



## Israel's LIES About Iran's Nuclear Program DEBUNKED

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

**Glenn Greenwald:** One of the things that you realize for the first time if you live outside the United States is just how aberrational it is for a country to constantly spend its time talking about which country it ought to go to war with next. It's usually unheard of for most countries to even consider the possibility of a war with another country or bombing other countries or attacking other countries, let alone to actually do so. And in the United States we have an endless array, a really, literally endless array of military conflicts, bombing campaigns, wars, invasions, and all kinds of covert actions in other countries as well. And it always seems like the public grows increasingly tired of that. Poll after poll constantly demonstrates that people are eager for an end to endless wars, that these wars are not in the interest of American citizens or American interests. Candidates who run on a platform of being anti-war, of avoiding war, as Barack Obama did, as Donald Trump did, tend to do extremely well because they're telling the American people what they already want and believe, which is that these wars are being fought in a way that not only doesn't benefit their lives, but in so many ways undermines and subverts and prejudices it.

The war in Iraq is something that should have put an end to this forever. It was the supreme expression of a war begun and sold based on falsehoods and lies, not just about the cause of the war, but also how the war would end up being prosecuted. We were told, oh, it'd be over in a few weeks, we're so much more powerful than Iraq, we're just gonna remove the Saddam Hussein regime, we're gonna be welcomed as liberators, it's gonna be quick in and quick out and then we're gonna have freedom and democracy spreading throughout the Middle East. Absolutely none of that happened. All the people who told us those things, which ended up disproven and debunked, didn't lose any stature at all in Washington. If anything, they gained it and are more powerful than ever. And that's why basically 20 years later, the same people are back and have been back for the last 20 years, selling similar wars of regime change in Syria and Libya and getting us involved in all sorts of conflicts all around the world. Obama bombed multiple Muslim-majority countries, killing all sorts of civilians, generating anti-American hatred and instability. We fought in Afghanistan for 20 years. Soon as we left, the Taliban marched right back into power as though nothing had ever happened. Iraq went from – whatever else you think of Saddam Hussein, an actual adversary of Iran, to basically being a proxy state of Iran, strengthening Iran, the country we were told is the greatest terrorist regime on the planet. None of what we were told was going to happen actually happened. And that's true for essentially every single one of these conflicts.

And yet every time there's an attempt to sell the US and American citizens into participating in or funding a new war, as we're doing funding the Israeli destruction of Gaza, as we're

funding the Ukraine war with Russia. The propaganda is very intense, all you have to do is keep people's fear level high enough for a certain period of time to get them to sign on, or emotionally manipulate them enough to get them to sign on. And once they do, even if a few months later or a year they start regretting it, the war just continues. Without any end in sight, and the current target, clearly, openly, if you pay attention to the news at all, you would know, is a new war with Iran. It's being sold just like the war in Iraq, in the sense that, oh, this is a very limited war, don't worry, it's not going to be a full-on, years-long war, we're just going to go bomb a few of their nuclear reactors, or Israel is going to do it and we're going help them. And all the fear-mongering, "oh, Saddam Hussein was on the verge of getting nuclear weapons, he's going to hand it to Osama bin Laden, who will use it to smuggle nuclear weapons into that stage" – same exact narrative. Iran is just seconds away from getting a nuclear bomb, we can't allow them to do so, it would be the end of all of history. Everyone in the world would die. You're going to die if Iran gets a nuclear weapon or is allowed to get close. And therefore we have to go to war. And it's coming from the same people who have been debunked and exposed as liars over and over because in Washington there's an accountability free zone for people who advocate wars. In fact, they get more and more powerful both within the media and politics. It really doesn't make a difference what happened in the past. They're able to use the same tactics over and over.

