

# Trump CARPET BOMBS Iran, Tehran Hits US Bases – All-Out War BACK | KJ Noh

KJ Noh discusses the restart of all out US war on Iran, what precipitated the over 80 strikes along Iran's coastal cities, and the beginning of Iran's retaliation. 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/spiritofho> #iran #iranwar #trump

## #Danny

Welcome, everyone. It's Danny Haiphong here. As you can see, I'm joined by KJ Noh. I want to begin with the news that we're going to cover. So, Trump has bombed Iran. It seems like full-scale war is indeed back on. The United States CENTCOM said that it struck over 80 targets in response to Iran's striking of five vessels in the Strait of Hormuz the day before. On July 7th, it carried out more than 80 strikes on Iran, focusing mainly on the Bandar Abbas area. Now, Iran says that these targets that were hit were indeed civilian targets. They were not military targets, but CENTCOM says otherwise. Now, Iran did answer back right away.

To begin, there were 85 targets hit by Iranian ballistic missiles and drones, including the Fifth Fleet headquarters in Bahrain and the Salman Port there, Ali al-Salem Air Base in Kuwait, and an MQ-9 Reaper drone was downed by Iran in the process. Now, the ceasefire has been declared over, KJ, on both sides. The IRGC has said there is no more ceasefire. Trump has said he's not going to talk to the Iranians, this scum leadership anymore of Iran. And Iran has said a crushing response is coming even further, which will include the closure of the Strait of Hormuz and a new target bank for its missiles and strikes. So, KJ, your thoughts on what all of this now signifies as this huge restart to the war begins?

## #KJ Noh

Well, you know, you and I have always said that the quote-unquote MOU is very, very fragile. It's a very, very temporary ceasefire. We expected this kind of constant reversion to war, and it seems like that is what is happening. As I've said before, the U.S. is not agreement-capable. Clearly, this was a U.S. provocation. It seems like they were encouraging a Qatari vessel and other vessels to travel along the Omani side. The Iranians have said, we don't want this to happen. And we have to understand the logic of this. Not only is it in the MOU that Iran will control who goes through, who

transits through the Strait of Hormuz, but remember, we are still at war, and they want to ensure that whatever goes in or goes out is properly declared and that they know that this isn't further escalation or further preparation for war, as could be the case if these ships travel through undeclared.

So I think that, you know, the ships were struck. The U.S. reacted in a, you know, disproportionate way, but also it violated the MOU, not simply by striking Iranian civilian targets, if the reports are correct, but also by undercutting the measures that they had to allow Iranian oil to be sold on the market. And so these are two big maneuvers, especially the second one. That one really is a deal breaker. And I think it's going to be hard to go back. We'll see. I mean, there's this constant pendulation, Jekyll and Hyde process that we've seen throughout the entire process. But I think this is a bad omen. I think that we can expect further escalation. Iran has demonstrated over and over again that it will give as good as it gets, and even more forcefully.

So I think the United States is going to see further attacks on its military assets. I'll just draw your attention to something I thought was pretty interesting, which was that Donald Trump claimed that the Islamic Republic of Iran had attacked the United States. And I thought that was, you know, very kind of striking, if you will, but I think it reveals the way in which even, you know, it's that Henry Kissinger dictum: to be an enemy of the United States is dangerous, and to be an ally is fatal. I mean, this is a follow-up to Trump's previous justification of the surprise attack on Iran by referencing Pearl Harbor in front of Takahichi.

And so, you know, people will explain it the way they see it. It's just a gaffe, it's confusion, it's the verbal equivalent of a friendly fire incident. But I think it reveals a deeper truth. You know, Trump equates Japan and Iran. Both are essentially alien enemies, despite the U.S. attempt to corral it into an ally in a proxy war. And so I think that, you know, Trump is, you know, deliberately and sometimes inadvertently revealing what he's really thinking, which is that being an ally of the United States is very dangerous. Japan is as much in the target crosshairs as Iran or any other country. And this is just a temporary, you know, utilization of U.S. quote-unquote allies as convenient proxies.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, you're either a target to be eliminated or you are a tool to be used. And both have very, very, very bad consequences for the world. Now, I'll just play exactly what you said, because this comes during the NATO summit where all of this is happening, where all of these decisions are being made to restart the war on Iran. And here's what you just mentioned.

## **#Donald Trump**

Which is one of the most beautiful in the world. It's one of the biggest, the Abraham Lincoln. And two months ago, we had 100—I told this story yesterday—we had 111 missiles shot by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

## **#Danny**

So quite the gaffe, but as you said, yeah, we can definitely read far more than just a gaffe into how the U.S. views those countries that it has any interactions with. Then I wanted to play Donald Trump's announcement. Well, this is the naval blockade announcement—that the blockade could also be coming back?

