

Iran's 7,500 Strikes HIT US Troops, Yemen SNUBS Trump! | Patrick Henningsen

Geopolitical analyst Patrick Henningsen discusses the devastating revelations on the damage done by Iran to US military forces and bases, and why Trump is now trapped on two fronts in West Asia alone. <https://www.youtube.com/@21stCenturyWireTV> Patrick's YouTube <https://patrickhenningsen.substack.com/> LIKE the video and Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritho> #iran #bessent #iranwar

#Danny

Welcome back to the program, everyone. As you can see, I'm joined by Patrick Henningsen of 21st Century Wire to go over the latest developments. Well, yesterday it was reported that Iran has, in recent days, struck a vessel in the Strait of Hormuz, leaving U.S. military personnel wounded. The vessel was under contract and had American troops aboard. They are now being treated in unidentified Arab countries. Now, new photos obtained by CBS show the widespread damage that U.S. positions have taken from Iranian missile and drone attacks. And this is Camp Buehring in Kuwait. This is also appearing in Kuwait.

And this, we also have a lot of, I mean, a lot of Kuwait pictures. And there's Prince Sultan Air Base in Saudi Arabia. Now, this comes as there's an inspector general of the Pentagon. They gave a report saying that Iranian strikes have damaged or destroyed hundreds of buildings at bases across eight countries. Now, this also includes—and this is interesting, Patrick, the way they frame it—6,000 Iranian drones and 1,500 ballistic missiles were, they say, shot down, despite the fact that the images show otherwise. Now, Trump has said that he is in talks, secret talks, with the Houthis, or at least with Ansar Allah.

It's being reported by Reuters that Trump has made a deal with Ansar Allah around preventing U.S. vessels and U.S. interests from being hit now in Bab al-Mandab. But the Ansar Allah spokesperson, Mohammed al-Bukhaiti, who was on Sky News, said they have no contact with the U.S. administration. Patrick, things are getting to a deep crisis level. The situation with Iran, it seems that the U.S. is having a hard time figuring out what to do there. The data that I showed demonstrates a

very problematic situation for U.S. interests. And now we also have Yemen, which there's definitely desperation there around the Bab al-Mandab Strait. Your thoughts about what's going on and where we are now?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, I have to say, I think the most important piece is the last thing that you just mentioned in terms of news, and that is that the report, as you mentioned, by Reuters that said that the U.S. was secretly meeting with Ansar Allah representatives, or at least mediators or middlemen, in Muscat, Oman. And so, how much can we take and believe there? It's not a good look for Ansar Allah that they're meeting and talking with U.S. officials, first and foremost. But then, if this was a strategic leak, which, coming from Reuters, Danny, I would say that there's a high probability that it could be, I think it's possible with this administration.

You never know, when it claims it's talking or negotiating with somebody, that it could be third-hand. It could be they are talking to somebody who might be talking to them, to the Houthis, as they call them. But it's all very hard to confirm. Okay, what this does say, 100%, we can confirm, is that this is a message to Saudi Arabia. That's what we can confirm, 100%. It's a message to Saudi Arabia. Was it not, Danny, Saudi Arabia that asked the United States for assistance with airstrike packages just a few days ago and was reportedly denied that assistance? So you marry that fact, that data point, with this leak story in Reuters, and now we can see something going on. What does it look like to us?

What type of president do we have in Washington right now? He's been called a transactional president. Are we looking at a transaction, or are we looking at leverage, a power play going on here? The target has to be Saudi Arabia. So the question we have to ask, Danny, is: what does Saudi Arabia have that the U.S. or U.S. allies need and are not delivering at the moment? Okay, that's the question we have to ask. And is it fuel? Well, it can't be oil or fuel because that's offline. There's no exports confirmed today, confirmed zero exports coming out of Saudi Arabia in the Red Sea. And, of course, the Strait of Hormuz, that's a given. So what else? Money, cash? Well, they don't have a lot of that at the moment. I think they'll probably be down on cash flow.

I'm sure, as a result. So maybe the U.S. need them to buy bonds, to buy U.S. Treasuries, to step up and help support the U.S. dollar. Saudi Arabia is going around to BRICS meetings, Danny, and flirting with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and people like this. So that's on the table as far as the U.S. is concerned, and the Abraham Accords. Ah, now we're getting close. Now we're getting close. So I think this is a very aggressive and a very dangerous power play by the U.S., I would imagine. And I think it's also tied to an economic—regarding global energy markets, because while Saudi Arabia is offline, that only represents roughly 5% of the global supply of oil.

So is the U.S. going to be—how concerned are they going to be about that? Is that going to be enough to bear a lot of inflationary pressure on the global economy? Futures market, because that's

the only market the U.S. cares about. They don't care about the physical market. At the moment, there's a gap between those two, but that gap could be closing as reserves and supplies run low. But at the end of the day, how much of a crisis is that actually for the U.S.? They're going to be selling at a higher price. Supplies are destroyed or choked. The U.S. is happy to ride that situation out for a period of time, at least through Christmas, I would say, until after the midterms.

