



Who Is Really Dragging the U.S. Into Israel's Wars?

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Glenn Greenwal (GG): You might remember that there's a president of the United States, a sitting president of the United States named Joe Biden. And as everybody knows, and it's the reason the Democrats forced him out of the race, he's not actually a cognitively functional person. He can pull himself together sometimes to read from a teleprompter, but it's been more than obvious for a long time, Americans have known it for a lot longer than the media or Democrats are willing to admit it, that Joe Biden is mentally incapacitated and obviously cannot make informed, complex decisions about the United States role in all of this. And yet he did appear yesterday at the White House where he was asked to comment on what the Israelis are doing in invading Lebanon. And he made his views as clear as Joe Biden in his current mental state can possibly make them. Listen to what he said.

Reporter: The fact that Israel may be now launching a limited operation into Lebanon, are you aware of that? Are you comfortable with their plans?

Joe Biden: I'm more aware than you might know, and I'm comfortable with them stopping. We should have a cease fire, now. Thank you.

GG: So that was pretty clear. Especially for a politician like Joe Biden, who has spent 50 years reflexively defending Israel almost more than any other politician in Israel. You note he was asked about the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. He did not say, I understand why the Israelis are doing it. I'm comfortable with their right to self-defence. He said, No, I'm not comfortable at that. What I'm comfortable with is a cease fire to stop the Israelis from entering Lebanon. So based on that, it seems pretty clear that Joe Biden did not authorise that invasion, did not say that the United States government should support Israel's invasion of Lebanon, much less get involved heavily and militarily with its own assets in order to facilitate an invasion of Lebanon, that Joe Biden, the president, in theory, constitutionally, said yesterday he actually opposes in a pretty angry way at the Israelis. And at some point, who can blame Joe Biden? I mean, he's been saying all sorts of things about what the Israelis should and shouldn't do, and they've been ignoring him in the most humiliating way possible. And yet, Joe Biden's statement yesterday has almost no connection to or reflection in what has become US policy toward the Israeli invasion, which is, the US officials are actually backing the Israeli military

invasion into Hezbollah [Lebanon]. So you have a president in the United States saying he's not comfortable with this invasion. What he's comfortable with is a cease fire to prevent it. And then somehow people inside the US government, unelected people who are unnamed, seem to have just overwritten what he said, as happened many times, by the way, during the Trump presidency, too. Trump actually ordered soldiers and US military assets removed from Syria and various generals and the CIA tricked him by just kind of moving it around, pretending that they did it, but really just defying his orders openly. And the media celebrated them for that. And I know it's a conspiracy to suggest that there's a deep state, a permanent power faction in Washington that gets this way no matter the outcome of elections, but this is classically that. Politico, to its credit, asked that question: Who's making these extremely consequential decisions about what appears to be the increasing US willingness, eagerness, to involve itself militarily in Israel's not just their attack on Gaza, which we've been financing and arming and defending and isolating ourselves in the world to diplomatically shield, but also militarily, to be more and more involved militarily, deploy more military assets to the region, put more soldiers of the United States in harm's way. Given what we just heard from Biden yesterday, that I'm not in favour of this invasion, and now the US government is doing the opposite. And so Politico is trying to find out who it is that's running the government. A question we've been asking for a long time and are kind of shocked that so few people have. This was yesterday in Politico quote: *US officials quietly backed Israel's military push against Hezbollah*. Quote, "The officials urged caution and stressed the need for diplomacy, but the timing was right for such a military shift, they concluded". So here you have Joe Biden saying, I'm very concerned about this invasion. I'm not comfortable with that. The only thing I'm comfortable with is a cessation of conflict between Israel and Lebanon. And then on the other hand, you have, quote, "US officials" making the decision that, quote, "the timing was ripe" for this invasion and therefore they are supporting it because, quote, "they concluded the time was right to do so". Here's the text, quote, "Senior White House figures privately told Israel that the US would support its decision to ramp up military pressure against Hezbollah – even as the Biden administration publicly urged the Israeli government in recent weeks to curtail its strikes, according to American and Israeli officials". Now, that statement alone. Should be stunning. That's a massive scandal. That the people, the United States elected to make decisions for the executive branch about war and peace and foreign affairs, apparently decided that they don't want this Israeli invasion of Lebanon, and yet US officials, who supposedly work under Joe Biden and are required to carry out his policies, made a completely different decision. Namely that they think the Israelis should be invading Hezbollah or invading Lebanon and that the US should be supporting it. Quote, "Presidential adviser Amos Hochstein and Brett McGurk, the White House coordinator for the Middle East, told top Israeli officials in recent weeks that the US agreed with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's broad strategy to shift Israel's military forces to focus on the north against Hezbollah in order to convince the group to engage in diplomatic talks to end the conflict, the officials told Politico". So just to underscore the point here, Joe Biden very publicly yesterday said he's opposed to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, is very concerned about it and does not want the US supporting it, instead wants the US pressuring a cease fire. But somehow, these two people, who are named here – let me just get that – presidential advisers Amos Hochstein and Brett McGurk, the White House coordinator for the Middle