## **#Marco Rubio**

We need to. On your order, Mr. President, we will hit even more and even deeper because that's the consequence. And we may put down the blockade. We may put it back, the blockade. And it'll only be a blockade for Iran. Anybody else can have whatever they want. Of course, they'll drop some mines if they can, you know, if they can do it. But it's hard because we're taking out those little boats now with the same weapon we used to take out the drug lords and the boats coming in by sea.

## **#Danny**

So that's how Donald Trump is talking at the NATO summit. KJ, your reactions? Iran is saying that a lot of the shrapnel from the strikes hit civilians. And if it's true that the U.S. is hitting these small boats, the mosquito fleet, as it's been called, then that means there's been a significant number of casualties for Iran to also take note of and respond to.

## **#Danny**

Oh, it seems like we might have lost your connection, KJ. Are you still there?

## **#KJ Noh**

I think the first thing to remember is that currently the Iranians and also the Iraqis are.

## **#Danny**

Oh, no, you're good. You're good. Please, please, continue.

## **#KJ Noh**

Yes. So currently the Iranians and also the Iraqis are commemorating the funeral of the Supreme Leader Khamenei. And we know that this is the largest funeral turnout, you know, probably in history — I mean, at least 15 million by conservative estimates and probably much, much more. You know, that's comparable to close to a fifth of Iran's adult population that has turned out, and also now in Iraq, you know, significant turnout. And so that shows the level of resistance and defiance in the Iranian people, which is to say that if the United States re-escalates to war, it is in for, I think, a

very, very challenging period because resolve matters in war. Resolve is actually critical in war. And on the other hand, President Trump has said that, you know, he admitted that the United States is four weeks away from depletion of its oil reserves.

And so he's actually in a very difficult position. He's given away, he's shown his cards. And so he's both in a difficult position if he escalates to blockade, to bombing, further bombing, or boots on the ground. None of those options are actually viable, certainly not over the long term. As I said, Iran has greater resolve, it has a faster learning curve, it has an asymmetry of cost, it has an asymmetry of strategy, it has an asymmetry of geography — it has all the advantages on its side. And to equate the IRGC with some random drug traffickers or, more likely, fishermen, I think is very, very misguided. Perhaps, and perhaps already, they have hit many ships — according to recent reports, 20 — but those ships and those strategies will adapt.

And there'll be a new set of challenges and kinetic obstacles that I don't think the U.S. will find easy to navigate. So once again, I think escalation is the worst of all options. I don't think the U.S. should have been prompting the Qataris to break the agreements. And of course, Qatar is perfidious backwards and forwards. I mean, it's a fraudulent state, you know, from top to bottom. It just has good PR with a PR agency called Al Jazeera. But I think that fundamentally, once again, the U.S. is miscalculating. And I think it will see the resolve and the anger and the fury of the Iranian people once again. That fury that you see in the streets right now, I think will be translated into kinetic force one way or another.

## **#Danny**

Well, yeah, it seems like what's so, I think, stunning about this, KJ, is that it is happening during this funeral, and it does both. On the one hand, there were reports that the United States conducted these strikes in part because they believed the funeral gave them time to prepare for an Iranian response, while on the other hand, what you just said makes me think that actually the fact that you have tens of millions of people in Iran galvanized, organized around the mourning of their supreme leader, chanting revenge, and you're giving them a reason to want to push for even further revenge, that seems to do what the United States probably wants less of, which is to isolate any forces in Iran that are seeking some kind of compromise, no matter how real or imagined one may be able to happen. But let me just play first, before I get your reaction to that. This is how Donald Trump announced the end of the ceasefire, or at least for today, the end of the ceasefire.

## **#Speaker 1**

Is the ceasefire over? Is this fair done? Is the MOU dead?

## **#Marco Rubio**

It's a very interesting question. To me, I think it's over. They're scum. You know what scum is? They're scum. They're sick people. And they're vicious, violent people. And if they had a nuclear weapon, they'd use it. As far as I'm concerned, it's over. I'll speak to our negotiators. They want to negotiate. They're good people — Steve Witkoff, Jared Kushner. They have to come back to me. As far as I'm concerned, it's just a waste of time dealing with them. They're liars. We make a deal. If I make a deal with them, we have a deal. And he goes out, he talks. We make a deal. Everyone's agreed — no nuclear weapon. We make a deal. They go outside, talk to the press. They say, we never even talked about it. There's something wrong with them. They're cuckoo. As far as I'm concerned, it's over.

## **#Danny**

So that's how the news came that, you know, the oil markets are responding to that, KJ. But I mean, everything that he said — you replace Iran, you put the United States in — and that would be a factual assertion. But here we have him saying that Iran is the one that is violating the deal, that is, you know, crazy and wants to nuke, you know, wants to nuke the world. But your reaction to this — this is how that news broke.

