

prestige. Many analysts even feel that, strategically, Iran has gained a slight upper hand in this war. Therefore, as you indicated, the Democrats, liberals, and even those situated in the (political) center perceive weakness and anxiety within the Trump administration, and, of course, the reflection of this matter influences public opinion. Nevertheless, in the elections, the most profound crisis that the war has engendered for America, namely the economic crisis and the cost of living for the populace, will be raised, and the Democrats shall concentrate upon it.

A few days ago, one of the prominent figures of the Neo-Conservative current; Mr. Robert Kagan (spouse of Mrs. Victoria Nuland), wrote an article in *The Atlantic* that generated substantial commotion and was staggering. He characterized the war and Trump's action as a defeat and weakness for America, and believes that post-war conditions can no longer return to the pre-war state. The adoption of such a position by a Neo-Conservative and supporter of Israel was truly astonishing.

In your estimation, will the Democratic Party seek to exploit the critical atmosphere against Trump engendered by this war in the midterm elections?

Without any doubt, in the forthcoming elections, the Democratic Party will exploit the chaos and lack of planning in Trump's foreign policy. This disarray is not only manifest in strategic disorder in relations with Europe, but also includes a lack of direction in initiating an aimless war with Iran in the region, a war that has thus far produced no result.

A number of Senators, including a Democratic Senator from Connecticut and Senator Bernie Sanders, have declared that the cost of the war for America will be far greater than the Trump administration's estimates. The Democrats emphasize that at a time when the populace requires health insurance, employment, and infrastructural reconstruction, these capitals should have been expended domestically, rather than being squandered on adventurism in a war that has held no meaning for the people. But the more important point is that, due to inflation and price increases, the Democrats will concentrate their primary focus upon the war's impact on the nation's economy and the populace's livelihood; a factor that constitutes the most significant indicator in elections.

Israel provoked, encouraged, and accompanied America in both wars. Has this matter created a fissure within American public opinion, which previously perceived Israel as a strategic ally?

The vast majority of American society is unaware of the reality that Israel provoked and encouraged America toward war. The populace was induced to believe that the war's objective was to prevent Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons or to halt Tehran's support for terrorism in the region; the same stereotypical narratives repeated for years.

Perhaps the societal body is unaware that a successful agreement named the JCPOA existed, and that Trump, through his withdrawal from that deal, engendered the crisis; a matter about which American public awareness is exceedingly minuscule. Israel's role in the war decision is primarily raised in news agencies outside the United States. Of course, a political minority within society is cognizant of Israel's scheme, but, due to power relations, they have acquiesced to it

and have not reached a new stage of confrontation regarding Israel.

Given the role of Netanyahu and Israeli lobbies in instigating this war, can one assert that the traditional narrative in Washington (that "Israel is the executive arm of American interests in the Middle East") has been shattered, and that Washington has now effectively become the executive arm of the interests of Israeli radicals?

The main body of American society possesses little awareness of the existence of Israeli lobbies, and, therefore, in the absence of such awareness, no particular sensitivity toward this matter develops. Most people cannot even articulate the names of these institutions nor are they informed of their existence. For example, in Iran, we recognize AIPAC or the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, but the American populace does not possess such recognition. Of course, the powerful political class and academics have complete awareness of the Israeli lobby, and some intellectuals and university professors speak about it.

But individuals who themselves belong to the powerful political class, whether in the media or in Congress, perceive their professional position as contingent upon comprehensive support for Israel. Whether America is an instrument of Israel or Israel is an instrument of America is a matter that is not widely raised in the public sphere. The social and political conditions in America have evolved such that this country displays complete and total support for Israel, even if this support contravenes American national interests; of course, this matter is consistently justified. Perhaps one could say that a degree of cynicism toward the person of Benjamin Netanyahu has now developed within the political class, but this cynicism has not reached a level that would affect the overall American-Israeli relationship. One must consider that many billionaires possess particular orientations and do not maintain a neutral stance; they vigorously support Israel; among them, Sheldon Adelson, who owned casinos, and Larry Ellison, who is part of the new digital architecture and has now created a media empire.

As another example, Marco Rubio, who is now secretary of state, was propped up in his youth in Florida by two Zionist billionaires named Norman Braman and Larry Ellison and was elevated to the position of Florida Senator. Such is the manner in which power relations are constituted.

Among the Democratic elites and even segments of the Republicans (such as the old conservative movement), has a voice been raised calling for a reexamination of the unconditional relationship with Israel due to the repercussions of this war and, prior to it, Israel's conduct in Gaza?

One could say that, although voices from civil society, a few activists, artists, and student protesters have been raised in criticism of Israel, opposition to Israel does not occur within the Democratic and traditional conservative mainstream because the power relations in the United States have been constituted in this manner. Criticisms are directed more at Trump and his administration since criticizing Trump is safer for any individual within the system.

