Iran's allies in the multipolar world, especially in the energy realm, trying to choke very important trade routes and even worsening the situation around the Strait of Hormuz, which was open before the United States decided to strike Iran and Iran decided to exercise its power, its capacity to regulate the strait in defense of its sovereignty.

But now the United States is in this position where it obviously needed a breather, but yet it won't arrest the Israeli regime in order to ensure that that breather can last any significant period of time, given all of the, of course, the limitations we saw with the United States and its war on Iran. So what do you make of this contradictory position, where it seems like the United States can't seem to make a definitive decision about whether it's going to go full-scale war and continue on the war and try to meet its objectives that way, or to stop and take a breather? So, you know, because I'm not even fantasizing about the idea of the United States brokering peace—that's just not what the United States government, the regime, the military apparatus, industrial complex, everything does. But the idea that the United States can't even decide on a path between breather, pause, and continuing war is quite an interesting development. What do you make of it?

## **#Brian Berletic**

I think it's very similar to the Minsk Agreement. This was the agreement made between, you know, technically the United States, Europe, and Russia in regard to Ukraine from 2014 until Russia's full-scale intervention in 2022. So what they were doing was, technically, they were supposed to have a ceasefire, and then it was supposed to lead from there to permanent peace. But what the United States and Europe did instead was use all of that time to just rearm, reorganize their Ukrainian proxies, and create an even larger threat to Russia in the long term. That's exactly what they're trying to do now. They want to appear as if they're seeking peace. They want to create credible excuses for why that peace cannot be fully implemented and just hope Iran and everyone else goes along with it.

So far, Iran has said no, they're not going to go along with it, and they will keep the Strait of Hormuz closed. But you mentioned energy, and we have to realize it's not just that the US is trying to eliminate Iran in West Asia and then wanting to control all of West Asia for so many obvious reasons—the geostrategic position of the region, the energy that comes out of that region. It is to stop the energy coming out of the region specifically. So they want to cut off China, and they want to cut off the rest of Asia. The way they want to do this is not overnight. If you do that overnight, there will be an economic calamity, and it will be too quick to be of any benefit for the United States.

What the U.S. is doing right now is ramping up LNG exports to Asia. They did this years in advance of this current war that we're in the middle of with Iran. And as I pointed out before, there was no reason for them to be ramping up LNG export projects and infrastructure to Asia because there was already energy coming from West Asia going to the rest of Asia. So why were they doing that if it made no business sense? Because they fully intended to disrupt energy from West Asia reaching the rest of Asia. This is exactly what they did to Europe vis-à-vis their energy imports from Russia. They wanted to cut Europe off from Russian energy. They wanted to supply Europe with energy from the United States.

It didn't make any sense at the time because Russian energy was already being piped in much cheaper than the U.S. could ever send it to Europe. So what did they do? They started a war. They put sanctions on Russia. And even to this day, Europe is still getting a percentage of its energy from Russia, but they are gradually cutting it off permanently. This is what they plan to do with Asia. You cannot do it too quickly. So what you do is you do this waffling where we want peace, but we had to bomb in self-defense. Oh, we have Israel, we can't control them. Oh, the CIA says Iran's not honoring their side of the agreement. And so even before they signed the MOU, they had a whole list of excuses to worm their way out of the agreement, just like we all knew that they would.

## **#Danny**

Right. The CIA—what did the CIA say? The CIA doesn't trust Iran to abide by the terms of the MOU. Israel, right? And then the U.S. intel says Israel may undermine the MOU. And then, yeah, everyone's joking about that because Israel was literally doing it days— I mean, let's be honest, since the MOU began, the MOU was even uttered and agreed upon, Israel was undermining it,

meaning the U.S. was undermining it. And that just goes to show exactly what you said there, Brian. And now, how about this?

There is somewhat of what I believe to be, and I'm curious about your take on this, a kind of narrative management going on. And part of that is because obviously the United States faces crises that are mounting economically and militarily because of its inability to pull back on its war agenda. But there's also a kind of political narrative taking shape that is definitely about PR. And J.D. Vance has come back into the fore to spread what is now being perceived as a U.S.-Israeli rift. And I want to just play an interview that J.D. Vance gave to The New York Times, a brief snippet of it, where The New York Times opinion section asks J.D. Vance about his thoughts on how Israel has perceived this deal.