But I think what they need to get from Saudi Arabia is more important than that 5% of oil supply in the short term. That's what I think. And what Saudi Arabia can deliver in terms of geopolitics and security guarantees regarding Israel, I think that's more important for this current administration at this particular point in time, because the Israel lobby are still in the driving seat with this president. And so much so, Danny—and this is going to sound really incredible—but so much so that Donald Trump may have written off the midterm elections in order to do right by the Israeli lobby, first and foremost.

That includes the aggressive position with Iran. That includes the Strait of Hormuz. That includes the Bab al-Mandab Strait, quite frankly. I can't see—it's hard to find another way to read that. That's even putting aside the opportunism of profiteering, short-term profiteering on the global energy market, because that looks like that's real. But the Israel question, the Israel question—how much of that is influencing U.S. decision-making and the moves that we're seeing right now? Very unorthodox moves, Danny. When have the U.S. not come to the aid of Saudi in their hour of need? I mean, it's very rare.

#Danny

Especially against Yemen. Yes. Yeah, no, this is a great question. Some have said that the U.S. is gladly willing to sacrifice Saudi Arabia. But then it's like, to what end, as you're asking the question? Well, to what end? Because one thing that Saudi Arabia is definitely begging for right now, and it's not looking toward the U.S. for this, is air defense interceptors. Because as you know, Patrick, and as the audience may have been following, Ansar Allah has been pounding Saudi oil positions, Saudi military positions, with missiles and drones all throughout this whole offensive. Now, you know, I'm wondering, Patrick, how much—we get different numbers earlier this year.

During the MOU period, NBC News reported something like 9,000 Iranian strikes throughout the course of the 40-day war. Now we're hearing 7,500. But that's a lot. They're saying they shot down all of them. Only a few got in. I showed the images. I can pull more up. A lot got through. And even in just the attack a couple weeks ago, a week and a half ago, they used something like 70 to 100 air defense interceptors for only one of the two barrages, the 20 missiles that they're willing to count. Which makes me think, Patrick, how much of this is the U.S. then having to take what it can get out of the Yemen situation, Saudi situation, given that... Yeah, there doesn't seem to be much left to give to Saudi, especially on this air defense question, let alone anything else. But your thoughts on that?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, just step back and look at that announcement, Danny. That type of an announcement looks like they're supposedly touting the success of their air defenses against the Iranians or the Yemenis. But it's not something you want to be boasting about, having to expend that amount of very valuable and scarce interceptor missiles. I mean, that's not a good look. It's not a good announcement. So I'm reading that as a total disaster. But they're putting it forward like showing how effective their air defenses are. But you don't want to be expending that many. I mean, it's just not. And, you know, in terms of restocking, it's not sustainable. That type of warfare in the current economic, military-industrial situation, especially regarding the U.S., it's not sustainable.

So this is bad news. So then you're gambling there. What do the Iranians have? Do they have another 6,000 drones? Do they have another, you know, 1,500 missiles? And the answer is probably yes. They probably have. If they don't have, they're in the process of stocking them as we speak. And the U.S. have no answer to Iran's ability to deploy these types of missiles and drones across the region. As we have seen in the last month, if there was a capability for the U.S. to do this, they would have done it. But they haven't. So look at Jordan as an example. U.S. military facilities in Jordan is in addition to this. So first of all, the math is horrible for the U.S. and for their allies.

But the horror doesn't end there, Danny, okay? Step back and then look at this. Look at Saudi Arabia. Look at Bahrain. Look at Kuwait. Look at the UAE. Look at the damage in Jordan, okay? Look at all this. So if these are not going to be operable military positions for the U.S., what is the U.S. motivation? A, are they able to defend their allies? And B, what would be the motivation if those aren't going to be operable forward military operating, you know, staging bases or operational bases in the near future or ever? What is the motivation for the U.S. to defend them? Is it to defend the honor of the royal family in Kuwait? Really? Or the Sunni minority ruling family in Bahrain, ruling over an overwhelming Shiite majority?

Okay. Think about that. And Saudi Arabia would be basically called on to defend both of those emirates, okay? Because the U.S. ain't going to do it. Where's the 82nd Airborne? Where are they? You remember months ago, oh, they're hovering in the area, the 82nd Airborne. They're dispersed in hotels across the region and ready to activate for a ground operation in Iran. Looking at this situation, Danny, if the 82nd Airborne are loitering in West Asia, ready for an operation, the only operation I think that would be worth doing for U.S. ground troops is defending some of these emirates, not invading Kharg Island. Okay.

Because think of the abject humiliation, Danny, if Iraqi Shiite Iraqi PMFs rolled into Kuwait to retake Kuwait. Just think of the devastation for the American ego, and everything that they've done, and everything the neoconservatives have achieved, and quite frankly, the Israelis, and Netanyahu himself. I mean, that would be, to me, the ultimate. That would be the ultimate scene. That kind of would be the Western equivalent of the toppling of Saddam Hussein's statue in Baghdad. You remember that iconic scene back then? Okay, end of the regime. Well, you know, Bahrain would be

bad, but I think Saudi would step in to defend Bahrain at the last minute, as they have done multiple times to keep the ruling family in power there.