Now the difference is that Donald Trump ran in 2016 on trying to break that bipartisan war policy of endless war. He ran not only against the Democratic party, but the Bush-Cheney regime. He had to do so. Jeb Bush was his primary opponent backed by the entire Republican establishment and all of the muddled interests that support the Bush family and the Republican party. And Trump prided himself and often boasted about the fact that he was one of the first, the only president in decades, not to involve the US in a new war. And by all accounts, there is massive pressure now being put on Trump, barely three months into his presidency, to go and bomb, just coincidentally, what happens to be Israel's primary enemy, the country that Netanyahu has dreamed of inducing the United States into bombing, which is Iran. Massive pressure is being put onto Trump, and by all accounts his posture seems to be he does not want a war with Iran on his legacy, that he prefers instead a diplomatic solution that would provide confidence that Iran is not able to obtain a nuclear weapon. There was an agreement along those lines negotiated not just by the Obama administration but with the help of many foreign countries, not just in Europe, but also Russia, that allowed inspectors in, that by all accounts had prevented Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Trump ran in 2016 on a promise to nullify that deal on the grounds that it was insufficient. He pulled out of that deal, all inspectors were gone. That is what has created the crisis that we're now in, or at least the ostensible crisis that we're now in where we're told that Iran is again close to a nuclear weapon. But at least this time there is serious division and serious debate taking place within the Trump administration on the question of whether or not that is in the United States' interest to pursue, notwithstanding the extreme amounts of pressure being placed on Trump and his administration by not just Israel, but the Legion, an army of Israel loyalists who are all over the United states, who are inside the US government.

And a lot of news outlets have been reporting, not just on the two camps within the Trump administration, the one that wants to take the diplomatic route and the one who wants to go the bombing route, but also giving a lot of details about who's on which side. And my own reporting, my own speaking to people very close to the Trump Administration absolutely aligns with several of these reports, including this one from Axios that was published on April 16th with the headline: *Trump Team's Iran Divide: Dialog Versus Detonation to End the Nuclear Threat*. Quote, "One camp, unofficially led by Vice President J.D. Vance believes

a diplomatic solution is both preferable and possible, and that the US should be ready to make compromises in order to make it happen. Vance is highly involved in the Iran policy discussions, another US official said. This camp also includes Trump's envoy, Steve Witkoff – who represented the US in the first round of Iran talks on Saturday – as well as Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth. It also gets outside support from MAGA influencer and Trump whisperer Tucker Carlson." Who I should say has been probably doing more, at least consequentially, to prevent a military conflict between the United States and Iran than almost anybody else, going back to when he had his Fox show during the Trump administration and denounced Trump's targeted killing of General Soleimani on the grounds that that was likely to provoke a war with Iran, or at least possibly would provoke a war with Iran, and there was no interest in doing that. So there is a group of serious influential people who have Trump's ear – JD Vance, Steve Witkoff, Tucker Carlson, Pete Hegseth – who are strongly in the camp of pursuing a diplomatic resolution. The Axios article goes on, quote: "This group is concerned that striking Iran's nuclear facilities would put US soldiers in the region in harm's way when Iran strikes back."

Remember, the United States has military bases all throughout the Middle East. I'm not talking here about sprawling, highly fortified military bases, basically small military bases of 1,000 troops here, 2,000 troops there – in Jordan, in Iraq, in Syria – that are not only highly vulnerable in theory, but that have been attacked over the last two years. Service members have died, US service members, at military bases attacked by drones, by Iraqi militias, by other forces in the region, and all of them will be extremely vulnerable to counter attack by Iran if the United States or some combination of the US and Israel attack Iran. This is a country three times the size of Iraq with a vastly more sophisticated military than Iraq had. You had a bunch of sheep herders, basically, in Afghanistan who fought off the US military for 20 years. And the idea that it will be easy to defeat Iran, which is what we were told about Iraq, a country with a fraction of the military strength and size as Iran, is a pure fairy tale. And there are lots of targets, human American targets in the Middle East, business targets in the Middle East – to say nothing of what the Axios article goes on to describe, quote: "They also argue a new conflict in the region would send oil prices skyrocketing at a very 'sensitive time' for the US economy", to put that mildly.