East, told Israeli officials something completely different than what Joe Biden said, namely that inside the White House, they Amos Hochstein and Brett McGurk – elected to absolutely nothing – want the Israelis to invade Lebanon and we'll do everything possible to encourage it. The article goes on, quote, "Not everyone in the administration was on board with Israel's shift, despite support inside the White House, the officials said. The decision to focus on Hezbollah sparked division within the US government, drawing opposition from people inside the Pentagon, State Department and intelligence community who believed Israel's move against the Iran backed militia could drag American forces into yet another Middle East conflict". So this is not trivial opposition. You have, inside the Pentagon, the State Department and the intelligence community, deeply concerned that if Israel invades Lebanon and the US supports it, that that could drag American forces into yet another Middle East war. That's pretty significant. And yet somehow all of that was overridden by Hochstein and McGurk and, quote, "other top US national security officials". The article goes on, quote, "Behind the scenes, Hochstein, McGurk and other top US national security officials are describing Israel's Lebanon operations as a history defining moment, one that will reshape the Middle East for the better for years to come. The thinking goes Israel has obliterated Hezbollah as top command structure in Lebanon, severely undercutting the group's capabilities and weakened Iran, which has used Hezbollah as a proxy and power protector. The internal administration division seems to have dissipated somewhat in recent days, with top US officials convening Monday at the White House with President Joe Biden to discuss the situation on the ground. Most agree that the conflict, while fragile, can offer an opportunity to reduce Iran's influence in Lebanon and the region". Do you have any confidence that Joe Biden is participating in these meetings and any sort of a serious way?!

Here is a headline from the TRT World. Here, this question about who exactly these people are inside the White House who seemingly single handedly disregarded the consensus of the State Department, the military, the intelligence community, and apparently Joe Biden. That supporting the Israeli incursion into Lebanon could lead the United States, drag the United States into a conflict, another Middle East war on behalf of Israel. And so the question is: *Can the US envoy to the Middle East, an Israeli army veteran, end the war?* So one of the people that Politico says, one of the two, was most responsible for overriding those concerns and signalling to Israel, that they should invade Lebanon, and that they will have the support of the United States government if they do, despite what Joe Biden said as well, is this person. Quote, "Amos J. Hochstein, who was born in Israel to Jewish parents and served in that country's military, is an odd choice for the US to de-escalate tensions in the Middle East, including the Gaza war". Oh, do you think that's an odd choice? Somebody who was born in Israel and served in the Israeli military, who seems for whatever reason to have a free hand to override the concerns of most of the US government executive branch and the president, that we should not be encouraging or supporting Israel's incursion into Lebanon because of the very significant chance that the United States could be once again drawn into a new Middle East war. But when you have a president who's not functional, when you have an executive branch that is headless, where the president is drooling on a beach and the vice president is doing nothing but focussed on her presidential election, you're going to have these turf wars and somebody is going to emerge victorious, someone who the public doesn't even know, let

alone elected, to make the most consequential decisions that a country can make about whether to risk involving itself in a new war. One of the ironies of all of this is that supposedly the view of the United States is that sometimes it's necessary to use military force in order to make a diplomatic solution possible. That's one of the ways the US has been justifying the Israeli bombing of Beirut and the incursion into Lebanon: Oh, sometimes you have to use military force in order to de-escalate. Sometimes you have to escalate to de-escalate. Sometimes you have to use military force to foster a diplomatic resolution.

Here was Axios on September 21st, expressing this view, quote: *US fears war in Lebanon but hopes Israeli attacks will push Hezbollah to a deal*. Quote, "Israeli officials said their increasing attacks against Hezbollah are not intended to lead to war, but are an attempt to reach, quote, 'de-escalation through escalation'." Kind of like burning down the village in order to save it. "The officials said Israel believes putting more pressure on Hezbollah could push the militia to agree to a diplomatic deal that would return citizens to northern Israel and southern Lebanon, irrespective of the deadlocked negotiations to establish a cease fire in Gaza. U.S. officials told Axios they recognise Israel's rationale and agree with it, but stressed this is, quote, 'an extremely difficult calibration' that could easily go out of control and lead to an all out war". Which not to spoil things actually is what ended up happening. Here is Matthew Miller, the State Department spokesman, and a long time vocal supporter of Israel, when he was on MSNBC, when he served in prior administrations, now that he's the State Department spokesman, he's pretty much been the point man every day to stand up and not only defend the Israeli destruction of Gaza, but US financing and arming of it. And here is what Matthew Miller had to say about the US's view of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