Okay. But Kuwait, that's a different story. And then we could even extend that to the UAE, although they're somewhat safer, I guess, because it's mostly foreigners that live there anyway. But in Qatar, the same. I think Turkey is providing additional security for the Qataris. But all of a sudden, Danny, this whole scene in the Middle East looks a little bit more unstable than it did before. And I think Iran—any of these things that I've mentioned, any of these situations, including what's happening in Yemen—all of this works in favor of Iran and anybody allying with Iran in the region. That's the way it looks right now. And I don't see the U.S. going to reverse any of those trends in any of those particular spots.

And in fact, we even need to also be reminded, Danny, the U.S. is currently under orders from the Iraqi parliament on a withdrawal timeline that's very specific. So add all these things together. To me, the one would be Kuwait. That would be the biggest geopolitical wound for the U.S., that one, even though it's small, relatively small, but symbolically and what it represents in terms of the control over the Iraqi kind of position in the region. And where would that leave the Kurds in northern Iraq? Because that's also part of the withdrawal. Well, Iran has done a force majeure on the U.S. positions in the KRG. So, I mean, just add all these things up, Danny, and it's quite an interesting equation that we're looking at.

I can't tell you that's going to transform in the next two months or six months or even a year, but I'm telling you the clock is ticking already on some of these points. And they're not going to be the same as they are right now, or they were before. In a year or two years' time, it's just not going to be the same, based on everything and the direction of travel of events right now. And then I think, I can't see how the U.S. is going to be able to defend a hegemonic position in the region or maintain any kind of a hegemonic position. So something else would have to happen. Something else would have to happen completely.

#Danny

Patrick, I wanted to pull this up because we definitely need to factor in this question of energy and oil into what you were just talking about with U.S. hegemony, its position in the region. This immense diesel crisis has become so bad that there are stations, gas stations in Texas, Orlando, and other places that are putting up zero, zero, zero because the pumps are now dry and the prices are going above \$10 a gallon for diesel. And here's just some photos taken there. I mean, this is an immense crisis that doesn't show any signs of wearing off. It's not as if Saudi Arabia right now is in a position to, one, fix its pipelines anytime soon, and two, to stop the war against Yemen, even though it probably should do that as soon as possible. But it doesn't seem like it's in the position to do either of those things.

And the United States is still playing market manipulation. We were talking before the show. You asked me, "Did Trump tweet anything today, or Truth Social anything, I should say?" Well, he did go to Barak Ravid, as the administration often does, and said he's approaching a major crossroads in the Iran war. He's saying, "I have a big decision coming up. Do I want to annihilate them, meaning Iran, or do I not? It's a big decision, and anything could happen with me." And Patrick, last time I checked, it's Thursday in the middle of the day. Markets close tomorrow. I mean, this has been a pattern every single end of the week. We get another little nugget for the markets to react to. Your thoughts on where energy is playing in all of this, because there are so many, I think, factors in discussions and debates happening about it.

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, yeah, I think you called that pretty accurately. That's a controlled statement coming from the Israeli intelligence embed at Axios, Barak Ravid, and definitely that's a target to—it's an ambivalent kind of neutral threat, if you will. It could go either way, but it's kind of parroting—he said that on multiple occasions before, Danny. "I'm going to annihilate the Iranians," and he hasn't annihilated them yet. I think that's probably the sixth or seventh annihilation threat that he's issued there on a high-profile level or publication or leak or whatnot. So the question is, are the Iranians, is the world going to call his bluff on that?

He is pushing this mad dog kind of framework, which is that he's very unpredictable, and he potentially could unleash Armageddon, and everybody should just be on notice and be aware of the power that Donald Trump has over life and death of the planet and the economy and the stock market and everything else. So it's just a continuation of that situation. So I would say it's... I think... I would say the president is probably, at this stage, bluffing. He's talking about nuclear annihilation. There can't be a conventional annihilation with Iran. It's just not possible. A, the U.S. don't have the resources militarily to do that.

They don't have the strategic positioning anymore in the region to do anything. They can't even do what they did previously in terms of conventional airstrikes, which did not cripple Iran. So even if they were to match what they did previously, it is not enough to decapitate the government, it's not enough for regime change, and not enough to cripple them militarily nor economically. Yes, it's done damage to Iran, severe damage economically, and will continue to be very difficult for Iran, but... you have to weigh that relatively against the political situation in Iran.

And while that strategy might work against a petulant, impatient population that's short-term in their thinking, and whereby you don't have any solidarity or cohesion in society, that maximum pressure strategy may net results eventually. But that's not the situation in Iran. So, I mean, even in Syria, it took the United States 12 years to break Syria. And that's with 200,000 Takfiri fighters cleaving off

cities, towns, and regions off the Syrian map, and a Kurdish breakaway movement backed by the U.S. It still took them 12 years to collapse the state in Syria. So much more solidarity, cohesion, and resilience with Iran. It's not an isolated economy, not in the way that Syria was.

But yet it still took them 12 years to topple the government in Syria. So, facing that reality, I can't see anything other than the deployment of nuclear weapons. That would be a major game changer for the U.S., like somehow tilting the balance of force and putting the U.S. in a stronger position, putting Iran in a weaker position. I mean, it could happen over 10 years, I think, if they kept this pressure on Iran. But it would have to be military pressure as well as economic pressure. But maybe in five, maybe six, seven years, they might be able to strangle the state to a degree whereby maybe an uprising might be possible, or some kind of weakening to such a degree that they're not able to govern all their territory.