## **#KJ Noh**

Yeah, I think you're absolutely correct, Danny. The accusations are confessions. Everything that they have accused Iran of applies to the United States. And I think it boils down to the fact — you know, sorry to be a broken record on this — what Sergei Lavrov said: the U.S. is agreement-incapable. Right from the get-go, from the signing of the MOU, it broke the first clause and then the fifth clause, and then the entire MOU is null and void because it's been broken, abrogated so many times by the United States, starting with the original agreement that there was to be no aggression and no threat of aggression. That was broken within hours of the signing. And once again, if we look back to history, you know, think about the Korean War. The negotiations actually took about two and a half years just to get to the point of a ceasefire.

And it took 150 meetings. I think we're in for the long haul on this. Certainly, I do not believe the U.S. has the capacity to prevail kinetically in any meaningful fashion. The MOU was essentially a surrender document on the part of the United States. It wouldn't have signed it if it had other options. Now it thinks that it has reloaded a little bit, that it can restart some kind of kinetic action. I don't think that's going to happen. Certainly, as I said before, the resolve of the Iranians to resist, to fight back, and to send a message to the United States is extraordinary. And I think that the U.S. is going to, once again, realize that far from being sick people, they're very, very deeply, profoundly committed to defending their sovereignty and their dignity.

I think that they're going to—I think the U.S. is in for more surprises. I just want to comment, you know, once again, going back to the propaganda apparatus. First, we see the complete erasure, or

the near-complete erasure, of the funeral in the mainstream media, or the spin that just minimizes it as much as possible. But I think that other commentators on the left have pointed out that this is really a turning point in West Asian politics. It really kind of reinvigorates the Iranian revolution in a way that we have not seen since 1979. It really galvanizes Iran's internal population, but also the entire Shia region, into a powerful force.

And, you know, within that kind of propaganda movement, you can see Al Jazeera claiming that Iran attacked these ships on purpose during the funeral because they wanted to essentially force the United States into, you know, a civilian situation, you know, a civilian strike. So, world upside down. Be very, very careful when we listen to the mainstream media because they're either going to erase the truth or they're going to give us something that is 180 degrees opposed to what is really happening. It's most likely the United States thought that it could use Iran's grieving period, mourning period, as a way to sneak its ships out and possibly instigate a provocation, which they thought would not happen while Iran was in this nationwide grieving period.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, that seems to be exactly the case. And you said we're in it for the long haul, KJ. Well, this is what Donald Trump said following those remarks about the ceasefire being over.

## **#Marco Rubio**

And so we hit him very hard last night. Very, very hard. Probably hit him hard again tonight. I'll give him a little warning—we're going to hit him hard tonight. But we'll see how it all works out. No, I'm happy with that.

## **#Danny**

So, it seems like, KJ, what we're going to see is more attacks. And I just want to put up one of the few Iranian responses, specifically from Iranian officials. This is from Mohammad Ghalibaf, the chief negotiator, speaker of the parliament, and envoy to China. He said, major MOU violations by the U. S., violating Iranian adjustments in the Strait, persistent threats of further strikes, reinstating oil sanctions, attacks on southern Iran, continued Zionist aggression on Lebanon, which was occurring simultaneously last night. There were airstrikes by Israel on Lebanon. The era of bullying and extortion is over. It leads nowhere. We don't fold. So, KJ, I'll just kick it back to you.

## **#KJ Noh**

Yeah, once again, I think it, you know, boils down to resolve. You know, I think the Iranian people and the Iranian leadership are galvanized. They're tempered. They're strengthened. You know, they know that this fight has been coming for, you know, 50 years, since 1979. They knew that the U.S. had it in for them. They knew Israel had it in for them. And finally, you know, the hammer has

dropped. The shoe has dropped. And they're in, you know, for the full fight. So I think, you know, the U.S., on the other hand, is in over its head. As I said, it doesn't have strong kinetic options. The magazine is depleted. Its forward basing is significantly impaired. And I think that, you know, they need to come to grips with reality.

Yes, they can hit civilian targets. Yes, they're capable of standoff attacks on defenseless schoolchildren and, you know, infrastructure. All of that is possible. But the fundamental equation, the asymmetries, the six asymmetries that I said give Iran, you know, an unbeatable advantage, do not change with any minor strikes. So I think that we may be in for the long haul, like the Korean War, which the U.S. also essentially lost, but took 150 meetings in two and a half years to work out. And of course, we should expect more Jekyll and Hyde behavior. We should expect more, you know, pendulating back and forth, more, you know, deceit and underhanded actions. And of course, more borderline behavior, because clearly that's what we're seeing here. It's a borderline case.

## **#Danny**

Well, the impact is already being felt on the oil markets, back to almost \$80 a barrel. That's just what is reported on Brent crude. But, of course, there are all kinds of intricacies about that that you can get into, KJ. Iran has also now suspended all negotiations with the United States, including a diplomatic channel — the last one — aimed at curbing the so-called nuclear program and blaming the direct threats on this. This is from an Iranian source to TASS. And then I just wanted your comment on this too, KJ. You know, Pete Hegseth was supposed to go to Israel.

