



Israel Attacks Iran: What's Behind the Escalation

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

Dimitri Lascaris: Good day, this is Dimitri Lascaris coming to you from Beirut, Lebanon on June 9, 2026 for Reason2Resist. I'm currently seated in my hotel room in central Beirut. I am awaiting news from our colleague Laith Marouf at Free Palestine TV about whether we have obtained security clearance to travel to an area near the front line of the war in Lebanon. And that news should be coming in at any minute. But while I was waiting, I wanted to take the opportunity to update you on what transpired in the past 24 hours and where I think everything is heading based upon currently available information. By the way, as I'm speaking, you may hear a buzz in the background. I'll just pause talking for a moment so you can hear it better. That is the sound of an Israeli drone flying over central Beirut. It has been a constant during my time in Beirut over the past five days. And it's remarkable to see the people of this city going about their daily business as if this noise and this menace isn't there but over time I guess people become acclimatized to it, particularly when you live beside a genocidal monster like Israel, it's just part of life apparently. In any case, I want to start today's report by asking you to like and share this video if you find it to be informative. And if you're not already a subscriber to Reason2Resist, please become one and help us to expand the reach of our unapologetic resistance journalism. We have just passed the threshold of 180,000 subscribers. Our goal is to get to 200,000 before the end of this summer, which would mark the two year anniversary of the founding of Reason2Resist. So you can help us to get there within our goal.

Now, I want to start by focusing the first part of our report on yet another article written by Barak Ravid, the former Israeli intelligence officer who now masquerades as a journalist at the US corporate media outlet Axios. Ravid, an Israeli-American, has become the go-to person in the US corporate media for the Trump regime to advance its narratives about what is happening in this region and particularly in the genocidal wars on Lebanon and Palestine and the war of aggression on Iran. He just put out a lengthy article, based on the accounts of unnamed officials from both the Israeli and US regimes, and also in significant part on a direct interview done by Trump over the phone apparently with Ravid yesterday. And the whole tenor of this article, which I'm going to take you through in some detail, and the reason why I'm doing this, is because it is apparently having a lot of influence on the public

discourse around what happened during the past 48 hours. It's deceiving a lot of people into misinterpreting these events in ways that are potentially harmful to us all. And that is the only reason why I'm going to commit any time talking about this piece of journalistic toilet paper.

So let me begin with the headline right out of the gate. *Behind the scenes: How Israel and Iran nearly pulled Trump back to war.* At the very beginning Ravid is casting Trump as the reluctant participant in this criminal war of aggression, the man of peace who is trying desperately as the only adult in the room to separate these quarreling brats, the leaders of Iran and Israel, and cause them to act in a sensible manner. That is the overall thrust of the article and it's conveyed immediately in the headline. Ravid begins by writing: "The past 24 hours underscored the risk of the US once again being ensnared" – yes, the US is getting trapped in a war that it doesn't want to be a part of, even though without the US's participation, the war would not be happening. The US has caused the war, but we are being led to believe by Ravid by this and every other article he's written about this subject, that the US, Trump in particular, is trying to extract himself from a war that he never really wanted to participate in.

And then, Ravid goes on. And he writes: "100 days into the conflict, Trump still has not secured an elusive deal to end the war and spent the last 24 hours scrambling to avoid its full-scale resumption". So again, Trump is the adult in the room who's trying to stop this insanity and if only he was able to deal with more reasonable, sensible adults. Now, Ravid then says: "Trump found himself in a dilemma. On the one hand, he understood it would be nearly impossible for his key ally, Benjamin Netanyahu, to let an Iranian missile attack go unanswered. On the other hand, he was concerned the tit for tat would lead to all-out war. Trump told Axios in a phone interview that he'd warned the Israeli prime minister if he went back to war with Iran, he might find himself fighting alone".

Ravid then continues: "An Israeli source", according to Ravid, "said that the Israeli military notified CENTCOM" – that's the segment of the US military that operates in the region of West Asia – "ahead of the strike in Beirut, but not the White House". So any suggestion by Trump or his underlings in the White house that he had no foreknowledge of this and didn't approve it is more or less being contradicted here by a source in the Israeli government. Why would they tell CENTCOM, but not the White House, if they knew that this was potentially going to result in a resumption of a full-blown war? And they know that Trump, the supposed adult in the room, is trying to avoid that? Are we really to believe that the Israeli government, that Netanyahu himself, would not give direct notification of his intentions to Donald Trump? But let's suppose for the sake of argument that they didn't tell. Trump directly before they proceeded with these attacks on Iran, and that they only told CENTCOM. Well, unquestionably, CENTCOM would have immediately reported that news to the White House. So there's no question that the White House knew in advance that the escalation was coming.