That's possible. But still, even then, Danny, best possible scenario, we're talking about five to seven years. This president only has 18 months. You know, the presidential campaign begins in April. Yeah, the midterms are coming, and so is the presidential election for 2028. So what's he talking about, Danny? What's he talking about? Other than it's more transactions, it's more maneuvers to push the market this way or push the polling this way. The president is running out of these poker hands that he's been running, so many of these short-term plays. You're now at the point, Danny, where they're having to recycle stuff.

And so the U.S. economic situation, even with the interest rate hike from the Fed, Danny, that's going to stabilize the inflationary situation for a short period of time, and it's going to stabilize the bond yields for a short period of time. But all the experts agree, Danny, that the fundamentals are out of control and that eventually all of these things just are going to snap back, including long-term bond yields and the fact the U.S. is just increasingly not creditworthy. So you've got that to contend with, and I would argue those are much stronger forces of nature that will bear down not just on the U.S. domestically, the political situation, but it will also bear down on what the U.S. can do internationally. And I will also add another problem that's come in here. Israel is no longer able to sell its shekel bonds on the European market.

They've lost the license in Luxembourg. That was their single entry point into the EU bond market. And a lot of people don't realize this is how Israel has survived. They've been selling these shekel bonds. And now, because of the country's governments wanting to basically look at sanctioning Israel, it's too much of a risk to issue a license. Because if one EU country issues a license—Ireland was doing it for a while, and then they had to close that loop because the public found out about it. And then Luxembourg has been doing it. Now that's expired. They're looking for—no other European country wants to step forward to take on issuing these Israeli bonds. And so Israel's got a huge cash flow problem, massive cash flow problem. They're hoping the United States is going to fill that gap.

Okay, but the U.S. has got a cash flow problem as well. So politically, that's not going to be a good look, is a big financial bailout for Israel. Because as pro-Israeli as this government is, Danny, the

Trump administration, I would say the majority of the American public do not support what Israel is doing in Gaza, in the West Bank, or in Lebanon. So in terms of a major financial bailout, like look what they gave Argentina, and look what they've done for these other backstops for Japan, Israel is going to require something similar, and that's not going to go over too well. That's not going to be very popular in America, and it's going to surely, surely be divisive along Democrat and Republican lines, and also it's going to be problematic for this president. So that's another thing that's now looming there in the background.

#Danny

I wanted to, as you were talking, a few things here. Here are Trump's claims that the U.S. won the Iran war, not just that he's going to annihilate them. He makes these claims almost seven to 14 times, 15 times a month. Only once now, though. So things have changed a little bit in the month of September. I also wanted to show you this, Patrick. This is J.D. Vance's pitch and plea to U.S. voters. After all of this, the landscape you just laid out, this is his pitch and plea of why you should continue to support not just his regime, but, of course, those who will be trying to ride the coattails into Congress off of it.

#JD vance

We're fixing it. Give us another chance or give us another couple of years to continue to work on the amazing things that we've been doing for the past two years. And the second argument.

#Danny

So give us another chance. That's the pitch of all the amazing things they've been working on. That's your thoughts briefly, and then I have one other thing I wanted to show. But your thoughts on this.

#Patrick Henningsen

I wouldn't use the word amazing if I was Vance. Maybe incredible or incredulous, maybe, but not amazing. That's a really desperate one. That should haunt him for his presidential aspirations. He's such a bootlicker with the president that he's been tasked to go out and basically try to hype up the crowd ahead of the midterms. And because Trump knows that Vance is probably polling better than Trump is, in terms of public acceptability or whatever. But Vance's sort of slavish loyalty to the president is just, like, nauseating at this point. And what's he talking about? What are the great achievements? A completely flat and spiraling economy. Record inflation. A collapse of the U.S. bond market. Countries officially bankrupt at \$40 trillion.

And not only that, arrived at the \$40 trillion, Danny, almost a year ahead of schedule. Okay, so that's where the reward is. Oh, you delivered. You're ramping up the national debt quicker than previous presidents. So congratulations. There's another great achievement. That's not going to go

anywhere positive at all. In fact, that's also that particular point, the overspending by this presidency, the record-breaking overspending, over-budget spending, is actually driving all of these fundamentals that are making it even more difficult for the U.S. to raise credit and things like that for the government. And it's putting pressure on, of course, the American people at every conceivable angle in terms of the cost of living and so forth, plus the fuel crisis, the diesel crisis, all of that.

The other idiotic thing that this administration has done is decide, amid all of this, Danny, to then declare a tariff war against the U.S.'s most loyal and economically positive partnership the U.S. has, which is Canada. Okay? During a diesel shortage, and you're starting a trade war with the number one diesel supplier to the U.S., at least for half the country, which is Canada. The whole U.S. economy is basically relying on trucking, shipping. So just the cost of diesel alone is going to put—you're adding a few percentage points in terms of inflation on pretty much everything that gets delivered by road. So, yeah, I don't think so. It's a pretty weak pitch for the midterms. I think personally, with that level of desperation, that if you look at the polls, they've written off the midterms.