There's been a lot of controversy, some division, it seems like brewing, where the U.S. wants to really get into the good graces of Turkey at once, to supply it with these F-35s, whatever that is worth. Israel is very much against this. And Pete Hegseth was supposed to go to Israel and smooth things over. Some have reported this was about coordinating strikes on Iran. I'm not so sure about that. That hasn't necessarily been verified. But your thoughts on these developments, because there's this wider picture here. Oftentimes when we're doing news, these conflicts end up in a vacuum. But there are a lot of other developments that are both affected by this war and also happening around this war. So your thoughts on this?

## **#KJ Noh**

Yeah, there's a lot of kind of complex, you know, footsie going on that we're not, you know, we're not fully privy to. But clearly, the U.S., you know, is trying to pull Turkey onto its side. You know, Turkey has always been a wannabe NATO Western country aspirant, starting with the Korean War. You know, it sent thousands of troops to Korea just to show that it could fight on the side of Western imperialism. So Turkey is, you know, trying to get its moment in the sun. Of course, Israel doesn't want that because its plans involve the greater Islam. You know, Israel's plans involve

demolishing Turkey. And so we can see, you know, the fissures, the fractures actually coming to the surface. I think you're probably right that Secretary Hegseth was going to Israel to try to see if they could smooth things over.

Right now, you know, Israel is in this kind of indeterminate state. You know, certainly the U.S. seems to be yanking on the chain a little bit more on its attack dog, and it's trying to see if it can maneuver, tug, or pull, get a little bit more of its own way. But, you know, Turkey, I think, is a very, very interesting country at the current moment. It also speaks to the weakness of NATO in general. You know, NATO has depleted itself. Multiple countries have said that, you know, we don't have any more munitions left. You know, we are stuck and trapped. And certainly that 5% military budget that the U.S. has been trying to nail them to the wall on is long and hard in coming because they are so dependent, and domestically their economies are all struggling.

So Turkey is the one that the U.S. wants to place its bets on, and it's throwing in the enticements of advanced weaponry, which Israel doesn't like. We still don't know about the F-35s. Trump has essentially thrown that out as a carrot, but we don't know if it will be delivered. But the other thing to remember right now is that even if the F-35s were delivered, they would probably be delivered without radar because currently, you know, the shortage of rare earth elements means that they can't, you know, make the radars. And so they would end up with some very, very expensive white elephants.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, I think the lesson here is that doing business with the United States often leads to feeling cheated. But nonetheless, that is where Turkey is pursuing its aims, as you said, as a wannabe NATO country. It is in NATO, but it has always felt unfairly treated. This goes back decades and decades, back when Samuel Huntington came out with *The Clash of Civilizations*, and Turkey was not so happy when a lot of neocons were adopting that theory and not necessarily excluding Turkey from the axis of evil, so to speak. But, KJ, now some have been wondering about what this continuation of war will really mean for not just Iran, but the rest of the multipolar world.

How do you see this? Some have been very critical now, even of, let's say, China's stance on this and how it hasn't maybe come more to the aid of Iran. I've been seeing some angry about this, but there were also others who were questioning from the start Iran's posture in this MOU negotiations process. And now that we're back at war, I mean, it seems like further proof that not only is the United States agreement incapable, but it really isn't diplomacy capable. It really can't even engage in this process, in large part because it simply doesn't want to and simply has no interest in doing so. What's your thoughts about the larger picture here in this regard?

## **#KJ Noh**

I think you're absolutely right. You know, the U.S. is not only agreement-incapable. Let's remember the 300-plus agreements that it abrogated with the Indigenous nations of the United States before it was the United States. Every single one of them abrogated. Same thing with Korea. Every major agreement the U.S. has ever signed has essentially been abrogated. So I think that that is kind of a starting point. And then, is it capable of diplomacy? Well, most certainly not. I mean, its diplomats think that their job is to insult and to threaten people. That's not diplomacy. That's gangsterism. I'm thinking of, for example, slightly different topic, but, you know, former ambassador-at-large, Moore Stan. He's in Korea, threatening the South Korean government and threatening President Lee Jae-myung, saying that he was a gang rapist and a murderer.

I mean, this is the kind of language and behavior that you're hearing from the top officials — the highest, most selected, the most, you know, renowned diplomats in the U.S. circuit. This is how they're speaking and behaving. Remember the other, you know, diplomat who was harassing a falafel vendor and saying that 5,000 murdered Palestinian kids is not enough. You know, this is the behavior with which they manifest. That is, it's sheer gangsterism. What's clearly being modeled with them is a kind of hypocritical arrogance combined with unbridled gangsterism. And so, yeah, I think diplomacy is, you know, a tough road. I don't believe that the U.S. is engaging in diplomatic talks in good faith. And so then what that means is, you know, we are probably back to significant amounts of kinetic war.

