

# Patrick Henningsen: Israel Strikes Iran's LARGEST Gas Field

## #Nima

Hi, everybody. Today is Wednesday, March 18th, 2026, and our dear friend Patrick Henningsen is here with us. Welcome back, Patrick.

## #Patrick

It's great to be with you, Nima.

## #Nima

Patrick, let me start with the new escalation in the war in the Middle East — the attack on one of the main oil refineries in Iran, the South Pars, or Assaluyeh Refinery. This is a major escalation. From your understanding of this move, it seems Netanyahu didn't act without coordinating with the United States. Reports said they were in contact with the U.S. before the attack, so Washington knew it was coming and went along with Netanyahu's agenda. Now they're opening a front where Iran has a lot of leverage. As we've seen, Iran is striking targets in Saudi Arabia and Qatar. How do you see this escalation, and what do you think was the main reason for going that far, knowing how fragile the situation already is on their side?

## #Patrick

Well, I wouldn't want to second-guess what's going on between Israel and the United States, other than to say people have to understand this was intentional. This wasn't an accident — it was intentional. So the question is, why? It seems like the Trump administration is basically following Israel, and this gets to the heart of the debate that's been raging — one I've been talking about, and others too. There are a lot of people who say, "No, there's no way Israel is dictating U.S. military actions. There's no way Israel is dictating U.S. foreign policy decisions." But I don't think that's the case. The preponderance of evidence says otherwise. So anyone making that argument at this point isn't making a serious argument.

There are a lot of people who claim to be geopolitical analysts or experts, and they're making this argument as if they don't realize they're playing into the hands of the Israelis and the Americans — because they're playing good cop, bad cop. The U.S. and Israel are like a tag team, and unfortunately, one of those partners has much greater leverage over the other. The smaller partner, Israel, has greater political leverage over Washington. That's documented — just look at the

campaign contributions from the last election cycle. So the question is, your question, Nima, is why? Why this level of escalation? Because clearly, Iran had already said beforehand that any attack like this on their oil and gas infrastructure would mean immediate retaliation against the Gulf states' energy infrastructure.

So, you know, that's the lifeblood of the Gulf. These monarchies wouldn't exist — they wouldn't be able to afford all this U.S. military protection if they didn't have oil and gas to sell. I mean, it's as simple as that. So what's going on here? One has to look at this and think, is it a strategy by Israel to destroy the Gulf countries? And then, whatever comes in their wake through chaotic upheavals or deprivation, that would be very easily controlled by Israel — either through military threats, blackmail, or in conjunction with the United States. So if they feel that these Gulf families, who were initially installed by the British and then taken over in terms of custodianship by the United States to control these monarchies — it seems like, perhaps, their time is up.

Maybe their time is up. If they're not showing themselves to be subservient enough, vassalized enough to the wishes of America — because some stern words have been made by some of the Gulf leaders, specifically from Saudi Arabia, but not only from Saudi Arabia — pretty much condemning and heavily criticizing the United States for starting this war against Iran. The Gulf states knew what could potentially come. Washington knew what could potentially come. But they felt the Iranians were bluffing, perhaps. Or is it a case that Israel wants to destroy these Gulf countries, weaken them, and ultimately take them over? Because all of them, for the most part, withdrew from the Abraham Accords.

Okay, Saudi being the lead actor in that. Israel already attacked Qatar militarily just a few months ago, so that's a big change. Israel doesn't really respect, or they don't need, these Gulf families in charge. They'd much rather put a U.S. or Israeli puppet in charge, or have the country torn to pieces and then come in after the dust settles. Then they can strike a deal with these Gulf monarchies — that if they're not on board with the Abraham Accords, if they're not going to endorse a genocide of the native Palestinian population, then they're gone. They're out. And they're getting Iran to potentially do the dirty work for them, perhaps. Maybe that's not the intention of Iran.

But that end result will be weakened monarch states in the Persian Gulf. Now, which way that goes in the end, Nima, it's anyone's guess at this point. But that's the only explanation I can come up with here, because this was intentional. This wasn't just that they got the wrong target or went a little overzealous. This is strategic by Israel. They know what's coming after this. And Iran has very little choice. I mean, the only choice Iran has at this point, other than to retaliate in kind, would be to go to the Gulf states like Qatar and say, "Well, if you're going to allow the Americans and the Israelis to destroy our LNG, our natural gas, then you're going to have to supply us with natural gas — and you're going to do it for free."

Otherwise, we're going to destroy your country, your supply. They would basically have to extort oil and gas from the Gulf states to keep Iran going. Otherwise, you know, it's going to be in-kind

retaliation — which is what we're seeing now, I believe. This is what we're seeing today. So, I mean, that's my best explanation: there's a bigger plan here, and that bigger plan is possibly to throw some of these Gulf monarch families under the bus. The U.S. and Israel — if they cared about them, they wouldn't have started this war. Simple.

So, I mean, we need to start expanding our view of this and think outside the box, because certainly, you know, the Greater Israel project is not going to exist with stubborn Gulf Arab states. Simple. Now, whether that plan is going to come to fruition or not, whether that's going to work for Israel and the U.S., that's another matter. But we are seeing an intentional move designed to get Iran to strike back at Gulf oil and gas facilities. It's not like Trump cares about the global economy. In fact, for the U.S.—and this is where there's a U.S. advantage—the beneficiary of this is going to be U.S. oil and gas companies. They will dominate. Russia will also be a beneficiary, but I think that's a secondary matter.

But first and foremost, it will be the U.S. So if you look at it from that point of view, there's a continuation of the U.S.-led operation to destroy the Nord Stream pipeline, which then created a dependency in Europe on overpriced, extortionately priced U.S. LNG—liquefied natural gas—into the northern European market. Now you have the southern European market cut off from Qatari LNG supplies. And the U.S. believes it can just ramp up production and price, and price again. Maybe Trump thinks he's going to pay off the \$40 trillion national debt this way—by basically sucking the life out of the rest of the planet and getting everybody hooked on overpriced U.S. oil and gas.