## **#Speaker 1**

There is another country in the Middle East that thinks of itself as having a very intimate knowledge of the Iranian regime—not just the Gulf states. That's Israel. I don't think this deal is popular in Israel right now. I don't think you're an especially popular figure in Israel today. We'll see where things are in six months. And one perception I think people have after watching this war unfold is that there is a certain misalignment, maybe, between the kind of pragmatic American interest that you just described the president as having and the more existential sense of the stakes that Israel has.

And one key criticism of the Obama deal, from people in the Republican Party, people in Israel, and elsewhere, was always that it was focused on the nuclear program and wasn't focused on Iranian proxies, their support for terrorism around the Middle East, their support for Hezbollah and Hamas. So I'm just curious, do you think there's a misalignment between the U.S. and Israel? Do you think Israel has incentives to not want this deal to continue? And is there a vision for how you get to a point where Iranian support for Hezbollah isn't sending rockets into Israel on the regular?

## **#JD Vance**

Well, what I'd say here is that it's clear that large segments of the Israeli political system and population are very sensitive about this deal. But I also think they're picking up on some misinformation about the deal and running with it and sort of panicking about it. And I fundamentally believe this deal will be good for the entire region and for the world. That includes, of course, the Israelis. Now, I think it's important to say that while I do believe that this deal will be good for the entire world, fundamentally, we're worried about what's in the best interest of the American people.

And to the extent that, and I think the president has shown this, where he sees misalignment between the goals of the political system in Israel and the goals of the American people, he's willing to say that we're going to pursue America's interests where there are divergences. So there are

certainly going to be disagreements from time to time. I think that's normal. I will say, I don't know, maybe I've missed this, I don't think Bibi himself has actually criticized the deal, because I think he's maybe a little bit more familiar with the details of what's in it. But yeah, you've seen people in their system, Ben-Gvir and Smotrich, who've attacked the deal. And I guess my response to them would be, what is your exact proposal? And you're a country of nine million people. You can't just kill your way out of solving every single national security problem that you have.

## **#Danny**

Very interesting, Brian. You can't kill your way out of every single national security problem that you have. That sounds familiar. It almost sounds like a key element of U.S. foreign policy for many, many decades. Literally, there used to be, back in the Vietnam era, "kill everything that moves." It's just so interesting to hear J.D. Vance talk like this, and it indicates, or it's supposed to spread this idea, that yeah, there's a significant rift between the United States and Israel right now.

## **#Brian Berletic**

It's the same act of political theater we've watched the United States and the European Union perform since President Trump came into office. We remember, actually, we remember Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth all the way back in February 2025 telling Europe there's gonna be a division of labor. You guys are gonna continue in Europe, you're gonna continue this war while we go deal with China and apparently also Iran. And then that's exactly what they went off to do. But there had to have been this split, this theater of some sort of split. Even as Europe did exactly what the US was telling them to do, they had to pretend that the United States abandoned them, because what were they asking of the European public?

They were asking the European public, we're going to have to get rid of all of these public programs that you depend on to actually live your life as a European citizen. We have to redirect all of that money into this proxy war we are going to fight on behalf of the United States because we are vassals of the United States. And so, to sell that to the European people, you have to convince them that the Americans abandoned them, that Russia is an existential threat. And then this is the pretext they use to push forward, actually fulfilling demands the US has made of them. It's the exact same in Israel, for Israel.

They have their own political circus they have to perform for the population there, to continue radicalizing them, to continue silencing anyone voicing any sort of dissent there. They also have to perform political theater between the US and Israel, especially if you're tasking Israel with spoiling peace, conducting attacks out of the blue all on their own, which, as we know, militarily is impossible. Those attacks have to be enabled by the US even as they're being carried out. But you have to perform this political theater to convince people that if you want to convince people Israel did this on their own, you have to convince them that there's some sort of split that justified it. And I will continue to warn about this: Israel has nuclear weapons.

If the United States ever decided they wanted to enter nuclear weapons into the equation in the region, they would probably have Israel do it and try to create plausible deniability for themselves. So the more division that they're pretending to have between the U.S. and Israel, the worse thing, the more... the more catastrophic the thing is that they have Israel planned to do on their behalf, that they want plausible deniability from. And we remember them playing this theater all the way up before the 2025 strikes on Iran, the decapitation strikes on Iran in 2025. And they played the same game before this most recent round where, well, we told them we're in talks and we want talks, and Israel's going to undermine them.