"Iran then launched missiles toward Israel, as it had vowed to do if Israel struck the Lebanese capital. Some in the IDF had believed that was an empty threat". Well, they proved to be disastrously wrong, as we now know. "And from that point things escalated quickly". Now again, we're supposed to believe here that Israel was not assisted in this regard, as if Israel has

the targeting intelligence, the intelligence-gathering capabilities that the United States military has, the satellite constellations, the refueling capacity, the air defense capacity to defend itself from Iranian attacks without the the American military's massive intervention. All of that, of course, is bullocks. Israel desperately needs the assistance of the United States to launch attacks on Iran. It needs the air defense capabilities of the US to protect it from Iranian attacks. It needs munitions. It needs targeting data. It needs refueling in the case of attacks that are launched from Israeli war planes. So the whole notion that this attack was carried out without the extensive involvement of the US military is simply laughable, frankly. But that's what Ravid wants you to believe. And that's clearly also what Netanyahu and Trump want you to believe.

Now Ravid goes on and says: "Behind the scenes, Trump called Netanyahu on Sunday evening and asked him not to retaliate". Really? He asked Israel not to strike back at Iran, when Iran was lobbying missiles and drones at Israel? "Trump argued that either he would get a deal with Iran in a few days that would make the strikes unnecessary, or he wouldn't, in which case he might lead the strikes on Iran, an Israeli source briefed on the call said". And then further on, Ravid writes: "The call ended without a clear decision from Netanyahu. Some US officials who were on the call felt the president had managed to buy more time". The suggestion here seems to be that Trump can't control Israel, even though Israel is existentially dependent upon the United States for military, economic, political, and legal support and protection.

Then Ravid writes: "Netanyahu on the other hand felt that while Trump was opposed to retaliatory strikes, it was not a firm 'don't'". And then Ravid writes: "After the meeting with his security chief and IDF commanders Netanyahu informed the White House that he decided to proceed with the strikes. Trump claimed in the interview that 'Israel gave us very late notice' about Sunday's strikes. 'They were already on their way but eventually I had the Israeli strike limited'. An Israeli official confirmed that Netanyahu and other Israeli officials spoke to Secretary of State Marco Rubio on Sunday night to reach an understanding over the targets that would be attacked". So, we have admissions in these articles despite the attempt to persuade the public that the US was not itself involved in the execution of these attacks, in the carrying out of the attacks, that CENTCOM was notified in advance, that there were discussions between Netanyahu and Trump about whether the attack should happen at all, and that there discussions between Rubio and other Israeli officials in which they jointly selected the targets that would be hit.

And it doesn't stop there, you will see later on, a statement that the Israeli military relied upon the United States air defense systems in the region to protect Israel from incoming Iranian strikes. So Ravid then writes: "Two more rounds of strikes and counter strikes took place on Monday morning, bringing the situation perilously close to all-out war. While the US military didn't participate in the Israeli attacks, it did help the idea intercept incoming Iranian missiles, two US defense officials said". So despite all of the Kabuki theater, it is abundantly clear from this article that the US in fact played a very significant role in the planning of the attacks and in defending Israel from the retaliatory strikes from Iran. And I would suggest

that it went much further than that and that they are concealing the full extent of US military involvement in this latest act of aggression against Lebanon and Iran.

Now, Ravid then writes. "Trump told Axios he got calls from five different countries in the region asking him to press Netanyahu to stop". Then Ravid says that "Israel was preparing for the biggest wave of strikes on Iran since April with dozens of sensitive targets to be attacked on Monday, according to two Israeli officials". Yes, big bad Israel was ready to deliver a devastating blow to Iran without the United States direct involvement – bullocks, I say. "Then Trump called Netanyahu and asked him to stop the strikes. 'I said, Bibi, you better be careful or you will be on your own very soon'". This is what Trump says to Axios. "An Israeli source said there were disagreements on the call, but it ended with Netanyahu agreeing to stand down if the Iranians didn't attack". Now, assuming that all of this happened, what it reveals is that when Trump wants to reign in Netanyahu, he can, in fact, reign in Netanyahu. And finally, Ravid says here: "After the call, Netanyahu told the senior military commanders to cancel the strikes".