The only thing that I think this president is concerned about is the majority in the Senate, because of the two-thirds majority vote required for a conviction of impeachment. I don't think the Democrats are going to have that. There might be a swing in the Senate. You might get a Democrat majority. It might be as much as five seats or something like that, but you're not going to get the two-thirds. So there's going to be no conviction for impeachment. However, there could be, with a Democrat House, there could be impeachment hearings. And that's actually what matters more. It's very difficult, and so few, if any, U.S. presidents have ever been actually impeached or convicted through the Senate process.

Once it's gone through the House, through the hearings, the discovery, the evidence, the testimonies, then over to the Senate for a vote, that's very difficult and almost impossible to get. But where the value is for the opposition, or for the anti-Trump bloc, will be in tying up the president through the impeachment hearing process, through all the testimonies and all the media circus that's going to surround that. It's pretty much going to paralyze this president from being able to achieve anything in the final two years in terms of any kind of domestic—forget about international. Trump has basically just sabotaged any international foreign policy goals, initiatives, anything. It's toast. It's shot to bits, as they say. That's not going to happen.

But domestically, it's going to make it very difficult. And, of course, you know how, when they smell blood going into the general election in 2029—or, sorry, 2028—when the media smells blood, when the opposition smells blood, then it's open season on Trump and anything related to Trump. And that includes J.D. Vance, by the way. That's going to be a very, very weak campaign by Vance if he's supposed to be the heir apparent, and he has so thoroughly tied himself to this president and a

string of failures. In fact, some of the worst failures, foreign policy, military-wise, and economically, in the history of the country. It's not going to be a very good campaign for Vance unless he changes party and then reverts to his normal position, which is basically a liberal Democrat.

He's only cosplayed as a conservative, really, in order to secure a ticket onto the Trump campaign, thanks to Peter Thiel and his billionaire backers and big tech and big data and big AI. That's who J. D. Vance represents. But I think those powers in America, those oligarchs, could just as easily find a suitable vehicle on the Democrat side to ride through their dreams of deregulation and continue the AI stock market bubble. A Democrat can do that just as well as a Republican. So, yeah, those are some of the overriding issues, I think, that are going to shape it domestically.

I don't see a lot of salvation bandwidth internationally, though. Not economically, not foreign policy-wise, not military-wise for this president. I mean, even the hope, Danny, that there'll be a... a resolution to the Ukraine crisis, that at least Trump could deliver that. You know, Kushner and Witkoff, the Del Boy and Rodney, can deliver some kind of a Hail Mary there and come up with the goods. That's not going to happen either, because we've already established that the way Trump does business and does diplomacy, there's going to be no enduring settlement, treaty, ceasefire, nothing.

They're not capable of doing it because they don't have the process, the personnel, nor the process to make any of that happen. So that's off the table. So I don't see anything other than, I guess, stealing Greenland, invading Cuba. Those are probably the top two candidates. There may be trying to do a coup in Nicaragua, perhaps on the strength of the... But they're going to have political problems already festering in Venezuela because prosperity has not been delivered, in the very same way, Danny, that prosperity has not been delivered by the Takfiri Al-Qaeda Emirates. Oh, yeah.

#Danny

I didn't even ask you about the protests. I mean, there are massive protests in Damascus, and all over Syria, I believe, too.

#Patrick Henningsen

All over Syria, yeah. So that's another one. So think of the optics of that. Jolani goes to the White House, photo ops with Trump, spraying perfume on Jolani, making jokes, shooting baskets at the White House, Obama-style, and then all of a sudden, they can't stop the hemorrhaging and the theft and the grift of the Syrian economy. It's so corrupt. There's no money. The currency's in free fall. Meanwhile, the U.S. is still holding on to its military bases there. They've delivered nothing in terms of benefit for the Syrian people, even the people that supported the HTS military regime change. They're probably going to be at the end of the rope pretty soon as well.

It's coming up to, I guess, what is it, the two-year anniversary coming up very soon in a couple of months of the toppling of the government in Syria. Nothing positive. Nothing positive. So this is just going to continue. As Gerald Salenti famously said, when people have nothing to lose, they lose it. And I think Syria is way past that point already. So they haven't delivered. So people are now going to be—and this also feeds into the Arab mentality of reminiscing and nostalgia for previous political regimes. And that's exactly what's going—the conversation is going to be happening in Syria. It was better under Bashar. It was better under Bashar. That's just going to be an inevitable thing. So the Gulf can't come in and, like, inject hundreds of millions in cash.

Saudi certainly can't afford to do that. Qatar has already burned hundreds of billions trying to destabilize Syria over a decade. So they're not coming in with any kind of a rescue package because it served its geopolitical purposes. That was the whole point. The U.S., the Israeli goal was to remove the government in Damascus and take out what used to be an Iranian-allied government, Hezbollah-allied government, a pro-Palestinian government, and get rid of them and replace them with pretty much anything. And it just so happened to be the former deputy head of ISIS and the founder of al-Qaeda in Syria. They put a suit on him, called him president, even though there's no elections.