Matthew Miller: I think sometimes people either misinterpret or have their own version of what a cease fire is. A cease fire is not one side in a conflict unilaterally putting down its arms and stopping the conflict. It is an agreement for both sides to stop the conflict. And in this case, what we have proposed is a 21 day cease fire where both sides would stop attacking the other and we would reach a diplomatic resolution. And we are going to continue to engage with our Israeli counterparts, with Lebanese counterparts and with other countries around the world to reach that objective. But at the same time, there are a couple of other things that are true as well, which is that, number one, military pressure can at times enable diplomacy. Of course, military pressure can also lead to miscalculation. It can lead to unintended consequences. And we're in conversations with Israel about...

GG: So this 21 day pause, or whatever, that they were saying they were working towards obviously did not happen. But this principle that he defended, that sometimes the only way you can get a diplomatic solution is if you show that you're willing to use military force and that military force can facilitate a diplomatic resolution, couldn't one make that exact argument in defence of Hezbollah's shelling of northern Israel in order to pressure the Israelis to stop bombing Gaza. And there's been a lot of reports that Nasrallah and Hezbollah made very clear to the Israelis that they would agree to peace, a cease fire, as long as Israel agreed to a cease fire in Gaza. And when the Israelis heard that, they concluded, we are never going to agree to a cease fire in Gaza, they've made that very clear, as even the U.S. has tried to

pressure them and everyone else unsuccessfully. They want to destroy Gaza and take it over, make it uninhabitable, dry those people out, that's the real goal, not the hostages or anything else. And the Israeli officials anonymously said to media, the reason we decided to kill Nasrallah is because he knew he wouldn't accept the peace deal. He made that very clear unless we agreed to a peace deal in Gaza, which we're not going to do. So this principle of sometimes you have to use military force to facilitate a diplomatic resolution, when Matthew Miller was invoking that in defence of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, isn't that also true, that principle, for what Hezbollah was doing? We're going to shell northern Israel in order to put pressure on you to agree to a diplomatic solution in Gaza. And by the way, isn't that also a justification for what Iran did both in April and today? Oh, we need to show a little bit of military force just to make clear that we have that capability, not because we want a war, but because that's sometimes the only way to facilitate a diplomatic resolution. But as we know, these principles only operate in one direction. Sort of like the principle that sovereign countries and their borders are sacred. That principle gets invoked to condemn the Russian invasion of Ukraine. But it gets instantly disregarded when it is time to justify the US invasion of Iraq or the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, and then suddenly borders are not sacred at all and sovereignty absolutely means nothing. And while a lot of Americans, drowning in Western propaganda, in American propaganda also apply these principles in a one sided way, do you think the rest of the world is that fooled? You don't think they see what the United States does with its power and the way it invokes these concepts when it suits them and it disregards them when it doesn't? I can promise you the rest of the world sees that. Here was Jake Sullivan today, the national security adviser for the Biden White House, vowing very unequivocally that the United States will absolutely involve itself in this new Middle East conflict in order to defend Israel.

Reporter: In April, after Iran struck Israel, the U.S. issued a number of sanctions as a consequence. This morning, the president said there would be severe consequences if Iran carried out this attack. What are those consequences? And are they more severe than sanctions?

Jake Sullivan: Totally legitimate question. And that answer will come based on the conversations and consultations we have with our Israeli counterparts. It's too soon for me to stand before you today and give you an answer. What I can tell you is this: We are proud of the actions that we've taken alongside Israel to protect and defend Israel. We have made clear that there will be consequences, severe consequences for this attack, and we will work with Israel to make that the case. Thank you very much.

GG: So, as always, Israeli Israeli wars are American wars. We are responsible for them. We pay for them. We finance them. We get involved with them. We stand by Israel. We fight with Israel and new wars if we have to. No matter what the rest of the world thinks. Now, by the way, very easy to forget that as all of this is happening, and last week the US announced it was sending \$8 billion more to Ukraine, drawing down \$8 billion more of the authorisation to send weapons to Ukraine to continue to fight a futile losing war with Russia, and the very next day announced that it was sending a half billion dollars to Israel to fuel all of this. Parts

of North Carolina and other parts of the Appalachia are drowning as a result of a hurricane. And the people who are the victims of that are getting very little help from the federal government. And that's because, as we've seen for many years, the establishment wings of each party have high priorities, none of which include the welfare of the American people. The only real priority that they ought to have, in theory, that's what they're elected to serve. The right wing journalist Sean Davis noticed the following about Mitch McConnell today. He said, quote, "Mitch McConnell represents a large swath of Appalachia. In the last week, he has tweeted about the UN, Israel, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Hezbollah and defence spending. But not a word about Hurricane Helene, or North Carolina, or flooding or helping the dying Appalachians". Which to me is about as perfect an expression of the priority scheme of the bipartisan ruling class in D.C. They love to spend huge amounts of money on foreign wars. They love to finance other countries. They're obsessed with who they're going to bomb. And as the communities that they represent continue to be destroyed, including basically drowning to death in a hurricane with very little federal intervention or federal resources being sent, they don't even pretend to care that much. Because in fact, they don't.