There are lots of very negative repercussions from a US military conflict with Iran on top of the fact that it has proven to be the case that maybe if you bomb Iran's nuclear facilities, you can slow down their program for a couple months. Iran is a vast country, geographically. It's extremely large. They have proven the capability to covertly put nuclear facilities underground, very, very far underground, and you can't eliminate the know-how. You may be able to eliminate the infrastructure, but you can't eliminate the know-how. And the more you go around attacking countries because they don't have nuclear weapons, while avoiding any conflict with the countries that do – note that we don't ever threaten military action against North Korea, or Pakistan, or India, or China, because those countries have nuclear weapons. We're creating a world in which any rational government would say to itself, wow, I'd better get nuclear weapons. Because that's the only way to prevent the United States or Israel or some combination of US allies, from constantly threatening my people and my country to attack. Nuclear weapons are the only thing that gives respect enough to deter these kinds of attacks.

The article goes on: "The other camp, which includes National Security Advisor Mike Waltz and Secretary of State Marco Rubio" – unsurprisingly two members of Congress with a long record of neoconservative militarism – "is highly suspicious of Iran and extremely skeptical

of the chances of a deal that significantly rolls back Iran's nuclear program, US officials say. Senators close to Trump, such as Lindsey Graham and Tom Cotton also hold that view. This camp believes Iran is weaker than ever, and therefore the US should not compromise but insist Tehran fully dismantle its nuclear program and should either strike Iran directly or support an Israeli strike if they don't. Iran hawks like Mark Dubowitz, CEO of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracy, are lobbying hard for that approach. Quote: 'The president once called the 2015 Obama deal with Iran fatally flawed. The question now is whether he still believes it', Dubowitz told Axios, warning against 'a warmed over Obama deal'."

In case you think that there's alarmism about the prospect of a US conflict with Iran or that it's just sort of a hyperbolic attempt to scare people into thinking that a war is likely to break out when it really isn't, consider the fact that a lot of people extremely close to the Trump administration, extremely supportive of the Trump administration and Donald Trump in particular, are warning that the likelihood is very high. And these are people who are not speculating from a distance. These are people very well connected to exactly what's going on at the highest levels of the Trump White House. On April 7, Tucker Carlson tweeted the following, quote: "Whatever you think of tariffs, it's clear now that this is the worst possible time for the United States to participate in a military strike in Iran. We can't afford it. Thousands of Americans would die. We'd lose the war that follows. Nothing would be more destructive to our country, and yet we're closer than ever thanks to unrelenting pressure from neocons. This is suicidal. Anyone advocating for conflict with Iran is not an ally of the United States, but an enemy." And he's saying that because it may be the case that if you're Israel, you want regime change in Iran. The United States once engineered regime change in Iran. It was in 1954 when we overthrew their democratically elected government, replaced him with the Shah of Iran that proceeded to dictatorily and savagely rule that country with an iron fist for the next 25 years until there was an Islamic revolution in 1979. And people wonder, why did this Islamic revolution constantly chant 'death to America'? It's probably because they know that we overthrew their government and imposed the savagery and brutality of the Shah of Iran, who crushed all kinds of dissent, all kinds of religious expression, and aligned himself as a puppet state with the United States and Israel. And every time we interfere that way in another country, and that's a story that has happened over and over with the same results on virtually every continent on the planet. And they wanna do that again. They wanna go in and try and change the regime again. That might be beneficial to Israel. I don't think so. But how would it improve the lives of American citizens?

Charlie Kirk, who also is very close to the Trump White House and a very vocal and important supporter of Donald Trump, on April 3rd said, quote, "It's going unnoticed because so much other news is happening, but the war drums are beating again in Washington. The warmongers worry this is their last chance to get the white whale they've been chasing for 30 years, an all-out regime change war against Iran. A new Middle East war would be a catastrophic mistake. One, our military stockpiles are depleted from three years of backing Ukraine. Our effort to restore manufacturing has only just begun and would take years to bear fruit. War would worsen our already immense deficit and national debt. Iran is larger than Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan combined. A war would not be easy and could easily become a calamity. Thanks to President Trump's restraint during his first term, America has a golden opportunity to pull away from Middle East quagmires for good. We shouldn't throw that opportunity away so that some DC has-beens can feel tough by sending young Americans to die yet again." Hard to say anything but amen to every word of that tweet.