I mean, they might feel they can temporarily share the market with the U.S., and then deprive China, South Korea, and Japan—maybe discipline the Middle East a little bit, maybe get them to buy U.S. oil and gas at extortionate rates. So, from that point of view, Nima, that's what this looks like. We can look at it from the Israeli point of view—reshaping the Middle East into subservient, obedient client states—and then the U.S. benefit would be to increase demand for U.S. oil and gas at substantially higher prices. That's what it looks like to me, Nima. That's my best educated guess.

## **#Nima**

I think that makes sense, because you remember when Donald Trump went to the Middle East and the Israelis were so afraid of how much leverage those Arab states would have over him—because they were bribing Trump left and right. That's why they thought those guys were getting so much power in Washington. You remember the military cooperation with Qatar—they were so much against it in Israel. And right now, the war is doing everything for them. The problem is, Patrick, it doesn't seem that the United States sees these countries as sovereign nations. They see them as some sort of territory with a few rich people there. And is that going to influence the leadership? Or are they going to be in the same position as before—as they are right now—and stay in the same sort of mindset?

## **#Patrick**

There are two ways you can look at this—this is a very important question, you may hear it often. Okay, this is the nature of the Gulf states: their ability to rule in their respective territories, and then, what is their exact relationship with the West, with the U.S. in particular. So, one way to look at it is that the United States provides military protection to keep those families in power. As long as the U. S. keeps those families in power, they can control those states. They can also harvest the oil revenue through the petrodollar system—oil bought and sold in U.S. dollars. And the quid pro quo, since the early 1970s, has been that those Arab states would then reinvest the dollars to buy U.S. Treasury bills, U.S. debt—basically, to pump up Wall Street.

Okay, you know, there are whole institutions that have been built on the back of this petrodollar. Citibank is a good example—a powerhouse on Wall Street that's pretty much been inflated and built up by Arab petrodollars. Major institutions like that actually exert a lot of control over U.S. government policies, and Citibank handpicked Obama's cabinet in 2008. That shows you how that circular relationship works. So that's one way you can look at it. And then, with that money, they also buy U.S. weapons, U.S. jets, U.S. missile defense— all sorts of U.S. things. And the U.S. pretends to provide protection for those Gulf states.

So that's one. But to me, since the petrodollar still helps prop up the U.S. world reserve currency, the United States still needs it. But in terms of direct oil sales from the Gulf to the U.S., it's less and less—it's been diminishing over the years. And, you know, while Europe still buys a substantial amount from them—definitely in terms of LNG from Qatar—when it comes to straight-up oil sales, it's not what it used to be. The Far East is the main beneficiary of supplies from the Persian Gulf, and Iran is part of that equation as well. But the real relationship right now is that Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Kuwait, Qatar, and the other Gulf states, like Bahrain, they spend their money.

They're just used to spending money on U.S. military gear, and it makes them look tough. It also buys them a lot of favor from the U.S.—politically, from the defense industry, and from banking and finance. It brings them into the Western game in a big way. But it doesn't really provide any protection for them. It's a protection racket, and the U.S. is basically extorting these overprivileged, hereditary Arab monarchs. They use them—they're milking them for as much money as they can get, to buy the latest F-35, the latest tank, the latest defense systems, or, you know, Patriot missile batteries, or whatever.

They know they're a soft touch. And they also know that the U.S. strategy has been to stay aggressive toward Iran for years. Then they use Iran's own aggressive posture toward Israel and the U.S. to their advantage. They tell the Arab countries, "Look, Iran's a threat. Iran's a threat. You need to arm up. We're going to provide you with this." But you can't even fire a gun you buy from the United States without U.S. approval. You can't fly any air missions, you can't light up your Patriot missile batteries—you can't do anything. It's all U.S. technical teams, U.S. soldiers, U.S. staff, U.S. maintenance. Everything is American. You have no independent military at all if you buy from the U. S.

Nothing. You're basically just an outsourced franchise of the Pentagon. So politically, you have no independence at all. They're stuck in this trap because the leadership was very short-sighted, very corrupt, and not very smart. And just to prove it to you, Nima, the culmination of this was during Barack Obama's second term. Barack Obama and a young MBS, Mohammed bin Salman—who was probably only 32 or 33 years old in 2015—convinced Saudi Arabia, I think while he was defense minister (I can't remember his exact position at that time), to attack Yemen and launch a full-scale war against the neighboring country of Yemen. Of course, we know why that was.

It was really a U.S. and Israeli operation, using the UAE and getting them to pay for a lot of it, to partition Yemen—not just because of the oil in the south, but also to isolate Ansar Allah, the Houthi movement, and to regain control of the Bab al-Mandab Strait and the entire Gulf of Aden. So it was a geopolitical move. But what that showed was that they wanted Saudi Arabia to lead that war. It was all U.S. planes. Everything was American. There are even reports that the United States was flying the missions, but with Saudi flags on U.S. jets. And they got other countries involved in it. That was the peak of this arrangement.

And that went on for eight, nine years. It started in March 2015 and really didn't end until around 2023. Then it was being wound down, but it's still actually going. So that shows you these countries have zero independence, zero sovereignty. All of these royal families serve at the pleasure of the United States and ultimately Israel. Because if Israel wants to wipe any of them out, they're gone in 48 hours—they're out. And any one of these, Israel can do it for the United States, or the U.S. could do it. But the U.S. doesn't want to be seen doing that publicly, so they get Israel to handle some of their dirty work there.

So maybe this is a case of what's happening here. All of this facade is falling apart—this facade, it's now clear. The U.S., because of what Israel and the U.S. did, drew fire to all of these Gulf countries. These foolish—I'll be kind—foolish Gulf monarchs were paying billions of dollars in protection from the U.S. And look what it got them: no protection. They couldn't protect Qatar from Israel. And they're drawing fire. The whole facade of this phony relationship is a predatory one. The U.S. preys on these naive, spoiled, overprivileged Gulf hereditary families. They use Iran to threaten them, to create a case for them to buy more arms.

They cash in on the stock market. They get their petrodollars in New York. I mean, it's such a scam. The U.S. has been running this scam with the Gulf Arabs for a long time—really since the early '70s—and it's just gotten worse and worse. They keep doubling down. Now look at it: it's a mess. And there are people in the U.S. and the Gulf thinking, well, let's just wipe the board now. I mean, or in Israel, in the U.S.—let's just wipe the board now. We'll put new governments in, find other royals. There'll be a palace coup—watch, watch—and they'll take over. And those will become colonies of Israel and the U.S. That's where they're heading.