And then, of course, it was, you know, there were no talks to begin with. They always planned to have these strikes. And I've pointed out in policy papers from all the way back in 2009, where they have entire chapters about using Israel as a proxy to provoke a war and to have the United States look like they had nothing to do with it. They wanted diplomacy, and it was Israel that forced them into the war. So they're just redoing this over and over and over again. I just hope people start spotting the pattern and trying to get ahead of this for the next round.

## **#Danny**

J.D. Vance went on to say in a different podcast that, in terms of the hierarchy between the U.S. and Israel, he said, and this is, I do believe, that the United States—Trump and the rest of the political elite in the United States—believe that the United States is the senior partner and Israel is the junior partner. And that could literally be read as the United States is senior, the top dog, the master, the alpha, and Israel is the proxy, so to speak. So, Brian, I think there are two things that happen when there is a perception being spread that the United States and Israel are experiencing a rift.

One, it definitely 100% creates a plausible liability, as you said, for the United States to absolve itself of responsibility everywhere—in West Asia, all the crimes against humanity, the genocide, all of it, and the war with Iran. I don't know if you remember this, Brian, all this rift, all this, oh, well, big bad calls with Netanyahu before the February 28th strikes. There were disagreements on whether to go to war with Iran or not, and then on February 28th, they were both launching standoff strikes in coordination with each other on Iran. They together were coordinating that attack. And the second part of this, I believe, too, is to distract from—to totally distract from—the fact that they are working in lockstep with each other.

So it's to create a plausible liability, make the United States look like it's not as involved in the region as it really is, and then to distract from the fact that the United States, definitely in lockstep with its junior partner Israel, has a hand in all of this and cannot be detached from that. So that's how I see it. I see it as a way to get people looking at something that is a lot more—how should I say—more simple and yet more complex than just, "These two parties are now at odds with each other because the U.S. needs a breather, wants peace, blah, blah, blah, and Israel just controls the United States." And so it doesn't happen.

## **#Brian Berletic**

Exactly. And again, I just want to bring up the other proxy war the United States is waging against Russia in Ukraine. We have to remind ourselves, all of these attacks that we see taking place deep inside Russia, these drone strikes—number one, it's admitted that the United States is behind these and driving them and directing them and enabling them. Number two, just from a standpoint of material reality, the United States is the only one with the capabilities of carrying out strikes like this—not just deep inside Russia, but the strikes on the ships exporting Russian energy. All of this is being enabled by the United States. The U.S. still maintains a command center in Germany overseeing the entire war.

And so when you see Europe and the U.S. pretend to have this huge divide, and the U.S. is like, "Well, we're not interested in Ukraine anymore," well, they're still literally running and driving the entire proxy war. And they're using Europe as the proxy there. They're creating plausible deniability. The increasing signs of provocations from Europe against Russia—the United States wants to distance itself from that, even while they are driving it. It's their proxy war. And this war against Iran and this war for primacy over West Asia is America's war. And Israel is just one of many proxies they have in the region. And you see them playing this game in parallel. Europe and West Asia—they're doing the exact same thing. They play the same game here in the Asia-Pacific region.

Oh, the Philippines are so brave. They're standing up to China in the South China Sea. That is 100% a U.S. operation enabled from A to Z by the U.S., directed by the U.S., and then promoted by the U.S., but they need to keep that illusion of distance because they are using the Philippines as a proxy. The whole point of having proxies is to have them do the dirty work for you, and as these policy papers point out, to absorb all of the retaliation and blame for when something goes wrong. It's the whole point. So this is why you have to pretend to have distance between yourself and your proxies. This is what enables it to be that much more convincing and effective. And so they're doing in West Asia what they're doing absolutely everywhere else. People should keep that in mind.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, and it works for both sides, too. This is why the whole "two cheeks of the same bottom," as George Galloway often puts it. But it just so happens that one cheek, the United States, is far bigger and, of course, has far more capacity to dictate to Israel. Yet there is a dynamic where the United States has allowed Israel to become a huge lobby group, all similar to major corporations and monopolies, where their moneyed classes, those who wield influence in that colony, can influence policy by money. But it's all symbiotic.