What does this mean for the multipolar world? Well, I think the first thing to understand is that the U.S., the further it goes down the path of war, the more and more it demonstrates its own weakness. Eventually, it will deplete all munitions. It will deplete all of its capacities to fight. The U.S. does not have a large military at this point. The military that it has is significantly demoralized. Its platforms, when they're not exorbitantly expensive or being depleted, are working very, very poorly and certainly not up to what they have advertised. And so I think that over the long term, Iran will show once again that it has the mettle, the strength, the power to prevail, as it has during the Ramadan War.

So then the question becomes, you know, what is China doing? What are other countries doing? Shouldn't they be helping more? Well, the first question to ask is, is Iran asking for help? If it's not, I don't think it's the duty of other countries to get involved and to pile on to, you know, a fight where, you know, nobody's help has been solicited. So I think already that is a, you know, misframing of the issue. But also, I think that, you know, what China and the multipolar world and the Global South are doing are probably the things that are most helpful — that is, continued trade, continued support, continued legal and diplomatic support. I think all of these things are invaluable.

There may be other forms of support that are being given that we don't know the specific details about, such as intelligence, ISR, and other technical support. These things are all possible. But I think what we do not want is a rapid pile-in of all the major powers and to turn this into a global war, the proportions of which will be unimaginable. If that happens, then we're very, very rapidly

going to see an escalation to nuclear warfare. And as I've said many times before, that is probably already in the plans, in the cards. This is why the U.S. equates Iran and Japan, because, you know, Japan — the U.S. nuked Japan, and the U.S. may be contemplating nuking Iran. So I think that is...

## **#Danny**

KJ, your connection is cutting out, so to speak. I hope we can get you back soon. Yeah, I mean, the minute that China intervenes in the war with Iran without Iran's request — and not only without Iran's request, but also, what kind of scope and support would that be? Immediately, it would turn into a nuclear standoff, I believe. And it seems like we have lost KJ for the moment. Everyone hit that like button, and we will bring him back in once he is back. Yeah, it looks like we've lost him completely. Hopefully, he's able to return soon — very soon. Nonetheless, the point here is that, yeah, that would turn into a nuclear standoff immediately.

And Iran, you know, whether it's cooperation or solidarity, yes, Iran will be the one to request such support. And if Iran isn't, then we have to understand that there are reasons for that, likely reasons being what I just said there. But nonetheless, some other reports I wanted to get to. It's just been announced by Iranian sources that eight military personnel were killed in these U.S. strikes yesterday. And here are just a bit more specifics on the targets. Okay, so Sirik Port, Qeshm Island, Bandar Abbas, Kharg Island. Most of the attacks, according to Iranian media, were on civilian areas, and, of course, military personnel, it appears, were mainly in these strikes on boats and on these coastal areas.

Now, it is very important to note that the United States still, even with what they said, the strikes amounted to four to five times the power of prior strikes 10 days ago, that these strikes still concentrate on the coastal areas and still end up being very brief in nature, lasting several hours, and then there being a pullback. So there obviously are a lot of calculations about the munitions that KJ and I were talking about and why Iran and why the United States do not go into a much deeper campaign than even this. But KJ is back. Hey, KJ, good to see you again. Please continue your thought there.

## **#KJ Noh**

Well, I was saying that there is a real risk of nuclear war. As we know, the neocons have been planning tactical nuclear war as part of a continuum with the conventional war. They see it as a kind of an interchangeable, seamless continuum. And so if this does escalate, where China and Russia all get involved in a war against Iran—right now, both the war in Ukraine and the war against Iran are relatively contained. There have been specific standoff strikes. From the Iranian perspective, it probably doesn't feel like it because they've had hundreds of thousands of sites attacked and certainly, you know, massive civilian losses. It doesn't feel like it. But relative to what could be the case, the war is still contained.

We're seeing, you know, pinpoint strikes, certainly on the part of Iran—just pinpoint strikes, for the most part, on military installations and bases. If China and Russia were to get involved—let's forget for a moment, let's rule out the fact that China's military is not set up for expeditionary war—but let's assume that China would get involved kinetically in some fashion, then I think we would see a rapid escalation to tactical nuclear strikes. The U.S. has already spoken; it tosses out this language very casually, that it's going to thin out Chinese troops with nuclear attacks. I mean, this is just... it's not even a point of debate that they have to justify. They're just going to do it. They're going to thin out Chinese troops with nuclear strikes.

And certainly, they're very capable of attacking Iran with nuclear strikes or using Israel as its nuclear proxy as well. So I think that the risk of nuclear escalation is very real. And I think those who are clamoring for unbridled horizontal and kinetic escalation with other countries joining in—these are usually people who have no experience of war, never been on the battlefield before, probably never even fired or held a weapon. And so it's very easy for them to get into this chicken hawk bravado. But I think that right now, the Global South should follow the lead of Iran and support its leadership in doing what it sees fit as the most important thing to do, rather than to pile on as Sunday quarterbacks telling other countries and other leaders what to do.