There's no way they'll allow an Arab nationalist movement to take power in any of these countries, even Bahrain. But that's probably not going to happen anyway, because they can be crushed

immediately. Any sort of political movement can be crushed. Israel will assassinate every last one of them, like they're trying to do with the Iranians now. So, you know, sorry to paint a very dark picture here, but we're looking at potential paradigm shifts—major upheavals in the Gulf—as a result of what we're seeing here. I cannot see it going back to where it was before. I just can't see it.

## **#Nima**

Patrick, the Strait of Hormuz continues to be one of the biggest challenges the Trump administration and the Israelis are facing in this war against Iran. Donald Trump is doing everything he can to push, to somehow force the Europeans into the conflict. That doesn't mean the Europeans aren't part of the war—they are, on the defensive front. They're defending, they're doing everything for the United States and Israel right now, but they don't want to go on the offensive, especially when it comes to the Strait of Hormuz.

Because I think one of the reasons is what you just mentioned with the case of the Nord Stream pipeline. They sabotaged the Nord Stream pipeline. And if not the Middle East—if they start a war in the Middle East, in the Strait of Hormuz, which they know isn't viable—that's not a real option for them, because nobody would be able to open the Strait of Hormuz. I think their calculation is this: what's your understanding of the Europeans' move, their reaction to what Donald Trump is asking for?

## **#Patrick**

Well, he's not really getting a lot of uptake from the Europeans—not really. In terms of their involvement, you know, Italy, the U.K., France—they've all got troops deployed and attached to various U.S. bases constantly. And that's because these European countries need to be involved in everything to maintain operational readiness, right? So they're always going to be attached at the hip, even if it's in a minor role. But it sort of justifies the internal military-industrial complex of those respective European countries, which are also NATO members. So it's just part of them being involved. The British always have to be involved in every single raid, coup, or war.

They have to be there next to the United States, because otherwise their forces won't get any experience. And that's going to hurt their ability to get military budgets the following year. So this is just a game that's constantly being played. But in terms of getting them to come in to help open the Strait of Hormuz—uh, why? Why would Donald Trump be asking that if the U.S. has the most powerful military in the world? If they're winning, if they destroyed the Iranian Navy, if they destroyed their air force, and they destroyed all of their missiles—or half their missiles, or whatever Trump's claiming that particular afternoon, or that particular breakfast session, whatever the case may be—why would they need Europeans to help?

Why not just call Israel and have them come? Israel has a navy. They've got ships—they can do it. Why not? They're the greatest friend and ally. Because the U.S. has done this very cynically: Trump

wants to draw in the Europeans to create a target in order to diffuse the tension. And also, if it's just the U.S. and Israel, that's a big, obvious target—that's only going to motivate the Iranians even more and inflame the situation further. So they want to bring in the Europeans with this idea that Iran might hesitate to attack a European naval vessel for fear of drawing a European power into an alliance with the U.S. and Israel. But that's exactly what Trump wants to do.

He wants to use the Europeans as shields, yeah? And some European countries are smart enough to see this; others aren't so bright. But they all have one problem: they're completely subservient and vassalized to Washington, and it's very hard for them to get out of that role. So what Trump will do is offer them—he's always trying to use every situation to leverage some transaction that connects to another, separate situation. In the case of the Europeans, those separate situations would be like bargaining chips—Ukraine, for instance, or some kind of NATO arrangement. He's already trashed NATO and blamed the European countries.

He said to them at the press conference this week, "Well, I don't understand why the European countries don't want to help. I mean, we didn't have to come and help with Ukraine, but we did." No, the U.S. actually started the Ukraine war. They launched a coup and a civil war under Obama in 2014. And Donald Trump himself flooded Ukraine with weapons and lethal aid during his first term. He also sabotaged the Minsk peace process during that time—his government did that. So the war wouldn't have happened had Trump not done those things. And Obama as well. So the U.S. as a whole—the United States—is responsible for the Ukraine war, 100%. They've led it.

They've driven it. They created it. They dragged the Europeans into it to create a proxy war, to create a threat to Europe so that the Europeans were then motivated to defend themselves. This is all manipulation by the U.S., okay? So, uh, Trump trying to play that card—in one way, this is good, because hopefully it'll wake up some of these Europeans and these sort of bureaucrats and technocrats that are completely lost and drowning in their own propaganda. But what Trump will also do is perhaps leverage this to get some sort of, uh, you know, deal on Greenland with Denmark, for instance, or to be less aggressive with Greenland—who knows. But this White House will try anything.

They'll try anything. It's a gaggle of absolute degenerates—just absolute white-collar criminals who fancy themselves as international gangsters at this point, with no regard for U.S. law, U.S. constitutional law, international law, any treaty or convention, the United Nations Charter—nothing. Nothing. They've trashed it all. They make fun of it, they deride it, and they thumb their nose at anybody trying to raise any kind of humanitarian, human rights, or moral argument. They don't care. This is a rogue state now. It's a rogue hegemon. It's no longer a superpower. To be a superpower, you have to have the cooperation of partners.

You have to lead through institutions, through cooperation and trust. And Donald Trump inherited that. But Joe Biden did tremendous damage to this, by the way. Still, Donald Trump inherited a superpower. What Donald Trump's going to leave after four years is not a superpower—it's a rogue

hegemon. And that's an empire in steep, steep decline. That's what Trump will have left. If he makes it through four years—and at this rate, I don't think he may—some people in the U.S. will have to call on their better angels to invoke the 25th Amendment, that he's not mentally fit to be president. I mean, what we're witnessing now, and what's being said and done, it's unbelievable.

It's doing irreparable damage—irreparable damage—to the future of the United States, and it's risking a full-blown third world war. Because there are other powers in the world looking at this and saying, actually, the United States, and Israel as its partner, have become an existential threat to the world now on a scale we've never seen before. If you think about Japan and Germany—well, more so Japan in the Pacific theater, in terms of its expansionist imperial power, its designs and strategies and so forth—I mean, it was significant. But with Germany, it was fairly localized, aside from Eastern Europe and the Russian front, and a little bit in North Africa. The United States is projecting this continuously around the globe.