The very last paragraph of this article is probably the truest thing that Ravid writes in the entire piece of toilet paper. And he quotes here a US official who says, on the bottom half of this screenshot: "Bibi needs the war to continue to stay politically alive in Israel and Trump needs the war to end to stay politically alive in the US". Now this harkens back to something that I've been saying for weeks, and that is that the polls in the United States and Israel show dramatically different attitudes towards this war. The polls in United States show that a large majority of Americans hate this war and want it to be brought to an end, and think that it should never have been launched to begin with, whereas polls in Israel show that the large majority of the genocidal maniacs who live in that country want the war to continue and even to escalate.

So in order to advance their own political interests at a time when both of them are facing key elections, Trump is soon going to find himself campaigning in the midterms and there is a national election about to take place in Israel in the second half of this year. In order to maximize their chances of winning in these all-important elections, Trump is posing, has to pose as the person who's trying to stop the war and Netanyahu has to pose as the person who's trying to prolong the war and even escalate it. That's how they will win votes. Trump wants, at the end of the day, that any blame that American voters place on the continuation of the war placed on Netanyahu and for Trump himself to receive a free pass from voters, even to receive their support at the polls because he did everything he can to restrain the mad dog in Tel Aviv.

But the fact of the matter is, folks, that the actions of the Trump regime speak louder than words. They always do. And what are those actions? The United States continues to provide munitions to Israel, it continues to provide air defense capabilities to Israel, it continues to provide intelligence to Israel, it continues to provide economic support, legal protection, rhetorical support, support in every imaginable way, so that Israel can continue to carry out its crimes. The actions of the United States government, of the Trump regime, show beyond a

shadow of a doubt that its goal remains the same, and that is to destroy Iran. That of course is the goal of Netanyahu, he doesn't even pretend that it isn't. Trump has to put on a pretense because voters want him to put a stop to this insanity in the United States, but as I say his actions reveal that he remains committed to that goal. And unless and until he deprives Israel of the means to carry out these monstrous crimes, you should assume that he remains committed to the goal of Iran's destruction and the destruction of Lebanon, I might add, as well as the Palestinian people who continue to be subjected to a genocide with the full-blown support of the White House every single day. So, this is all Kabuki theater. I urge all of you not to be taken in by it, as so many people in the public discourse seem to have done.

A couple of other militarily related pieces of information I want to share with you before I talk about where I think all of this is heading. First, the New York Times just reported a couple of hours ago that according to US officials, an Apache helicopter gunship went down in the Strait of Hormuz yesterday. The US officials claimed that the two pilots were rescued safely, but they were unable to state whether the Apache helicopter had been shot down or whether it crashed due to a mechanical failure. Apparently, this is under investigation, according to these officials. Whatever the cause of the crash may have been, this basically means that the US military has flushed another \$50 million down the toilet in this criminal war of aggression because that's what these helicopter gunships apparently cost. Another piece of related news on the military front, a video has just been published on resistance channels of a drone strike on the Kurdish separatist military base in the Kurdistan region of Iraq. And here is that video.

So you can see, my friends, that this war is going on every single day. There really is no ceasefire in any part of this region. Not in Palestine, not in Lebanon, not in Syria, not in the Persian Gulf, not in Iran, nowhere. Not in Yemen. This is a war whose intensity waxes and wanes. Some days, like yesterday, it's extremely intense, and other days it's a low intensity war. And by the way, this is a normal feature of war. Levels of intensity do not remain constant. And when they escalate, they often do not escalate in a linear manner. So we should basically just stop using the word ceasefire to describe anything that's going on right now in this region. There ain't no ceasefire, and there isn't going to be when you're dealing with genocidal maniacs like Netanyahu and Trump, and all the people who surround them in their halls of power.

The other thing that we can take away from this news is that the United States and Israel continue to take a beating and this leads me to my interpretation of what is going on here. And let me preface what I'm about to say by acknowledging that I have very limited information about the degree of damage that Iran inflicted upon Israel yesterday, but I would suggest to you that a more plausible explanation for the fact that Israel stopped firing is that its political and military leadership was taken aback by the ferocity of the Iranian attack and the efficacy of the strikes. And in that regard, I think it is pertinent to take note of the types of munitions that were actually used by the Iranians in these strikes.