The key responsibility for the people in the Global North, in the belly of the beast, in the core of the empire, is to see if they can put pressure on their leadership to prevent further escalation. Because ultimately, if this escalates further, we've said that it's not simply, you know, the Global South and Iran or other small countries that will suffer. Certainly, already U.S. allies are in a very, very deep bind. South Korea and Japan are in all kinds of problems because of the shortage of petroleum, if that kicks back in. You know, Samsung and all of these companies that are actually serving as proxies for the U.S. industrial base will once again be knocked flat on their rear.

And of course, I've said this before, we're not just looking at a shortage of oil or diesel or natural gas. We're looking at a shortage of urea, sulfur, ammonia, naphtha, helium—all of these critical elements that are fundamental to the functioning of the global economy, industry, and global agriculture. Everything that you use is connected to hydrocarbons. That's where it comes from. And if you want to envision a world where you no longer have access to hydrocarbons and plastics and industrial fertilizer, you're going to be looking at a very, very impoverished and immiserated world. We're already headed there due to the contradictions of capital, but this will accelerate it in ways that I think people will be really, really astonished by.

## **#Danny**

Yes. And I wanted your comments on, you know, the news that came out while we were waiting for your return, KJ, that eight Iranian military personnel were killed in the strikes overnight. And now Donald Trump is saying not only are they going to continue these strikes, but also they're going to consider what we've been hearing ever since this war began, which is a possible invasion of Kharg Island.

## **#Donald Trump**

Desalination plants. We have to. I hate to do that. That's probably the one I would like not to do least. We attacked Kharg Island last night. We knocked out a piece. I said, don't touch the oil because maybe we'll take over Kharg Island. We may take over Kharg Island. There's not a thing they can do about it. But I said, don't hit the pipes, just hit everything else. They may hit it again tonight.

## **#Danny**

So that is what is being said. So desalination plants. So essentially making water a target in this war, as almost occurred in the first 37 days of the kinetic action. And once again, threatening a ground invasion of Kharg Island, which... for how many times have we heard that this would be a suicide mission by U.S. forces? So your thoughts on this? And it all leads into a potential catastrophic situation, as you just mentioned, KJ, for the global economy.

## **#KJ Noh**

Yeah, I mean, the first thing to point out is that attacks on civilian infrastructure such as desalination plants are a war crime. And, you know, once you cross that threshold—Iran does have desalination plants, but it is certainly not nearly as dependent on desalination plants as the U.S. Gulf allies, the U.S. proxies. They're all highly, highly dependent on desalination plants. So, you know, if push came to shove and it was tit for tat, the U.S. allies in the Gulf would rapidly see their countries incapable of sustaining human life, certainly not to, you know, the population levels that they currently have.

So essentially it would be a plan to, you know, wipe out, you know, habitability in the Gulf if Iran were to stoop to the same level. So I think that the United States needs to think about the consequences—certainly the consequences not simply of its words, but of its actions. If it does attack desalination plants, by, you know, the logic of tit for tat and certainly as a form of deterrence, I think it is not inconceivable, not inconceivable that Iran could, you know, reciprocate. And then the entire Gulf, you know, would be no longer capable of, you know, functioning as industrial states. Regarding Kharg Island, you know, both you and I have said that essentially it's a kill box. It's a suicide run.

Yes, the U.S. may be able to penetrate a small group of special forces in for a very short period, but it is impossible to hold. You know, the fact that you can enter an area doesn't mean that you can hold it. It is an island. Once you have troops in there, they would essentially be trapped, and it would be, you know, a kill box because that entire area is surrounded by the Zagros Mountains like an amphitheater overlooking a field. Essentially, those troops would be, you know, just—I mean, it

would be Dien Bien Phu all over again, any number, Khe Sanh, any number of, you know, historical catastrophes where the U.S. simply isolated a group of troops and then, you know, saw them be, you know, rapidly demolished.

So I think it's an act of madness. Certainly, if they were to take Kharg Island, they would have to take the entire Zagros Mountains as well. And that would require a ground invasion, probably in the range of anywhere from one to three million troops that the U.S. does not have. It would be like fighting the Vietnam War all over again because that entire area is comparable to the area of Vietnam. If they want to get bogged down in another Vietnam, but this time, you know, with a country that is, you know, not only fiercely resistant, as were the Vietnamese, but is an industrial power, then I think they have something else coming for them.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, I think people should imagine if the Vietnamese at the time of the U.S. war on Vietnam were armed with drones and ballistic missiles and things of this sort. The Vietnamese did not have that, even with Soviet and Chinese help. China was still very much underdeveloped, and the Soviet Union was very circumspect and specific about what it would provide Vietnam. So it was mainly small arms, and it was not major hard-hitting firepower. So that is what the U.S. is walking into if they invade Iran. Now, KJ, can the United States—the Trump administration—there's two parts to this, KJ. Can it continue to manipulate its way out of this global economic catastrophe that it is pushing the world through?