And it sort of worked for ISIS. A lot of people, at least for the last couple of years, Saudi and the Gulf were ecstatic about this because they got a Wahhabi, Takfiri, extremist, religious nutjob, a head-chopper in charge in Damascus. They couldn't be more happy because that's really what Saudi wants: to have that type of person in charge of a potentially Arab nationalist country. So basically turning Syria into another emirate, albeit a weak emirate, but still an emirate nonetheless that's got this packaging of a democracy, but of course it's not. Saudi is very, very happy about this, and that also helps to contain Lebanon as well. Saudi is pumping money into Lebanon to basically corrupt the political system in Lebanon and to divide people along sectarian lines.

And the U.S. have relied on Saudi Arabia and Qatar and all these other Gulf states to provide the grease for all of this. They pick up the bill for all of this. They're basically doing Israel's work. They're paying for pretty much everything Israel wants, including attacking the Yemenis. I mean, it's almost like Netanyahu made the call to MBS: "Can you deal with those guys down there, please? Bomb the airport in Sana'a." Yeah, might as well have been Netanyahu. Because the only beneficiary I can see from all of this is Israel, and to a large degree the United States as well. Saudi Arabia, I see no benefit whatsoever for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. And, you know, is MBS doing ketamine with Elon on the weekends? What's going on? It's crazy. You know, it doesn't make any sense.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah, yeah. Playing with fire with Bab al-Mandab, though, is quite the, for everyone involved, quite the choice historically to make here. But there's also, Patrick, when you're, you know, when things are going really badly, what tends to also happen is we start to get sources from, I don't

know, this is Reuters, so what, MI6, CIA? They tend to begin to look toward countries like China and Russia in some respects too, and put out these kinds of stories. Pressing Iran, China supposedly has been doing secretly to rein in Ansar Allah after Saudi Arabia essentially begged this to happen through mediators. Patrick, your thoughts on this? We just had the BRICS summit yesterday. Obviously, the conflicts that we talk about, Iran and Yemen, of course they affect China, they affect Russia, et cetera. But what do you make of reports like this and stories like this? They often come out in times where there aren't many options maybe for the United States and the other players involved.

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, it reeks. It's got the olfactory medley, the scent of fake news, basically. That's not China's style, to be leaning on people to deal with that person or deal with that person, because China, in terms of China's own energy, mainly those that are coming from the Persian Gulf, and it's very clear who instigated that situation. So it's the U.S. and Israel. That's the source of China's woes, not Iran. So this idea that—so they're trying to create a narrative, Danny, it looks like, that if Iran would just comply—if Iran would just comply and be more cooperative and sort out the Houthis, you know, come to terms with the United States.

That's kind of the subtext there. So it's written in such a way that it believes that, you know, from that Western-centric worldview, that everybody is just not behaving. They need to come to their senses and do a deal, right, with the U.S., and it's really their fault. They're holding up progress, they're holding up peace, prosperity, and slowing up the global flow of energy. I mean, and that's affecting the Chinese very, very negatively. That's definitely the narrative the West will paint and continue to reinforce, because that's the basic Western-centric hegemonic worldview, basically.

The natives need to be tamed, subdued, and co-opted, and if they're not behaving, then they need to be dealt with, and maybe get some other big fish to come in and pressure their Global South compatriots because they're not listening to common sense coming from Washington. That's basically the narrative there, just completely insane. So, yeah, that could have been spun up by any number of skillful propagandists in the employ of various Western intelligence agencies. No doubt they've got them on staff anyway as senior editors at the various desks there, including the Asian desks as well. So, totally unrealistic.

And if anything, people should be leaning on Saudi Arabia and asking them, why the hell did you start a war with Ansar Allah in Yemen? What possessed you to do that, to attack Sana'a airport? That's really the main question, isn't it? Then we would all like to know what the background to that story is. Where did that call come from? Who was pushing who? And I would guess, I said at the time, and I think it will come out eventually later, that the White House pushed Saudi Arabia to do that. He used any number of levers to coax them into doing that, probably promised them that it's all going to be fine. Or as Trump said, quote, "It's all going to be fine and dandy." That's what he said to the Saudis. And, you know, who knows?

How this started could have been something as inane as the U.S. promising Saudi Arabia a nuclear deal for their uranium enrichment and the nuclear reactor deal in exchange for doing a solid for us by attacking the Yemenis here. And don't worry, it'll end there. Well, it didn't. So, in a way, Saudi has kind of maybe sprung a trap there, or done something really stupid by doing something on behalf of Washington that quite clearly has ended in a disaster for them. It's hard to know. I think that if that was the case, it would be hugely embarrassing for MBS to know what the genealogy of this situation actually is. And it would even throw his legitimacy as leader into question. So they would have to double down.

Mohammed bin Salman would have to double down. If the truth were to be known, I'll bet you it's damning on the level of either stupidity or manipulation. That would throw his legitimacy as leader into question. You have to remember, this is a crown prince that basically purged a vast number of members of his own family from positions that might have challenged his ascendancy to leadership, and did that very publicly and aggressively, and with the assumption being that he is the most competent, he is the smartest, he's the best connected, has the best line of influence with Western powers. That's where the legitimacy of MBS comes from.