According to Iranian military sources who spoke to the Iranian media outlet Fars News, yesterday, Iran used upgraded versions of the Kheibar Shekan missiles. Their speeds, according to the Iranian military, of the upgraded versions of these missiles, reaches about Mach 9 during the dive, making it very difficult to get intercepted by the very best air defense systems that the US and Israel have, namely the THAAD missile system of the United States and the Arrow missile system of Israel, which is apparently basically just a somewhat modified version of the Patriot air defense system of the United States. And based on expertise of people in this field – and I'm thinking here particularly of Theodore Postol, the Professor Emeritus of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the leading missile experts in the United States and the world – taking out missiles that are traveling at those speeds are well nigh impossible. Very, very few of them are struck. And so, if in fact Iran used missiles that travel at those velocities, I would imagine – and they didn't just launch one or two of them, the reports are that they launched tens of missiles and advanced jet-powered drones at Israel yesterday – I would imagine that the damage that was done was quite extensive. And to me, it's much more believable that Israel decided to pull the plug on this round of escalation because it was taking a beating, and not because Donald Trump felt that there was a peace deal just around the corner and this was going to derail the peace deal. There ain't going to be no peace deal, as I say, with these genocidal maniacs.

Now, interestingly, a widely followed investigative journalist who writes for New York Magazine and for Israeli media, Ronen Bergman, has authored an op-ed about what just transpired in the Israeli newspaper, Yedioth Ahronoth. And the substance of that article, which I understand is in the Hebrew language, has been summarized by The Military Media Channel in a post put out today. I've screenshotted the posts of The Military Media Channel. And Bergman writes that the "Israeli strike on the southern suburb of Beirut was not isolated from the broader context. It came after it had become clear through the experience of the previous week that any major Israeli attack on the Lebanese arena could lead to a direct Iranian response. Therefore, when Israel chose to take the step, it had to take into account, and did indeed take into account, a scenario in which Iran would find itself compelled to respond. This means that the strike on the suburb was not merely an isolated action against Lebanon or Hezbollah, but rather a move that could have, and indeed did, reconnect the Lebanese arena with the Iranian arena. Instead of continuing the policy of separating the fronts, Israel, through its own initiative, created a situation of unity of the fronts". Well, as Bergman explains, that didn't work out too well for Israel.

He then goes on and says: "The Iranian response was relatively focused and carried out within a calculated equation. Iran launched missiles at bases that in its view were connected to the Israeli operation in Lebanon. In doing so, it delivered a clear message, any strike on the southern suburb would be met with a direct Iranian response". And then at the bottom here, it is stated that Bergman concludes his article with these observations: "Israel was not the one that ended the incident; Iran was. It determined when it would stop, the number of missiles fired, and the locations of the launches. From a cognitive and strategic perspective, this is a highly problematic outcome for Israel because it allows Iran to portray itself as having responded, not retreated, and concluded the round on its own terms. They had the final word,

not us. They stopped us because they reached an understanding with Trump regarding a ceasefire understanding that was imposed on Israel against its will". Well, I would part company with Bergman here, I'm very skeptical about that very last sentence. The reason why we have this extraordinary situation in which the genocidal maniacs in Tel Aviv allowed Iran to have the last word, and by that I think what is meant is that they delivered the last strikes, not Israel, which almost never happens when you're dealing with the lunatics in Israel. The reason why that happened is because the Israelis realized that they were having their asses handed to them by these missile strikes. The ferocity and damage being done to their military bases, those that were targeted, in my view, was likely so severe that they said, we need to stop this escalation and stop it now.

And what Ravid is doing is providing a cover story for why they stopped, a politically convenient cover story for Donald Trump, rather than saying the truth, what I believe is likely the true situation, which is that Israel pulled the plug on this escalation because it was getting hammered. They're saying that it was stopped, the escalation, because the great peacemaker in the White House finally impressed upon Bibi that it was necessary to refrain from any further hostilities because Trump was just on the verge of a glorious peace deal. And by the way, Trump claims that this fabulous peace deal, which is apparently just around the corner and has been for weeks, is going to put an end to all Iranian nuclear enrichment. And that alone tells you that Trump is lying through his teeth, because there is no way in hell that the Iranians are going to give up the right that they have under international law to enrich uranium. They may be willing to reduce the amount of enrichment for some period of time. But they aren't going to stop enriching forever. And that is abundantly clear, so we can say with a high level of confidence that when Donald Trump says that this peace deal is just around the corner, he is yet again lying.