And the one symbiotic thing that is so interesting is that by allowing this dynamic to exist, the United States can hide the population, it can manage the narrative away from the actual crises, whether it's economic, military, all of it that are just exploding for the United States globally and domestically through its massively close relationship with Israel. And, you know, Israel commits these horrible

atrocities with the U.S.'s complete and utter backing. But the United States can veer people's attention over there, as you said, with plausible deniability, without necessarily having to be attached to it.

And then for Israel, it can, with this whole rift and this closeness of the relationship, make itself look like it's under siege again and again and again. And now there's a narrative through top brass in Israel that the United States is assisting and aiding and abetting a kind of siege of Israel, to the point where Ben-Gvir is saying that he wants to eradicate all of Lebanon and every thousand Lebanese mothers for one Israeli mother — all of this genocidal rhetoric. But it reinforces the siege mentality and reinforces the political narrative for Israel that, you know, everyone's at war with it, so it needs to always be at war. It seems like a very symbiotic relationship.

## **#Brian Berletic**

Yes, and this is exactly what I described in regard to the fake split between the U.S. and Europe. "Oh, the United States has abandoned us. And I know you don't want to, but we absolutely have to because Russia is an existential threat to us. Europe's future is at stake. You have to make these sacrifices. You have to give up social programs. You have to accept that we're going to redirect all this money to military spending. And we're going to have to include more and more of the population into the fighting itself. Eventually, we're going to end up feeding ourselves into this proxy war as well." But they're pretending that it's not a proxy war, that the U.S. has abandoned them. And this is exactly the same narrative that is taking place inside of Israel.

Oh, the Americans are abandoning us. They might even be working against us. And this is what will allow them to justify to their own public greater and more extreme measures to be taken — a heavier price taken out of the Israeli public. And also, doesn't it seem like this would be a great pathway toward justifying the use of nuclear weapons? Saying you're under siege, everyone has abandoned you, even the United States has abandoned you, and we have all of these threats everywhere. Don't you see how that will logically lead to the justification of using something like nuclear weapons, or something even short of that — the sort of highly destructive, genocidal advance that they have been making, say, across Gaza or now southern Lebanon?

## **#Danny**

Possibility of, quote-unquote, false flags — kind of incredibly damaging but yet persuasive kinds of military operations, intelligence operations that are meant to sway people's public opinion toward war. Right? Channel 12 and Channel 15 in Israel, this is what they said: maybe the U.S. needs another Pearl Harbor, 9/11, to realize that Israel is a true friend. I mean, you know, and let's be honest, there's all kinds of narratives about 9/11 and who did it, and some people believe Israel did it. No matter what people believe about that, just know that Israeli and U.S. intelligence — they are

very, very, very close. So let's just say that any of these kinds of false flags or intel operations that you may be suspicious of, you can't detach. You can't just say Israel. You always have to understand that Israel — that the United States is right there.

But this is something that could happen, that could very well be in play, although it's hard to see how that would truly persuade people toward what kind of war. Brian, I wanted to actually talk to you now about what is not being talked about as much, because the United States has, again, this contradiction. The U.S., as an empire, has wanted to, at least in terms of how it talks about its hegemony and how it talks about its overall so-called strategy for full-spectrum dominance, move away from the Middle East, West Asia, and toward the Asia-Pacific, toward China — control the Eurasian landmass as a whole, to knock out Russia and China. And it's stuck in West Asia, or should I say, as you outlined earlier, that there are big interests in West Asia still and always will be, likely as long as the U.S. is an empire.

But I wanted to talk to you about the National Defense Authorization Act, which is coming due. The U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services published this report on the fiscal year 2027 NDAA. Now, this is an annual act, by the way, that is constantly renewed. The NDAA establishes funding levels and authorities for the U.S. military and other critical defense priorities, ensuring America's armed forces have the training, equipment, and resources necessary to fulfill their mission. And here's the key statement from the Armed Services Committee facing an axis of aggressors, including China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea: the United States is now competing in the most perilous threat environment since World War II. This competition will determine whether the 21st century will be American-led or defined by authoritarian, autocratic regimes that care little for the needs of their citizens.