Not just Tucker Carlson, not just Charlie Kirk, also Steve Bannon sounding the same alarms from The New Arab, April 18th. The headline, quote: *'Arrogant' Netanyahu trying to pressure US into an Iran attack, says Steve Bannon*. "Speaking on his podcast, Steve Bannon said Netanyahu, quote, 'forced his way' into meetings with Trump in a bid to win backing for a strike on Tehran's nuclear sites." Quote: "Trump insider Steve Bannon has accused Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of attempting to pressure the White House to approve a preemptive strike on Iran's nuclear facilities. Speaking on his podcast on Thursday, Trump's former chief strategist said Netanyahu had, quote, 'forced his way' into two meetings with the US president and accused him of, quote, 'arrogance' in trying to force the issue. Netanyahu has been to Washington twice since Trump's inauguration in January in a bid to lobby the White House into supporting Israel's escalation in Gaza and a military strike on Iran."

Now, I know the arguments in favor of the military strike, which is, well, we can't let Iran have a nuclear weapon. If we don't do anything, Iran's going to get a nuclear weapon, that's gonna be cataclysmic. There's a lot of reasons to doubt that Iran will get a nuclear weapon. But let's assume that they get one. I think there's a big question. Why would that be cataclysmic? It isn't Iran that has really demonstrated this sort of apocalyptic extremism over the past several years of bombing whatever country they want, of occupying whatever country they want, seizing territory – that's Israel that's doing that. It's currently occupying and has seized large parts of Syria, large parts of Lebanon. It's in the process of annexing the West Bank using military force and obviously has destroyed all civilian life in Gaza based on an increasingly religious fanaticism and nationalistic fanaticism of that government. Israel, of course, is the only country in the region that does have nuclear weapons. It has a massive stockpile of nuclear weapons, they got caught spying on the United States' nuclear program and other nuclear programs in order to acquire that. And people like Professor John Mearsheimer argue that why would it be destabilizing for Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon? A lot of countries have nuclear weapons. Iran and Pakistan have nuclear weapons. India and Pakistan have nuclear weapons. France and the UK have nuclear weapons. China has a nuclear weapon. Other countries too – Russia obviously has the largest stockpile of nuclear weapons. And his view is that if Iran had a nuclear weapon there'd be between Israel and Iran, they couldn't keep constantly threatening one another. There wouldn't be this constant threat of war in the Middle East.

But leave that aside, the idea that Iran is about to get a nuclear weapon, is just a couple weeks or months away – this is something that you would believe only if you're completely unaware of the history of these fear-mongering campaigns from Netanyahu and the Israeli government. They've been saying exactly the same thing for at least 15 years now. I just want to show you a little bit of this. Here's The Guardian from September of 2012 which is 13 years ago. The headline: *Benjamin Netanyahu demands a 'red line' to stop the Iran nuclear program*. "Israel's prime minister tells the UN General Assembly that Iran is more than 70% of the way to producing a nuclear weapon. Netanyahu marked a line near the top of the bomb" – he drew a graphic of a bomb, and there was a line there, – "beyond which he said Iran should not be allowed to pass. That line, representing 90% of the way to making a warhead, would be reached 'by next spring at most by next summer'. Netanyahu added, quote, 'from there it's only a few months, possibly a few weeks before they get enough enriched uranium for the first bomb'."