They're talking about three-front, four-front major conflagrations they want to manage simultaneously, with the help, of course, of Israel. And Israel has its own ambitions to dominate the Middle East with the Greater Israel Project. Maybe, to do that, they need to weaken the United States a little bit—and that's actually happening right now. There are different ways we can look at this, Nima, but, you know, how Iran fits into this equation really just comes down to a war of attrition, resilience, and the possibility of deterrence if the U.S. and Israel have depleted their interceptor stocks and military ammunition enough that it might lead to some kind of a...

## **#Nima**

Ceasefire, or pause, or some sort of armistice in all of this—that's about all we can say at this point, I think, Patrick. When it comes to the Strait of Hormuz, recently the foreign minister of Iran had an interview with Al Jazeera. He said they're defining the mechanism of the Strait of Hormuz—you know, they're trying to make sure it's not going to go back to the same situation it had before. It seems that Iran is seriously considering how to manage the Strait of Hormuz. And, you know, there's an article in the Financial Times that argues that Iran's actions in the Strait of Hormuz show the reality of multipolar economic warfare.

For decades, the United States dominated sanctions and used financial pressure as a strategic weapon. Now other powers, like India, Iran, and China, are using similar tools in response to escalations. This is literally what's going on in the Strait of Hormuz. I don't know if they were planning for this, but the United States forced them to take this new position. How do you see the management of the Strait of Hormuz by the Iranians as time goes by—either in the aftermath of this war or during it?

## **#Patrick**

Well, that all depends, Nima—you know, firstly, on the production capacity of the Gulf states and of Iran in oil and gas. What's that production capacity going to be? Because as it stands, the U.S. and Israel can bring the Iranian production capacity to near zero if they choose. Now, that's not to say Iran wouldn't be able to get supplies from other sources—they certainly can, and they can do some domestic supply themselves. But in terms of their export capacity, that could be severely damaged. And this is why Iran also wanted to pursue a civilian nuclear power strategy, because they knew their petroleum industry resources and production capacity could be targeted, either through sanctions or through other means, which we're seeing now.

So that's why they wanted a diverse portfolio in terms of energy, and that makes perfect sense. That's why the U.S. is targeting their civilian nuclear program. It's not because of weapons—it's because it provides an outlet in the event of a crisis. It would allow them to power cities, to power their industries, and so forth. This is also why the U.S. strategically went after Germany's nuclear power and convinced Germany—by co-opting and infiltrating the so-called Green Movement, the Green Party—to shut down their nuclear fleet. Very clever. And then they destroyed the Nord Stream pipeline, cutting off their gas.

So it left Germany with nothing—left Germany with coal. And now Germany has to pay a carbon indulgence tax for firing up any of their coal plants. They're paying that. They're also paying extra, what's called the "Uncle Sam tax," for taking expensive U.S. LNG across the Atlantic. So the U.S. has made Germany bankrupt—brought it down, brought their economy down—and made them dependent on U.S. energy. And they have no nuclear power. I mean, the Germans are just stupid. This is the most idiotic move by successive German governments, maybe in modern history—just no regard for their own sovereignty. You can't be sovereign unless your energy is independent.

If you're energy dependent—more than 50% of your energy—you're not really sovereign. You have to do a lot of negotiations and trading to maintain some independence, but ultimately you're going to be dependent. So you'll need good diplomatic relations with your neighbors, and if you can't do that, you're in trouble. So, the future of the region—if the Arabs aren't producing—then what is the Strait of Hormuz at that point? The Persian Gulf could become a dead lake compared to what it's been over the last 50 years. We have to look at that situation. Now, look at Saudi Arabia's east-west pipeline to Yanbu on the Red Sea—the Petroline.

They're looking at this as a potential pressure-release valve for the situation, but that's not going to provide eight million barrels of oil per day. And that's the estimated shortfall of the Persian Gulf right now—eight million per day to the global supply. So that's why the International Energy Agency announced this big release of 400 million barrels from oil reserves. That's basically a month and a half. A month and a half—it's nothing. It's not a solution to anything; it's an act of desperation. And the most that Saudi can ship to the Red Sea right now is limited by the capacity of that pipeline and the processing at the port.

You're talking about 1.5 to 1.7 million barrels a day, maximum—that's the current capacity for those facilities. They'd have to do serious upgrades to that system to get it up to maybe four or five million barrels per day. And they're probably working on that right now, but guess what? That same port in Saudi Arabia, on the Red Sea coast, has been attacked by Ansar Allah—the Houthis—before. It's completely within range of the Yemenis. So that's another front in the war that's potentially opened up here. How can they manage all these fronts? This is a disaster.

So, I mean, until the Gulf Arabs pull their finger out and actually realize and prioritize their own existence—the welfare of the region, the future of their people—and not their bank accounts in New York or whatever deals they've got going on the back end with the Israelis and AI and all the rest of it, then the situation for them is terminal. It's terminal. The U.S. is very happy to knock them offline. They probably believe they can survive for a while, and they're going to make so much money from oil and gas in America. But America will bankrupt the rest of the world through inflation, by squeezing supplies and using leverage.

Imagine what Trump would do if the Gulf were offline. What sort of, you know, racketeering do you think you're going to see from the U.S.? Look at what they're doing to Cuba—they won't even allow Mexico or Venezuela to give fuel to Cuba. So he's starving the country. Famine? No problem. Mass death? No problem. "We're doing it because we're fighting the communists." I mean, the level America's at right now—this is the lowest the United States has ever been in its history. Lower than Vietnam, because at least with Vietnam they had the fake excuse that they were battling communism.

You know, they at least had this ideological excuse within the framework of the Cold War. And, you know, to some degree that could be seen as somewhat legitimate, because this was a nuclear arms race between the Soviet Union and America. So there was this existential threat looming in the background, if you will. I mean, they sort of had that as a kind of excuse. What have they got now? What's the menace now that the U.S. is fighting? Is the menace that they're not going to be able to dominate everything going forward? That they might have to share the cutting edge of civilization with China? Is that the big threat to the U.S.? You can't sell that. You could sell a Cold War.