And all those assumptions will basically fall by the wayside if people were to possibly know the real story of how Saudi Arabia has painted itself into the most incredible corner right now, whereby there are no good options for Saudi Arabia and potentially looking at an existential threat to the viability of the regime itself as a result of the poor decisions and putting itself in a vulnerable position like it has. So, of course, it makes sense in that situation. You'd want to double down. You want to double down on a bad situation, bad bet even. And that's exactly what they're doing. So this is actually following a very classic pattern of failure historically.

And, yeah, but eventually the truth will come out on that, either before or after the regime is gone in Riyadh, or at least this current heir apparent, Mohammed bin Salman. So, yeah. And at the same time, Danny, there's also the inescapable trend. And the inescapable trend is Ansar Allah are growing in popularity. They're not ruling with an iron fist. They have massive popular support. It's only increasing. Nobody wants to suit up as part of this ridiculous paper mercenary army with the U. S. puppets and the Saudi puppets in Aden. They're calling them the pro-government forces, the National Presidential Council. I think they've got one of Saleh's sons who's like the acting sort of head leader now, whatever, and they just basically cut and run.

Nobody wants to fight Ansar Allah. And the reason they don't want to fight Ansar Allah isn't just because of their military prowess. It's because they have popular support. So it's the gaggle of misfits that they threw uniforms on, like mint camo, desert digital camo, like straight out of the package. Like there wasn't even a stain on anybody's uniform. And these guys look like no physique whatsoever, don't look like they can handle a gun even. And, of course, they surrendered en masse and they fled at the first sight of Ansar Allah coming over the ridge. And they have nobody left to—no more mercenary armies are available to hire now. They've done Sudan.

That's dead and buried now for a couple of years. There's nobody else that they can just draw on to get—imagine trying to put a fighting force together of even 5,000. They're going to struggle. You might be able to get some U.S. ex-Delta Force, ex-Navy SEALs, detachments, U.S., British Special Forces, but Triple Canopy isn't going to send in 1,000 Special Forces into a losing battle. No matter how much they pay those guys, they're not going to go because it's done already. The UAE have fled. This summer, the UAE fled a lot of their key positions, and guess what? They left all their weapons. They left a fortune in military gear and weapons.

And where are those weapons now? Well, you know, some of them have made it into the hands of Ansar Allah, others into al-Qaeda, militants, various and sundry. But, you know, they burned all the Takfiri armies. I mean, Saudi could have—if this had happened 15 years ago in Yemen, Saudi would have sent in the jackals, and probably 100,000, 150,000 of them. They would have brought them, like they did, from as far-flung as the Philippines, okay? From the Philippines, Indonesia, you name it, all the way around Africa, Al-Shabaab, plus the entirety of the Caucasus and Kosovo. But guess what? That's a spent force. Now they've, they've, they've done all of that in Syria, pretty much.

And ISIS was defeated as well. So there's nothing left. There's nothing left. So, and Ansar Allah are popular. They have popular support. They have control of the main populated areas, the most populated areas of Yemen, and the capital, Sana'a. So tell me, how are these insurgents? If you occupy and you're governing the capital and the majority of the populated and viable areas of the country, how are you the rebels? You're the government. That's the thing. This is how it's framed in the West, is that they're Houthi rebels. And they're not Ansar Allah as a political movement. The Houthis are just, like, a small part of it. They're not all Houthis.

It's like, yes, the leader of the Houthis is the younger brother of the late Hussein al-Houthi, the founder of the Houthi movement, Abdul Malik al-Houthi. He's a younger brother, but they're actually a relatively small percentage of the entire movement. The movement's growing. People have got to understand the symbolism of this revolt against Western and Gulf imperialism, the popular support, what that means to the Muslim community in the region, standing up for the Palestinians, even as, Sana'a, they're under siege, that hundreds of thousands of Yemenis were killed, starved to death by the U.S. and the Saudis with the support of the Israelis, then bombed and attacked by the U.S., by the Israelis, by the Saudis.

And despite all that, having lost hundreds of thousands of people in famine and war, they're still going to put it all on the line for the people of Gaza and attack Israel, go on the offensive against Israel. Do you realize what this symbolizes to the global Ummah, to the Muslim community? Yemen, like the status that Yemen has accrued from this, with everyday Muslims, whether they're from Egypt, whether they're from Libya, whether they're from Tunisia, whether they're in Algeria, Morocco, or any of the Middle Eastern countries, Iraq and so forth, even Turkey, they have their respect.

So before, the U.S. with Saudi portrayed them as apostates. And they did the same thing by radicalizing Afghanistan and all of these places around the region. All the Saudi money, all the Saudi money and U.S. political influence, have been for one reason, which is to impose sectarian divisions among Muslims in West Asia and globally. All of that is now melting away. And it's melting because of what the Iranians have done, because of the principled stance the Iranians have taken, and also the Houthis, or Ansar Allah in Yemen. And they've transcended sectarian division. No one has seen this before.

The U.S. and the British and the Israelis and some Europeans have been able to maintain this division with a lot of money and a lot of propaganda, and a lot of dirty wars, okay? And they've done this to subdue a real popular uprising, not the fake Arab Spring, which was very much co-opted, steered, and controlled, at least in the latter stages, largely by Western and Gulf intelligence and money as well. And so, in co-opting the political parties, Egypt is a good example, and even coming in to run a counter-coup afterwards, which the current Egyptian president owes his position to the Emiratis and the Saudis, because they bankrolled his ascendancy into power when they removed the Muslim Brotherhood after the first round of the Arab Spring.