It should be recalled that President Obama could not secure Congressional ratification of the JCPOA, but the more important point is that many of the Democrats themselves in Congress did not support Obama's JCPOA. Only a few individ-



People protesting the US war of choice against Iran gather at Springfield City Hall, the US, on March 28, 2026, for the third "No Kings" rally.
● ISAAC WASSERMAN/RFA

uals such as Bernie Sanders, Zohran Mamdani, Ms. Rashida Tlaib, and Ms. Ilhan Omar have now raised serious discussions about the Iran war, but this matter did not become a social issue within the entire system.

It is recalled that during the two years of the historical catastrophe in Gaza, the Democrats and those same old conservatives remained silent in the face of that historical catastrophe and genocide. An example of this condition is the New York City mayoral election a few months ago; after Israel's genocide in Gaza, during the electoral debates, the five candidates were asked what the first thing they would do as mayor would be. Four candidates answered: travel to Israel. Only Zohran Mamdani said that he would remain in New York and will not go to Israel. In conclusion, a sociological point must be recalled: one cannot view the developments in America through the lens of Iran's historical experience and awareness, or that of the Global South. Rather, one must regard the developments of this country based upon the power relations within American society.

The Pentagon and American security institutions (the Deep State) are generally opposed to endless wars, and recent reports also indicate that the military establishment opposed the recent war. Did what transpired lead to the weakening of the position of security institutions in America, or, conversely, could the result of this adventurism serve their interests?



Democratic hopeful Janelle Stelson holds a campaign event in front of a gas station on April 6, 2026, to emphasize the rising gas prices and challenge incumbent Rep. Scott Perry, R-Pa., a longtime Trump ally.
● MICHELLE GUSTAFSON/
THE WASHINGTON POST



It should be recalled that President Obama could not secure Congressional ratification of the JCPOA, but the more important point is that many of the Democrats themselves in Congress did not support Obama's JCPOA. Only a few individuals such as Bernie Sanders, Zohran Mamdani, Ms. Rashida Tlaib, and Ms. Ilhan Omar have now raised serious discussions about the Iran war, but this matter did not become a social issue within the entire system.

tion asymmetrical war" against the American-Israeli coalition. Have the American political and military elites concluded that Iran's deterrent model is no longer defeatable through military force, and, if so, in which direction will they proceed in confronting Iran?

In my opinion, even before the war commenced, the political elites and powerholders perceived conflict with Iran as crisis-ridden and futile. Now that the war has occurred and Iran's proficiency in this asymmetrical war has been demonstrated, this conclusion opposing war has certainly been consolidated and fortified.

In this asymmetrical war, Iran's military capability was deployed really fast, merely hours subsequent to the surprise attacks in the 12-day and Ramadan wars. The missile and drone forces did not cease operations until the cease-fire was declared. Although the army's leadership and military commanders were eliminated on the first day of the Ramadan war, war management nevertheless continued. All these factors have led to this conclusion. Therefore, American political elites in the future shall certainly not select the military force option. They shall either arrive at an agreement with Iran that constitutes a win-win accord, or they shall revert once again to the pressure of comprehensive sanctions as a coercive instrument, employing it to engender pressure within Iran.

War exacts a cost. Given the disruptions created in the energy supply chain and the direct military expenditures, what has been the impact of these two wars upon America's domestic economy?

Unexpectedly, the war transformed from a geographical domain into an arena within the energy and economic spheres. Before the war (the military aggression), no one considered the strategic importance of the Strait of Hormuz to such an extent. The International Energy Agency (IEA) has reported the largest supply shock in the history of the oil and energy industry.

It has once again been proven the degree to which various sectors of the global economy are interconnected. The increase in the prices of oil, gasoline, and fertilizer has had a profound impact upon the global economy. Initially, the Trump administration claimed that America is self-sufficient in oil and would not be influenced by the global oil market, but the experience of this war demonstrated very rapidly that an increase in the global price of oil leads to an increase in the price of gasoline in America as well. Since the price of gasoline and fuel affects the transportation of goods, consequently, the prices of consumer goods have also increased in the American market.

The price increases in America have perpetuated inflation, a matter that has directly overshadowed the populace's livelihood. If citizens' incomes and salaries do not increase commensurately with inflation, there's the real threat of economic recession.

In this regard, Donald Trump has selected an individual named Kevin Warsh for the chairmanship of America's central bank (the Federal Reserve). Trump had previously also always pressured the former central bank chairman to reduce interest rates. Now, Warsh finds himself in a singular position and must choose between acceding to Trump's partisan directives and pursuing what he deems salutary for the nation's economy.

The interview first appeared in Persian on IRNA.