Now, at the time, there was actually a leaked report from Mossad in 2012 that said that was actually completely false. There you see from The Guardian: *Leaked cables shows that Netanyahu's Iran bomb claim was contradicted by Mossad*. There's that little primitive

graphic that he nonetheless showed to the UN, knowing it was false based on his own intelligence. But this is the sort of thing that the Israeli government has been doing for quite a long time. Here's what the Guardian said about that, quote: "Benjamin Netanyahu's dramatic declaration to world leaders in 2012 that Iran was about a year away from making a nuclear bomb was contradicted by his own secret service, according to a top secret Mossad document. Brandishing a cartoon of a bomb with a red line to illustrate his point, the Israeli Prime Minister warned the UN in New York that Iran would be able to build nuclear weapons the following year and called for action to halt that process. But in a secret report shared with South Africa a few weeks later, Israel's intelligence agency concluded that Iran was, quote, 'not performing the activity necessary to produce weapons'. The Mossad briefing about Iran's nuclear program in 2012 was in stark contrast to the alarmist tone set by Netanyahu, who has long presented the Iranian nuclear program as an existential threat to Israel and a huge risk to world security. Behind the scenes, Mossad took a different view. In a report shared with South African spies on October 22, 2012, but likely written earlier, it conceded that Iran was, quote, 'working to close gaps in areas that appear legitimate, such as enrichment reactors, which will reduce the time required to produce weapons from the time the instruction is actually given'. But the report also states that Iran, quote, 'does not appear to be ready' to enrich uranium to the higher levels necessary for nuclear weapons. To build a bomb requires enrichment to 90%. Mossad estimated that Iran then had about 100 kilograms of material enriched to 20%. Iran has always said it is developing a nuclear program for civilian energy purposes."

These are the people who have lied continuously. These are people who told you Iraq had a nuclear program. That Saddam was in the market for nuclear weapons, that he had biological and chemical weapons, which induced people to invade Iraq at huge cost to the United States, to Iraq, to the entire region. Who in their right mind would believe them now with the same exact claims but about a different Israeli enemy? The Jerusalem Post, February 2013, headline: *Netanyahu: Iran is closer than ever to a nuclear bomb*. Quote, "Iran is closer today than ever before to obtaining the necessary enriched uranium for a nuclear bomb, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said on Thursday evening. He was reacting to the publication of details of a confidential report by the International Atomic Energy Agency that Iran had begun installing advanced centrifuges at its main uranium enrichment plant. Netanyahu termed the report, quote, 'very grave' and said it proved that Iran was moving swiftly toward the red line he had set out at the United Nations in September. He said during that address that Iran must be stopped before it crossed the line, something he said at the time could happen as early as the spring."

Lots of domestic criticism happened in Israel at the time from Netanyahu's very exaggerated claims. Here, former prime minister Olmert criticizes Netanyahu's alarmism, from Ynet News in April 2013. *Olmert: Iranian threat is exaggerated*. "Former prime minister says Iranian nuclear program is not progressing, calls on Netanyahu to work intelligently and calmly with US leaders". So over and over, this is the sort of thing that has happened. Here from The Jerusalem Post, months later, July of 2013 – *Netanyahu: Iran is 'weeks away' from crossing the red line*. This is 2013. "Weeks away". The Times of Israel from January of 2013, *Netanyahu: Iran set back only six weeks by nuclear deal*. "Prime Minister said the whole world notes Iran is after nukes. Final agreement will be the true test of Tehran's intentions". Here's The Times of Israel, three years later, March of 2015, when Obama was negotiating the nuclear deal. *Netanyahu: the deal will leave Iran 'less than a year' away from having a bomb*. Quote, "The time Iran will need to break out of a nuclear program if it signs a deal with world powers in Lausanne, quote, 'will be reduced to less than a year and probably a lot

less than that', the Prime Minister warned. Such a deal, whose emerging terms have been the subject of many reports, would, quote, 'pave the way to a nuclear weapon'." That was the deal that ultimately was signed. Iran did not get a bomb in less than a year, to say nothing of far less than that. Do you see the relentless tsunami of propaganda coming from Israel, Netanyahu, and its legion of supporters trying to induce the United States to participate in an attack on Iran based on the sort of propaganda that induced the United State to attack Saddam Hussein? Look at how many times these warnings have been issued with great urgency – 'Iran is weeks away, months away, if you do the Iran deal, they're going to get it in a year or far less'. None of it ever happens. At some point, a rational person has to start doubting these claims.

Thanks for watching this clip from System Update, our live show that airs every Monday through Friday at 7pm 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](#)