You could sell communism. You could sell it to your own people, and you could probably sell it to the world—half the world back then. They have nothing to sell now but intimidation, racketeering, protection rackets, fear, you know, just open threats of annihilation, threats of ethnic cleansing, siege warfare. That's what the U.S. is selling right now. And Israel's been selling that for 75 years to the Palestinians and to the region. Look at what Israel's doing to Lebanon—they're taking out city blocks in a premier metropolitan city in West Asia, Beirut. Do you see anybody pushing back from Europe against this? Do you see anybody standing up in Congress? No. They're all for it. We are in an age of brutality right now.

This is an age of savagery. And it's not because the U.S. is savage, or because Israel is brutal and barbaric. The reason it's happening is that no country will stand up to oppose it—not even

rhetorically, not even diplomatically. Russia and China might have something to say about it, but it's nothing. At the moment, it's Iran versus the world, with some assistance from the Chinese and the Russians—in terms of intelligence, maybe some military coordination, some cooperation. But besides that, it's Iran versus the world right now. I mean, what do you think the logical outcome of this is going to be? It's not going to be good for the Gulf, I can tell you that.

## **#Nima**

I think, Patrick, comparing the Persian Gulf to what's been happening in Ukraine—and basically the problems coming out of Ukraine for the Europeans—well, the Europeans have been suffering for four years of that conflict because of what happened between, you know, for example, Germany and Russia, the sabotage of the Nord Stream pipeline, and this sort of animosity, this nonsense hatred toward Russia. But the problem, when it comes to the Middle East, is deeper than that. Europe has a lot of problems with energy, but in the Persian Gulf, the problem is everything. They don't have food, they don't have water. If this escalation continues—if these escalations continue—and you start seeing desalination plants being hit, oil production being hit, everything, the state is going to disappear.

## **#Patrick**

There's no way back. There's no way back, because if desalination plants get hit, then obviously they can't sustain life. You'll probably have mass migration—probably to Europe. And they have money, by the way. They've still got money. So that money can buy them a ticket to Europe and the most expensive properties in Paris, London, Madrid, Barcelona, Rome, and so on—Swiss Alps, France, Germany, whatever, even the United States. So these people will leave, and the slave labor they've employed from Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, India, the Philippines—they'll go back home. They'll go back home. So, I mean, the region will just become a shell of its former self. But look, why do all these countries and these Gulf states exist? They're basically countries attached to U.S. bases.

So the U.S. and Israel will just move in. They'll move in, fix the desalination plants, and rebuild it for themselves. That's their plan, that's their idea. If they can't have it, they're going to wreck it and then take it. But Iran is standing in the way because that doesn't work for Iran's regional security architecture. I've been saying this for years, and so have the Iranians, by the way—that the Gulf, the Middle East, needs a new security architecture. It needs to be created by the Middle East, not by America, not by Europe—by the Middle East. It needs a Middle East-led, West Asia-led security architecture that doesn't depend on the U.S. or any foreign country like that, not even Russia, not even China.

It's for the region, and they manage it themselves, for their own benefit. That's what needs to happen. But obviously, the U.S. might be okay with that, and Israel might be okay with that—as long as Iran is not part of that security architecture. So we have a fundamental, major problem here. I'm telling you, you're looking at all-out total warfare right now. And what Israel did, in terms of

attacking the South Pars gas field—bad news for Qatar. Bad news. They're very worried now. Qatar is panicking. You're going to start to see a flight of capital from these countries like you haven't seen before, especially in the coming month, in the spring. You're going to see a flight of U.S. corporations and Western companies. It's already begun in Dubai.

And likewise, the Gulf states are going to withdraw their DFI—direct foreign investment—from Western countries and businesses. Or they're just going to pack up, leave, and go offshore. And, you know, literally, they'll suck their liquidity and assets out of those areas. They're going to relocate that capital somewhere else—maybe in China, who knows, maybe in the U.S. Maybe Trump will get some. This is all-out war. What Israel did by killing Ali, or the head of security, Larijani, and then announcing after that—Nima Alkhorshid—and also killing one of the heads of Iranian intelligence, they said after that they're now going to target all Iranian officials. So they're going to regard every politician, every government official, as a terrorist, and they're going to hunt them down. They just said that today.

Our policy is we're going to hunt them down. They're trying to destroy the Iranian state—the country—just like they've done before, trying to destroy any possible negotiators, any possible diplomats. They'll go after everybody. And then they'll point to Iran and say, “Ah, look, we don't have anyone to negotiate with.” No—because you murdered them all. That's what Israel did to Lebanon. It's what they're doing to the Palestinians. That's what they'll do to whatever the target country is. They did it in Iraq, and they're doing it with Iran—continuing to do it with Iran. Now they're going to ramp it up.

If they can't hit mass civilian targets and kill—well, you know, Israel would love to slaughter Iranians and kill them en masse, like they did to the native Palestinian population. They would like nothing more than to do that. The only problem is, they're not going to be able to cultivate any political capital in the West anymore if they continue this kind of mass-murder policy. So instead, what Israel is going to do is just say, “Well, these are going to be targeted assassinations because Iran is a terrorist state. Ergo, any official who holds any office is a terrorist, and we're going to kill them.” And they just announced that policy today. This is total warfare.

You can't come back from this. It's going to be brutal—annihilation on one side, the other, or both. That's where this is going to end. And it's very likely that world powers will have to be drawn in to stop it, or to help decide who's going to be the winner. For the betterment of the rest of the world, the axis of evil powers right now are the United States and Israel. That is clear from a historical perspective—looking at how wars start, like the Second World War, for example. The aggressors are the U.S. and Israel. That's the Axis powers. And you'll have allied powers forming, probably in a coalition aligned with Iran and other countries.

So, you know, the Gulf states need to decide what side they want to be on in this story, because right now they're with the Germans and the Italians in World War II—they're with the Axis powers. And, uh, a tremendous amount of damage, a tremendous number of lives lost as a result of these

world wars—tremendous damage—and borders get redrawn at the end of it. And their borders will be redrawn. These Gulf states can kiss their little fiefdoms goodbye if they're going to commit to the road they're currently on, which I believe is probably going to be the losing gambit. They do have some power, only just, and not for very long.