For that reason, we must be ready to deter conflicts and, if necessary, win them. To achieve this, we must advance significant reforms and modernize military capabilities, drive considerable competition in our defense industrial base, and solidify recruitment and retention in the ranks. So here is what they are hoping to allocate: \$1.15 trillion in fiscal year 2027. That's a massive increase for those who aren't counting. And here is the spread. Now, Brian, China was right up in there, and the Indo-Pacific region, by the way, in this document, by far holds almost two whole pages out of a five-page document as to where the U.S. military wants to focus. Your reaction to this and what's not being said as everyone's eyes are on West Asia at the moment?

## **#Brian Berletic**

Well, do you remember before President Trump was reelected, how everyone was saying that he was going to retreat to the Western Hemisphere, how they were going to abandon the pursuit of global primacy, and how they didn't even mention China or Russia in their defense policy papers and their statements? And now here they are just openly doing it because it's a bait and switch. And this is what they do every single election, no matter who it is. This is what they always do. And now they're openly admitting Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, just as it has always been, no matter who

you vote into power in the White House or into Congress, the House, or the Senate—it doesn't matter.

And these committees, they're bipartisan, they're made up of Republican and Democratic representatives and senators. And so what you're seeing is the true face of American foreign policy and the continuity of the agenda it is always, always pursuing. And yes, I have been saying this is all always about China. The war against Russia in Ukraine is about China. The war against Iran in West Asia is about China. Cutting down the export of energy from West Asia to China, but also the rest of Asia, is all about China. And people say, well, but Brian, the MOU, and they lifted the blockade.

People might have missed that during the actual fighting, up to 20% of production in the entire region was damaged and will be offline for the next months, maybe a year or more before that all comes back online, if it's allowed to come back online, if fighting doesn't disrupt it again. And so what they have already managed to do is reduce significantly the amount of energy going from West Asia to the rest of Asia. We're talking about South Asia, Southeast Asia, and of course, East Asia. And you have countries like South Korea, Japan, even the island province of Taiwan, here, Thailand, other countries in the region, signing deals with the United States for this LNG that the US has been bringing online for years before there was ever any need for it.

So this is something that they've definitely planned out. And the reason they're doing this is the same reason they did it to Europe. When you get a whole region of the planet dependent on you in terms of energy, and you've cut them off from cheap, reliable sources of energy, you are now exercising additional leverage over them, and you can use that leverage to continue feeding them into the proxy war you are waging against the targeted nation in the region. For Europe, that's Russia. For Asia, it's obviously China. And so they're going to get additional leverage over all of these countries. Will it be enough? I don't know.

That's something only time can tell us, but they now have this additional leverage over even countries like Thailand that have been building a much larger and stronger relationship with China than they have with the United States. But now the US has this additional leverage over them. All of these proxies, outright proxies like South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, they are now even deeper under the control of the United States because now there's this energy dimension to all of it. And that is going to allow the United States to enhance its encirclement, encroachment, and provocation of China here across the entire region. If you look at a map, you can see how they've been basically surrounding China all of this time. And that's what all of this is aimed at.

Now, they've cut a certain percentage of China's energy imports, and China's had to scramble to find that elsewhere. People talk about renewables, they talk about receiving additional energy from Russia. Yes, all of these things are possible, but they're going to take time. It's not a switch that you just flip and now it's instantly replaced and you're back in business. And people say, well, it's only a small percentage. But in a country the size of China, even a small percentage—you cannot, you cannot just go without that. Now, can they weather this? Yes, but this is just one aspect of a full-

spectrum campaign the US is waging against China. And so I've been following the events in the Philippines very closely. The United States has essentially turned it into the next Ukraine.

The armed forces in the Philippines are basically being run by the United States. The US is building up bases all across the existing bases. They're building them up for use against China. They've encouraged the Philippines to provoke China in the South China Sea over disputed waters that really have no benefit for the Philippines. If the Philippines were able to fully control these waters, it would really do nothing at all to help the Philippines as a nation versus the amount of trade that is done between the Philippines and China and the potential infrastructure projects that could be built between these two nations if the Philippines were actually pursuing their best interests and not being directed by the US at the expense of their interests.

And we see the same process repeating itself in Japan—the remilitarization of Japan. And people may or may not know this, but South Korea, which hosts thousands and thousands of US troops—in an armed conflict, the United States holds command over all South Korean troops. So again, if you think about it that way and the way it actually is in the region, the US is creating the same circumstances around Asia that the US created across the borders of Russia ahead of this conflict between Ukraine and Russia and increasingly the rest of Europe and Russia. And again, zooming out and looking at the big picture, you see the United States encouraging the Europeans to seize more and more ships carrying Russian energy.