That was all financed by Saudis and the Emiratis. They paid for everything. They ran the whole billion-dollar influence campaign for a year to oust the Muslim Brotherhood, Mohammed Morsi's government. That's what was really going on, along with all these paid-for insurgencies in Libya, Al-Qaeda movements in Syria as well. That's the real Arab Spring, Danny. And so now all of this, all these games, all of these moves—think of the hundreds of billions of dollars the West and Israel have milked the Saudis and the Qataris and the Kuwaitis and the Bahrainis to get them to pay for all this stuff, all the weapons, Operation Timber Sycamore.

The guns were underwritten by the Gulf. They were procured by the West. And maybe we spent a billion or two billion or three billion. It ain't nothing compared to what those guys had to spend. We procured everything. They paid the bill for Syria and probably for ISIS as well. So it's all for what? It was never sustainable. It was never sustainable. Saudi Arabia is not a civilizational state. It is a construct, as are all of those emirates, including the Kingdom of Jordan, quite frankly. But they're not sustainable. They're not real civilizational states. They're not even on the level of Yemen in terms of a legit civilizational state in Arabia.

Iraq's not even a real country. It's a cobbled-together construct, post-Ottoman British imperial construct. However, even then, Danny, they have more civilizational roots and legitimacy as a Mesopotamian civilization than any of the Gulf states have. Saudi Arabia is one giant air conditioning unit with imported labor. That's what it is. Yeah, and a whole lot of it, right? It's Arizona in West Asia, you know. Nothing against Arizona. I love Arizona. But let's just, you know, be honest. Data centers in Arizona require a lot of air con, like they do in the Gulf.

#Danny

Patrick, that was a great assessment. We are at time, but I'll never forget, and I think a lot of people, especially in the region, will never forget. First of all, the fact that the United States, from all that you outlined, and the U.S. trying to stay above it, Saudi Arabia's position right now is so precarious in large part because the U.S. has already failed to do what Saudi Arabia is trying to do this year and last year. So Operation Rough Rider was a massive failure, and it did not defeat Ansar Allah. And even during that period, people might remember there were a million Yemenis on the streets every single day marching for Gaza. And that was the case also during the entire period when they were blockading the Red Sea in solidarity with Gaza. So.

There's a big imbalance here between what the Yemeni people are doing, Ansar Allah, the Houthi movement, versus what's happening for Saudi, the U.S. side. And, of course, Iran being right there, benefiting from this very precarious dynamic. Patrick, I want to make sure everybody knows that your Substack and 21st Century Wire YouTube channel are in the video description below. So everyone should subscribe to both of those things. Support Patrick's work because all of what you hear here, here on this channel when he comes on, he does that work in spades on his own as well. So hit the like button before you go. Tomorrow, Friday, I have Alastair Crooke at 11 a.m. Eastern Time. Be sure to tune into that. I will share all the information there soon. Patrick, any final words before we head out of here?

#Patrick Henningsen

No, I appreciate the conversation, Danny. It's a very, very interesting time. And, yeah, we could be looking at the beginnings of a new, quote, Middle East or a new West Asia. Not immediately, of course, but I think the process is beginning. And I think the cradle of it all is Yemen. And actually, that is the cradle of Arabic civilization. Actually, it is Yemen, not Saudi Arabia. So not the Bedouin tribes of the barren quarter. No, no, no. It's Yemen historically. And we're talking thousands and thousands of years. So that's the reality, and we're starting to see the reassertion of that identity and that sense of drive and purpose. And I think, given time, solidarity as well, but not yet. But we're getting there. We're getting there.

So I think it's going to be really important. People also just remember, you know, how many different Arab tribes throughout the region, including people in Lebanon, in Syria, who came from, guess where, Yemen. So the influence of Yemen is region-wide, and it's always been like that. If you look back at history, as much as Egypt as well, along similar lines as Egypt. And so that's another reason why I don't see Saudis running to Egypt for assistance or help, possibly to help with the Yemenis. I don't see Egypt playing that game at all. In fact, they tried that in the past, and it didn't work out particularly well for the Egyptians, nor would I think they'd want to go down that road anyway.

So it's the paradigm, Danny, is the Gulf monarchies versus Arab nationalists, generally speaking. And I throw Iran in there, even though they're not Arab or nationalist countries. That's the real paradigm

in the region. It's the one the U.S. and Israel want to maintain, to protect, but it's also the one that's falling apart, and probably in favor of the popular movements, popular Arab nationalist movements, popular Shiite and even religious-nationalist, or like Islamic Republic movements as well. So that's what we're seeing, and that's always been the forces that govern the region, with Western control, have always had their hands on these exact levers throughout colonial history as well. Yeah, great points.

#Danny

Everyone, you heard Patrick here. Be sure to support his work outside of here too, Substack and YouTube at 21st Century Wire. Find those links in the video description. Hit the like button before you go. I'll see you tomorrow, 11 a.m. Eastern Time. Until next time, everybody, peace out.