But they do have power and influence now, if they choose to band together for the betterment of the region rather than their families' own personal interests. The U.S. has been playing them—the British, the U.S., the Israelis have all been playing these family cliques. They've been playing them so well over the years, manipulating them, getting them to do things against their own interests, getting them to fight wars against their neighbors. I mean, it's unbelievable how easily manipulated these Gulf families have been. Now you can see the whole thing is falling to pieces.

And them throwing their Arab brothers and sisters under the bus—throwing the Palestinians under the bus for decades and decades—has finally caught up with them. And now their very existence is under serious question. It's their own fault, because they chose to look west rather than east. They chose against their own Arab brothers, sisters, and neighbors. They chose London, Paris, and New York over Beirut, Jerusalem, and, you know, Tehran, Baghdad, and Damascus—Cairo too. They chose the West, and this is the result of it now. It's coming to fruition, coming to a big, big culmination—a big, big climax now.

## **#Nima**

Patrick, since the assassination of Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah, many people are arguing—basically in the mainstream media—that the axis of resistance is somehow getting weaker, that Hezbollah doesn't exist anymore, the Assad regime is gone, the Yemenis are under some sort of control from the United States, and Iran is weakened as a result of all this. And right now, with the war happening—the main war that Netanyahu has been wishing for, you know, for more than twenty years—he's finally got it. They're in it. And we have the axis of resistance: Lebanon is targeting the southern part of Israel. They've never targeted that part of Israel before. It shows that it doesn't matter.

There's no sign of weakness, in my opinion, so far from what we've seen from Lebanon. On the ground, they're fighting the Israelis as well. That's why Israel is calling up 540,000 new reservists to join the army. I don't know how well trained they are—that's a big question. The other thing is that, so far, we're seeing some coordination between Iran, Hezbollah, and the groups in Iraq. The Yemenis are not in the fight right now. It seems that, from how the axis of resistance is feeling, they don't need Yemen to join. And it doesn't show that the axis of resistance has been weakened. In my opinion, this war against Iran is really a manifestation of what the axis of resistance represents for the whole Arab world.

## **#Patrick**

Yeah, no, what this shows is that the leader of the axis of resistance is Iran, and the Arab countries are following its lead. Iran set the example. No other country had the courage to strike at Israel—only Iran did, and also Hezbollah. But Hezbollah doesn't have the same level of capabilities and resources that Iran has. It's the local militia of South Lebanon. They're very good fighters. They fought bravely in Syria, defeated ISIS and al-Nusra there, and they fought bravely against the Israelis and defeated them in 2006. But Israel has basically changed the game, because the difference between then and now is that back in 2006, or in previous years, it wasn't acceptable to kill civilians casually—to kill them by the tens of thousands.

And Israel has removed that prohibition in warfare, and the United States has endorsed it. The U.S. has enabled it and also partnered with Israel in a genocide, you see. So that changes things. This is not to the advantage of Hezbollah or any other country, because all these other countries now have to think about any action they take—attacking or counterattacking against the Israelis—might mean that tens of thousands, fifty thousand, maybe more, maybe hundreds of thousands, could potentially die as a result of their actions. That's a lot of weight on the shoulders of a group like Hezbollah.

So it's kind of like extreme blackmail by the Israelis and the Americans. If you dare to touch us, we're going to wipe out tens of thousands of your people—because that's how we do business. You know, Bashar al-Assad had to make that calculation every day in Syria. But he was criticized by the war hawks and the, you know, crowd online for not being tough enough against the Israelis. Well, it's easy for them to say that. But Israel can come in, take out a city block, and kill twenty thousand people like it's nothing—like they just finished breakfast. They have no moral compunction about killing Arabs. Israel doesn't care.

The United States doesn't care either. The only reason the U.S. cares is because it might hurt their ability to participate and make deals with some of their allies or other countries if they're seen as killing too many people—too many civilians. That's the only thing that restrains the Trump administration. It's just, you know, a little bit of the reputation they're clinging to there. So, you know, in terms of the Axis, Nima, Syria—breaking down the Syrian government and collapsing the Assad government—that was the bridge that would supply and support Hezbollah. But it also held the high ground at Mount Hermon and part of the Golan Heights.

OK, those are now lost because the U.S. and the Israelis installed an al-Qaeda terrorist government in Damascus—one that Donald Trump even invited to the White House. The former deputy head of ISIS, founder of al-Qaeda in Syria, al-Sharar, a.k.a. al-Jilani. So they put the black flag flying over Damascus to block the bridge, to isolate Hezbollah, but also to create a corridor for attacking Iran—for Israel via Iraqi Kurdistan—and to weaken the Iraqis so they can't cooperate with the Syrian government and the Lebanese, specifically the Hashd al-Shabi. But as you said, Nima, the Hashd al-Shabi has not gone away.

Hezbollah has not gone away, despite all the attacks, despite having their leaders murdered—the Hashd's commander, Abu Mahdi al-Mohandes; the Quds Force's General Qasem Soleimani; Hassan Nasrallah, the Secretary General of Hezbollah—all assassinated, all killed. But the groups are still there. They're still fighting. And guess what? They're probably going to be mobilizing a lot more young people to fight for their cause now. That's not going to be a problem for them. And Iran is the same, with the IRGC and with Iranian society. They now see the true evil of the U.S. and Israel. Young generations see it. They're not going to have any problem recruiting for the next generations. So the Israelis and Americans are looking at the population as the enemy now.

That's why you're seeing the targeting of civilians. The Israelis view the general population as a threat because they believe—both the Israelis, in their kind of criminal mindset, and the U.S., the Trump administration—that these populations will produce resistance. So therefore, they think, “We must target the population. We need to kill them.” The U.S. and Israel are taking Western society and civilization and winding the clock back 400 or 500 years, back to medieval times. This is a medieval mentality—pre-colonial even—just straight-up medieval barbarism: rogue, corrupt city-states and kings, mass siege warfare. This isn't the norm.