Donald Trump even acknowledged that oil prices will indeed go up by their actions, by his actions and by his regime's actions. And then two, how much does Israel factor into this? Because there are many in the audience who believe that this behavior can only be explained by the United States once again doing what is in Israel's interest. But maybe you can help us understand exactly what the convergence of interests between the U.S. and Israel are here, and whether the global economy can actually survive and be manipulated into a protection from global depression.

## **#KJ Noh**

I think we're already headed there, Danny. And certainly for the vast majority of the working class, we're already facing a depression. You know, if you average out the earnings of the ruling elite, then the picture looks better. But for the vast majority of the working class, certainly in the United States, certainly in the regions that I see, work with, and notice, I think we're already in a depression. The immiseration, I think, is abysmal. We're already in that depression, that deep downward spiral already. But it would get worse. It would get much, much worse. As I said, not simply stagflation, hyperinflation, as well as the breakdown of the industrial supply chain—naphtha, urea, sulfur, ammonia, gas, diesel, etc.

All of these things are potentially catastrophic for the global economy. Now, can the U.S. manipulate itself out of that? I don't think it has any more levers to pull. Frankly, what else can it do? I mean, strategic reserves are rapidly depleting. It is, you know, trying to cut off alternate sources of energy, and so it's, you know, preventing that also on the part of the EU. The EU is very foolishly, you know, going down that primrose path with them. And then, you know, what is the relationship between the United States and Israel? The U.S. is an imperial country, and Israel is a settler-colonial outpost of this imperial power. It's an attack dog. When the U.S. tells it what to do, Israel does it. When those interests align, Israel looks like it's getting its way, but it's actually because those interests were aligning. Israel does have its own agenda.

It wants to create a Greater Israel project. Yes, it does fund U.S. politicians. It does lobby them. But at the end of the day, when push comes to shove, if the U.S. says stop, Israel will stop, or it will find itself rapidly without any capacity to fight. The U.S. could cut off Israel's munitions and ISR and military platforms, and Israel would essentially be abandoned to the winds. And so Israel is a U.S. proxy. Anybody who thinks that it's just a matter of reining in, quote-unquote, the Israelis, doesn't understand geopolitics. Israel is a small country. It has some influence, but it does not have the inordinate influence that is imagined.

And when, ultimately, push comes to shove, if the U.S. makes a decision, Israel will have to follow it, or else it will be, you know, without any capacity. So I think, once again, this notion that if all we have to do is focus on Israel, then things will be better in the Middle East, that we won't have a war, etc.—all of these things are misguided. The U.S. has wanted war with Iran since 1979 onwards, and it's just been looking for the right moment. Yes, they, you know, wrote this plan, "Which Path to Persia," in which they said, you know, leave it to Bibi, we'll let Netanyahu do our dirty work—which is what they have been doing.

But they will also, you know, rein them in or control them as necessary. So once again, if you want to understand what's going on, if you want to make a difference, you have to see the cause, not the symptom. If you try and treat the symptom, if you try and battle the symptom, you're missing the point because, you know, the empire, the U.S. capitalist imperial empire, is the one that is actually driving the boat. And, of course, the Israelis are a useful way of disavowing U.S. complicity in all of this. But you have to understand it for, you know, that arm's-length screen that it is, rather than the actual dynamics of the situation.

## **#Danny**

Those are great points, KJ. And, you know, oftentimes I hear, oh, well, no, no, no, no, this cannot be the case because helping Israel is not in the U.S.'s interest. But I think we have to understand that the U.S. is not a monolith. There are things that are not in the interests of, let's say, the vast majority of people in the United States—maybe everyone that doesn't have a seven-figure, eight-figure net worth, for example—that isn't a millionaire or a billionaire. Maybe it's not in their interest.

But for those who do pull the levers of power, indeed, supporting Israel, supporting what it does in the region—especially when both of them, both the elites in the U.S. and the Israeli genocidal political class—they see Iran as a principal threat, and they see an unstable Middle East, as long as there's not a sovereign force, a sovereign entity in the region. They see it as much more easily controllable than if it were otherwise. So your comments on this, because I do often hear, well, it's not in the U.S.'s interest, but I would say that those who control the United States do see a war on Iran in their interest and also do see the alignments with Israel as being critical toward not just this end, but broader ends for West Asia and the region.

## **#KJ Noh**

The destruction of Iran has always been the target of the United States. It wants to take Iran back to, you know, the 1950s and 60s and 70s, when it had total control over Iran through a U.S. quisling. Of course, the Iranians will never let that happen. They didn't fight for three decades against a police state in order to be taken right back into it. So that will never happen. You know, just look at the resistance on the streets these last few days. But what the United States did not account for was the fact that Iran had grown strong and powerful during this period. Even during this period of five decades of siege, Iran continued to build out its strength, build out its industry, build out its schools, its intellectual class, etc.