Now, this brings me to the subject of where we are likely to go from here. In that regard, I want to draw your attention to two very important statements. First, the statement of the Iranian military leadership. Here you have a summary of a comment put out yesterday by the Central Military Command of Iran, Khatam al-Anbiya. The spokesperson said "a painful response was delivered to the regime and will halt operations for now". And then he says, "However, if aggressions and hostile acts continue, including in southern Lebanon, much harsher and more crushing responses than before will follow". The key words here are "including in southern Lebanon". So the Iranians are saying that they're not simply going to retaliate if Israel strikes the capital of Lebanon, Beirut, they will hit Israel if it hits any part of Lebanon.

And although I haven't seen any reports yet this morning of strikes by Israel on Lebanon, I did see lots of reports last night of strikes on Lebanon, including the strikes killing numerous civilians and injuring yet again emergency workers who are being systematically targeted by the genocidal Israeli military. We'll see what happens today, but I suspect strongly that if not today, then within the next few days, Israel is going to resume attacking parts of Lebanon other than Beirut, in which case, I think the Iranians have shown that when they declare their intention to strike if a red line is crossed that they are going to do so. They're not like TACO

– Trump Always Chickens Out – they actually, and increasingly so, tend to carry out their threats.

So on the other side, you have this statement from Israel's minister of genocide, Israel Katz. He made this statement, I believe it was yesterday morning, to the Israeli media: "In the first official comments", this is the Times of Israel reporting, "from an Israeli official on the ceasefire with Iran, Defense Minister Israel Katz says the military will continue to operate against Hezbollah and Lebanon and strike Beirut if the terror group attacks Israel". So, Katz is openly declaring that they're going to continue to strike Lebanon in the south. And you have this comment from the Iranian military leadership that they will retaliate against Israel if they strike the south. So that alone tells you that we are very likely headed to a further escalation.

But the equation that is being put to Hezbollah, the Lebanese resistance here in these statements by Katz, is simply one that is bound to be rejected by Hezbollah. The equation is this: If you, Hezbollah, do not attack any part of Israel, we will not attack the capital of Lebanon. Implicitly, what the Israeli leadership is saying is they reserve to themselves the right to strike any part of Lebanon other than Beirut. And Hezbollah, although it is being attacked and civilians are being attacked in parts of Lebanon other than Beirut, it must refrain from attacking any part of Israel. A balanced arrangement would be Hezbollah can't attack the capital of Israel if Israel can't attack the capital of Lebanon, but in fact what they're saying the Israelis in their inestimable arrogance is "we have the right to attack any part of Lebanon other than Beirut, but you, the resistance in Lebanon, can't attack any part of Israel".

Well, there's just absolutely no way that Hezbollah is going to accept that, because the Israelis are attacking Lebanon from Israel. They're sending troops from Israel into Lebanon. They are sending munitions from Israel to Lebanon. They're sending fuel, they're sending clothing, they're firing air defense missiles into Lebanon to protect Israeli forces operating in the south, and they're firing artillery into Lebanon from positions in northern occupied Palestine. So if Hezbollah were to accept this equation – you, Israel, can attack any part of Lebanon other than Beirut, but we can't attack any of Israel – it would be subjecting itself to a severe military disadvantage, and it's clearly not going to do that, folks. It's out of the question. It is inevitable that as long as Israel continues to strike Lebanon, Hezbollah will continue to strike Israel. It is inevitable.

And that means that Israel, if the Israelis are serious about carrying out their threat, they're going to strike Beirut again. And so, even if the Iranians were limiting their threat to Beirut, it would inevitably occur that the Iranian would have caused Israel to strike again. However you slice it, the positions of the parties, both politically and militarily, are diametrically opposed. There is no overlap between them. And this ongoing war will escalate again, I'm afraid to say. Please do not be taken in by all of this endless, nauseating, tedious, sophomoric Kabuki theater that we're being subjected to by the likes of Barak Ravid, Donald Trump, Netanyahu, and all the rest of these characters. We are headed for a cataclysm situation for the global economy if this continues to escalate. And that is the overwhelming likelihood. So

please prepare for the economic pain that is coming and please do all that you can as citizens of conscience to pressure your governments into putting a stop to this insanity as quickly as possible before we find ourselves in a full-blown global economic depression. I would love to be wrong about all of this, of course, but so far I and others who have made these arguments, I'm not the only one, have been proven to be quite correct about the situation. In any case, we will be heading out into the field shortly, and I'll be publishing in a report later today about our visit yesterday to the front line in the Beqaa Valley. And in the interim, please stay safe. And we're signing off today from Beirut, Lebanon, on June 9th, 2026.

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](#)