Look at what they're doing to Cuba. That's medieval siege warfare—no regard for human life whatsoever. And the cowards in the U.S. Congress and Senate have nothing to say about it, because in their feeble little minds they think it's somehow justified, since there's an “evil communist government” in Havana, as if it's a threat to the United States. What's Cuba ever done to the U.S.? Nothing. Nothing. And look what the U.S. is doing now—they're abusing the Cuban people. Marco Rubio, Donald Trump—laying siege to an entire country, threatening anybody who will give them aid, with the intent to destroy the society, to kill people.

They want famine. They want it. They call it “maximum pressure.” And where's the opposition in the U.S. government? Where's the opposition from the U.S. media? Is America that immoral now, in 2026, that they can't look at this—just 90 miles off their coast—and see how fundamentally evil this is? It's satanic, the level of abuse. I mean, this is just... and the European countries as well—they're okay with it. Forget about South America; they've all been threatened. The U.S. has said, “We'll come in and kidnap. We'll take your head of state and throw them in a jail in New York. So keep your mouth shut.”

And if you want to bring oil to the Cubans, we'll take your tanker. Thank you very much. We'll keep the oil, sell it, and keep the money. Thank you very much. That's where we're at right now. That's where we're at. And if people don't really understand and appreciate the depth of the depravity at this point in history—see it for what it is and act accordingly, to do something to stop it—there's still a window to stop this politically. But if they don't take this opportunity now, who knows what's going to happen on the back of this. They're forcing a third world war. They're forcing it and making it happen.

## **#Nima**

Patrick, before wrapping up, we know that many hours since Donald Trump took power—was elected in the United States—we were talking about Tulsi Gabbard, Kash Patel. These are people who could do something in the administration, you know, good people. But as time went by, we learned that these people are not going to do anything. But finally, someone in the Trump administration has decided to resign—someone nobody was talking about. We weren't. We never considered him a, you know, good character within the Trump administration who would do something about its policies, who would go against these kinds of policies. And his name is, you know, Joe Kent.

He's the director of the National Counterterrorism Center. He resigned in protest against the war on Iran. And we know how important domestic policy is for whatever the United States is doing outside the country. How important is that, in your opinion? And how is it going to change? Because we know the Democrats, for their own reasons—not because of Donald Trump, but for their own reasons—want to go after him. But this sort of movement that comes from within the Republican Party, they don't want it. This guy was involved in those endless wars in the Middle East. He lost his wife in Syria. He knows what he's talking about. What do you make of it?

## **#Patrick**

I think from a symbolic point of view, it's hugely important, even if he's the only one to resign. And he might be the only one, because everybody else is being threatened right now—you better believe it. The word has gone down the chain of command from Trump, from Pete Hegseth, from everybody. They're threatening to destroy, to ruin anybody who follows in the footsteps of Joe Kent. At the same time, they're promising riches, fame, and rewards to those who stay loyal to this administration. So Joe Kent probably represents the elite—the best of the U.S. Armed Forces. I mean, look at his résumé; it's unparalleled in terms of combat deployments, you know, elite units like the Texas Rangers, Green Berets, et cetera.

So he's not an easy person to attack. Donald Trump tried to insult him. What Trump does whenever anybody breaks ranks is he calls them a loser. He attacks their wife, he makes fun of them. If they have a family member who's dying of cancer, Donald Trump will make fun of the person who's dying. And, you know, he's just a disgusting—just, I mean, the things that Trump has done, attacking Thomas Massie over his dead wife, or his current wife, I don't know—but it's just disgusting. There are no limits for Trump and what he'll do to attack somebody he views as disloyal. But he can't do that with Joe Kent, because if he does, he's going to alienate all the SEAL Team 6 guys, all the special forces guys.

And the special forces guys are the real leaders. They have all the podcasts. Joe Kent was CIA paramilitary—he was a para for the CIA. There are a lot of guys who worked for the CIA in a military capacity who now have the leading podcasts, the top radio shows. They're the guests who come on

Fox. If Donald Trump attacks Joe Kent in the vicious, rude, crass way he usually does—because that's his nature, right?—it's because he's a mentally unstable, narcissistic type, a typical psychological profile with a very fragile ego for someone that powerful and famous. You'd think he'd be above that, but he's not.

He was hurt badly by this resignation. You could see Trump was completely disheveled during the press conference when asked about it. He had to think twice. He felt constrained. He couldn't come out and call Joe Kent a loser, a coward, and all the things Trump would like to call him. But if you read Joe Kent's letter, it's very measured—he's very straight, analytical. You can see he's someone who values his professionalism. I might have written it slightly differently, but in general, if I were in that position, I'd write something very similar to what Joe Kent wrote. He's kind of blown the whistle on the fraud—the intelligence fraud.

And what Joe Kent's letter is pointing to as well is not just Trump himself, but that it exposes the complete fraud of Tulsi Gabbard, who's allegedly the director of national intelligence, but has allowed all the fake Israeli intelligence to be stovepiped into the U.S. system to prepare for and ultimately justify a war. So the DNI—Tulsi's position—they shouldn't even have this department anyway. It was a post-9/11 creation, like so many bad ones, such as the Department of Homeland Security in 2002 or 2003. It's meant to be an objective backstop, to have an independent final curation of incoming intelligence from different sources to present to the president, so the president can make an informed decision.

But that's not what Tulsi Gabbard's doing. She's under the control of the White House, so she can't be objective. She's obfuscating. Her job now is to obscure real intelligence and flood Trump with bad intelligence. And Trump has proven he'll basically believe anything that's laid out on his desk. You could show him pictures of dead ducks in Salisbury, say it's a Novichok attack, and Trump will go, "Oh, that's very bad, very bad. What should we do?" And they'll say, "Well, we recommend that you expel all the Russian diplomats. Let's ramp up the Ukraine war." "Okay, that sounds good to me." He'll do anything. He's so easy to manipulate because he's functionally illiterate. He doesn't read.

He can read, but he chooses not to. He relies on whatever people are whispering in his ear—this sort of corrupt coterie of grifters, neocons, and Israeli operatives that basically have him cocooned, this president. So it's hopeless. They could tell him that, literally, Martians are launching green cheese missiles at the U.S.—"We need to attack the moon, we need to do it quick, otherwise Martian terrorists are going to wipe us out"—and he'd launch a nuclear attack against the moon. If he has enough people around him—Stephen Miller and all the other glad-handers—he'll believe anything. He even believed that Iran was going to somehow launch a surprise attack against the entire region.