So it is capable of resisting on the most forceful level of a modern industrialized state. When people say, well, it was not in our interest, what they mean is we're losing the war, and losing a war is not in your interest. But that just speaks to the overwhelming miscalculation, the pride, the arrogance, the hubris that led the U.S. to think that it would be a walkover, a cakewalk through Iran. They made the same error with Russia. They made the same error. They're making the same error with China as they escalate to war against China. As I said, this is the example of the grizzly bear fallacy that infects the U.S. ruling class.

You know, 6% of the U.S. population thinks they can fight a grizzly bear and beat it with their bare hands. Well, you know, the grizzly bear may have a thing or two to say about that. And in the case of Iran, you know, they've shown that they can certainly, you know, make their feelings known in the encounter. So, you know, let's get back to brass tacks. You know, how influential is Israel? Well, one example is the MOU itself. You know, when the U.S. signed the MOU with Iran, of course, taking into account that, you know, the U.S. is not agreement-capable. But even so, it had to put forth the pretense of signing this surrender document.

Israel was nowhere involved in that signing, although the provisions actually did cover Israeli behavior as well. So what this tells you is that the U.S. feels like, certainly at least, at the very least on paper, that it can speak for Israel. And Israel, you know, it does not even have a seat at the table. It is actually serving the table. So although Israel has clearly tried to abrogate it and to do what it can to undermine it from time to time, it has also had to comply with U.S. demands, at least

very briefly. And I think it sends the message that at the end of the day, the person leading is the United States. The U.S. is in the driver's seat. Israel is certainly a powerful engine, but the engine is not driving the car. The driver is.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, and then lastly, KJ, your final comments on this. As you mentioned before, now that we're in Iraq here, these are just the scenes in Iraq for the funeral of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei. And the images in Iran are just as, if not even more, impressive. Tens of millions have already participated in this funeral. It hasn't ended yet. I believe it ends tomorrow—don't quote me on that—but it ends very soon. Nonetheless, KJ, when you see this massive outpouring of mourning and gathering by the Iranian people, can the U.S. defeat this? I think this is the element people tend to forget—that wars not only involve weapons, weaponry, and strategy and all of this, but they tend to involve lots of people, and people end up determining at the end of it what kind of result the war brings. So your final thoughts on this as we begin to end the show.

## **#KJ Noh**

Well, you know, I think it boils down to, once again, as I said earlier, it boils down to resolve. And when we have the collective resolve of a people who are determined to resist, and if their determination to resist is also grounded in a tradition of martyrdom—the sheer tradition of martyrdom—then the U.S. has done exactly the worst thing for itself in terms of battlefield strategy. It has galvanized not just the Iranian population, but the entire Shia world. I think those were images from Najaf in Iraq, but it has galvanized the entire Shia world.

And I would venture to go so far as to say, possibly the working-class sections of the Sunni population as well, have been galvanized—all of them—and the U.S. has made itself the villain. If there were just a classic example of how to make yourself a villain and to do the most damaging thing possible in terms of, you know, people's beliefs, this would have been the thing—to kill off, you know, one of the highest leaders of the Shia faith. I think that is an absolute, absolute act of madness. And it shows that the U.S. was not thinking clearly, incapable of thinking dialectically, incapable of understanding that there are, you know, second-order, third-order effects—that you are going to get blowback.

All of this is an incapacity to think critically and dialectically. So the U.S., by assassinating General Qasem Soleimani, actually—you know, the die was cast when it did that. Essentially, it set the grounds for its loss by doing that decapitation. So I think the U.S. is in for, you know, if they haven't figured it out already, they're in for some hell, you know, very, very steep surprises. You know, even people like Mario Nawfal, who I think is, you know, working for Western intelligence agencies, said he was surprised at the turnout for the funeral.

So once again, look at the funeral, look at the feelings, the passions on the ground, and then ask yourself, what does that mean in terms of a country's resolve, its will to resist, its commitment to maintain its dignity and sovereignty? And then ask yourself, does the West have the same level of resolve and passion and, you know, commitment? I think the answer is no. Although the ruling imperial class certainly would like to sacrifice as much of its working class as cannon fodder as possible. You know, I think our job is to make sure that that doesn't happen, that, you know, we also have a voice, you know, in what happens with our destinies, our futures, our countries.

## **#Danny**

Very well said, KJ. Everybody, this is the end of the show, so please do hit the like button. That helps boost the show in the algorithm. I want to thank everyone who viewed, everyone who moderated today, and I, of course, want to thank KJ for coming on. So do hit that like button, do subscribe if you haven't, and all the places to support this channel are in the video description below. You can also be sure to find me tomorrow, same time. I'll let you know who's coming on with me then, a little bit closer to the show. All right, everybody, again, hit the like button. That helps boost the show so more people can hear what KJ had to say about these developments, and we will continue to follow them in the following days. See you then. Bye.