You see the attacks on the ships continuing, supposedly Ukrainian maritime drones. And you see these strikes deep inside Russia continuing. A lot of this is all beta testing for what the U.S. plans to do vis-à-vis China. And it's just a matter of getting their proxies ready and provoking the right chain of events to get it all kicked off. And so as long as they're pursuing their military buildup in Asia, they continue the proxy war against Russia. I don't know why anyone would think they are genuinely interested in peace with Iran in West Asia when it's one piece of this entire puzzle that they're trying to put together.

## **#Danny**

The United States is certainly attempting to reassert its hegemony. But there are a lot of challenges to this that I'm wondering if you could comment on, especially in regard to the fact that right now, the United States seems to be in a race against time for its own self-induced economic crisis that's coming if the Iran situation remains the way it is. China's economic growth has not really been slowing down to any degree significant enough to change the dynamic that China's economy will soon be bigger than the United States'. And Russia does not seem to be in any way, shape, or form in a state of collapse.

In fact, it seems to be relatively stable in the position that it's in regarding the Ukraine conflict. So these are major options. And then North Korea, the DPRK, mainstream media has actually been talking about how even this other part of the axis of aggressors, as the NDAA said, seems to have

been quietly following a model where it has made itself more and more resilient to the sanctions that are the primary weapon of war against it by the United States. So talk about the challenges and how that leads to what I believe we're in. It's like this long war, which, yeah, indeed, the outcome has not yet been tallied.

## **#Brian Berletic**

A lot of people interpret my analysis and my pleas to not underestimate the United States—what it's capable of doing and what it is willing to do. They misinterpret that as me saying there's nothing that can be done to stop the United States. But I absolutely agree with you, Danny. The United States is out of time. They're racing against time, and they're doing increasingly extreme things to try to reassert hegemony around the world. And you can see how reckless this is. You can see how rushed it all is. You can see how they've abandoned any attempt to really justify it.

I mean, they do in a way, but not the way they used to, where they would spend a year or two or three to really create a pretext and get people on board. They don't have time for that, and so they're just rushing forward with it, hoping that enough people are on board to sustain all of this. We've talked about military-industrial capacity in the United States, how they don't have enough to wage the wars that they are themselves provoking all around the globe. They are trying to rely on their proxies to do this. They're increasingly relying on industrial capacity in Germany, even as they destroy it by cutting them off from cheap energy from Russia.

They're increasingly depending on industrial capacity in Japan and South Korea. They're talking about putting in factories to make weapons in the Philippines—an impoverished country in Southeast Asia that should be building up a civilian economy. Instead, they will be building up this false economy solely to support a U.S. war against China that will fully destroy the Philippines in the same way Ukraine is being destroyed. They're doing all of these things, but it's still not enough. Danny, you've been to China. I'm here in Asia. I see China's—you can feel their influence and their rise, and you can see the rest of the region rising with it.

It is on such a scale that it's hard to put into words and explain to people who have not seen it and experienced it themselves. It's not going to be enough for the United States. What they're trying to do is not going to be enough. And that's my actual warning. The fact that they really can't do anything to change it means they will be pushed toward more and more extreme and desperate measures to try to anyway. And my biggest fear is that they will do something that is going to just topple global stability altogether because they refuse to accept that they are no longer holding primacy over the globe.

And we already can see a glimpse of that with this war on Iran, the closure of the Strait of Hormuz, and the economic crisis that it has tipped off that people are already feeling all around the globe. That's just scratching the surface of the damage the United States is still capable of doing to the globe. So we have to wake people up to all of this, to tell them it's dangerous. The United States is

dangerous. Do not underestimate them, but it's not hopeless that multipolarism is emerging and rising. But we have to get ahead of these things. We can't constantly react to it. We need to get ahead of it.

And we have to understand the true source of it and stop allowing the daily political circus the West performs to divide and distract us. We have to see past that and see the actual interests driving this. And it is these giant corporations, these corporate monopolies that have reigned supreme in the Western world for generations. They're the ones that are driving all of this. If you recognize them and see them and point them out to other people, they will no longer be able to hide behind this political circus. And that'll be one less source of strength they can draw from as they pursue this desperate last-ditch chance at primacy. Thank you.