Now, while all of this is happening – as I said today, although there's been all this kind of hysteria about this attack on Israel and how terrorising it was to Israelis, and what a monstrous assault this was on Israel, even though not a hair on the head of a single Israeli, as far as we know, was harmed – the Israelis killed far more people, far more Palestinians just today alone than all these scary, terrible, monstrous missiles from Iran that landed in Israel that killed. Here from Reuters, quote: *Fighting rages as Israeli bombardment kills tens in Gaza*. Quote, "At a refugee camp, Israel killed at least 13 people. There has been no immediate comment by the Israeli army on these particular strikes. Palestinian Umm Hassan al-Durra was in Deir al-Balah where the bodies were taken. Quote, 'They targeted 14 sleeping people, adults and children. What can I tell you? They were not doing anything. They were sleeping'. Palestinian medics said another strike on a school sheltering Gazans killed multiple people". Could you even imagine Dana Bash making that sound that she made when she saw missiles falling harmlessly on Tel Aviv, Oh, my God, Oah... It really is the case, there's just no getting around it, that so much of how we see the Middle East, so much of our policy there, so much of how we react is based on the same calculation that the Israelis have embraced, namely that Jewish lives, the lives of Israelis are infinitely more valuable than the lives of Arabs in the region. There's just no denying it. That's the only thing that can explain how we can watch tens of thousands, if not more innocent people in Gaza be obliterated over the last 12 months by Israel, and then all of us turn around today and act like Israel is the besieged victim, when not a single Israeli died on a day that they killed more Palestinians. All of this coincided with a new report from Oxfam International that was released yesterday. And the title shows that it's a study analysing how many innocent people were killed in Gaza by the Israeli military over the last year. And here's the title, quote: *More women and children have been killed in Gaza by the Israeli military than any other recent conflict in a single year*. Quote, "Conservative figures show that more than 6000 women and 11,000 children were killed in Gaza by the Israeli military over the last 12 months. Data from 2004 to 2021 on direct conflict deaths from the Small Arms Survey estimates the highest number of women killed in a single year was 2,600 in Iraq in 2016. A report by the organisation Every Casualty

Counts examined information on over 11,000 children killed across the first 2.5 years of the Syrian conflict, an average of over 4700 deaths a year. UN reports on children in armed conflict over the last 18 years shows that no other conflict killed a higher number of civilians in one year". And for all the talk about how brutal and savage the Russian war in Ukraine was, there's been a higher number of children killed by the Israelis in Gaza, than the total number of Ukrainian civilians killed by Russia in the entire war over the last two and a half years. And so when it comes time to hear about how the US government has to defend Israel because Israel is besieged, there were Israelis going on television today saying, what country could possibly live like this? How can you tolerate this? With absolutely no self-awareness of what they've been doing to the people surrounding them; wiping out entire families every day, killing a thousand people alone in Beirut over the last week. When you actually look at it in context, it really becomes truly remarkable just how distorted the narrative is. But again, I just want to emphasise, this narrative is believed in the United States, is believed in Israel, is believed in Western Europe, it's believed in almost nowhere else around the world. And I see a lot of conservatives who defend Israel above all else, constantly saying, who cares what the rest of the world thinks? Well, if you're somebody who believes that stopping China or limiting China's influence is this existential, overarching priority, which they often say it is, saying, I don't care what the rest of the world thinks is the dumbest possible thing you could possibly say. A major reason China has been strengthened, as we're going to show you in a little bit, is precisely because of the perception in the world – not the, quote " international community", meaning our Western European allies and Australia and the United States – the actual world, the whole rest of the world about what the US is and what it has been doing and how that's alienating people and driving them into the arms of China.

Thanks for watching this clip from System Update, our live show that airs every Monday through Friday at 7 p.m. Eastern exclusively on Rumble. You can catch the full nightly shows live or view the backlog of episodes for free on our Rumble page. You can also find full episodes the morning after they air across all major podcasting platforms, including Spotify and Apple. All the information you need is linked below. We hope to see you there.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:
E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:
<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:
Link: [Click here](#)

The acTVism Munich e.V. association is a non-profit organization with legal capacity. The association pursues exclusively and directly non-profit and charitable purposes. Donations from Germany are tax-deductible. If you require a donation receipt, please send us an e-mail to: info@acTVism.org