Imminent threat—turns out that's not true. In fact, the U.S. intelligence assessments, when you actually look at them, say that's not the case. But that's not what was put on the president's desk. And then Tulsi Gabbard will come around and tweet, like she did today. She'll say the president deemed it to be a credible threat. Therefore, you know, "I'm loyal, I work for the president, and Iran

is a terrorist state," and blah, blah, blah. Tulsi Gabbard is just another propaganda mouthpiece, another fake political construct, a great American political fraud who pretended to be anti-war for years in order to build a grassroots support base—which Donald Trump then saw and tapped into.

He says, "We'll have that. We're going to add that to the MAGA base, to the MAGA coalition." That's all he did—and by doing that, he managed to get Tulsi Gabbard to help Donald Trump capture enough independent, populist, anti-war votes. Very, very difficult to get, but crucial in terms of swinging an election. She helped him; she delivered that for Trump. But the quid pro quo was that, by doing so, she basically had to jettison and let go of all her anti-war positions. And now she's become a neocon. It's an amazing facelift—to go from Democrat anti-war to neocon, rabid Zionist, anti-Muslim to the hilt. After October 7th, she knows—Tulsi Gabbard should know better than anybody.

She went to Syria during the war. She knew that the U.S. was trafficking billions of dollars' worth of weapons into the hands of al-Qaeda affiliates and ISIS affiliates to destabilize and wreck the country. And Israel was also involved. She knew all this. She even tabled legislation to stop funding or arming terrorists—that was her bill. Okay? So she knew all of these groups, and she knew all this. She let it all go. And she knew that Iran, that Shiites, weren't part of this Wahhabi Sunni terrorist conclave. She knew that. She knew that Qasem Soleimani was fighting ISIS and al-Nusra on the ground in Syria. She knew that the Hashid were fighting ISIS in Iraq.

She knew Hezbollah were fighting and dying against Nusra, against ISIS. Yet she turns around now and calls Iran a terrorist state. Iran is not a terrorist state. They're not even one percent a terrorist state. The biggest terrorists in the world right now—if you want to talk about governments—who are they? Which governments are carpet-bombing densely populated civilian areas, threatening populations with expulsion if they don't leave, committing ethnic cleansing, genocide, kidnapping heads of state, stealing people's oil and resources, hijacking their oil tankers, and bragging about it to the world media? Who are the terrorists? The U.S. and Israel are the biggest terrorist states on the planet right now. Everybody knows it.

And Tulsi Gabbard's saying Iran is this terrorist state. They fought all the U.S.-backed and U.S.-armed terrorists that infested Iraq and Syria and carried out terrorist attacks in other places. And the MEK, another terrorist organization backed by the CIA—Iran fought all of them. And someone like Tulsi, who actually knows this, knows the truth, she's turned around and gone the full Israeli neocon party line, the John Bolton line: "Iran is an evil terrorist, leading state sponsor of terror in the world." A complete fabricated talking point, one used to justify the illegal war of aggression that the United States and Israel are currently waging against the Islamic Republic of Iran. The whole thing is a fraud.

And people like Tulsi, Trump, and all these others who leveraged the anti-war message—you know, she said, Tulsi—the last thing I'll say, Nima, because this is just unbelievable, what's going on in America. Tulsi Gabbard said in her tweet that Donald Trump won an overwhelming electoral victory,

basically insinuating that he has a mandate to carry out his foreign policy. She's lying. Donald Trump won because he ran on an anti-war platform, saying he was going to stop regime-change wars. She chimed in on the exact same campaign platform—that was the biggest plank, one of the biggest planks in the entire platform. That's what he ran on; that's why he got the margin he got. So it's very disingenuous of her to turn around eighteen months later and use that electoral claim, that supposed mandate, to launch an undeclared, illegal regime-change war of aggression.

Illegal by U.S. constitutional standards, and internationally as well. It's very—it's unbelievable—the kind of gymnastics move she's trying to pull, clearly completely in the tank for Israel and for the neocons driving Trump on this. So it's a lie. It's disingenuous. It's also stabbing the American people in the back, and definitely stabbing everyone who voted for Trump on that basis. The original MAGA movement—they've just thrown them right under the bus. And why?

For promises of fame and fortune in the next election cycle, in 2028. They've all been promised a seat at the table. Tulsi's been promised a ride on the ticket—most likely, my understanding is, as a vice-presidential candidate in the next presidential election cycle. But she's not the only one who's been promised that. They've probably promised it to about half a dozen other people. That's how politics works. That's what the Israeli lobby does with its power and influence, with its money. They're able to have those conversations offstage with people like Gabbard, or people like Rubio, or whoever else. I mean, if you actually looked to see who's been promised what, there aren't enough available seats on the next electoral train for the number of people who've been promised seats on that train.

Tulsi is just another one—another malleable, fluid politician who will change and shapeshift into whatever she needs to. J.D. Vance is another one. He'll change and shapeshift whichever way the political train is going in order to keep and retain power. He'll change and shift accordingly. So these are just empty vessels, these people, and they move according to power. And when the oligarchs and international—you know, the titans of industry, the Israeli mafia—whatever direction they want these American politicians to go, they'll go. They'll go. And they promise, "Oh, you'll be able to do a lot of good if you stay in power." Tulsi's diehard fans—there aren't many left—are saying, "Oh no, she shouldn't resign."

It'd be better if she stayed in government—better if she stayed in government because she could change things from the inside. How's that change from the inside going right now? Not very good. She's been co-opted. She's been co-opted by the war machine. She's now part of the war machine. She's now the biggest advocate for war. And that's why they selected her. They knew if they could take her and transform her into a lethal weapon for this international criminal cartel, they would have achieved a massive victory. They eliminated any potential future opposition in Tulsi Gabbard as an anti-war Democrat or whatever. They got rid of her. She's now on their team. And this is how it goes.

This is the same with all these kinds of people they select on that basis—that they can turn them. Then they become part of it, they become co-opted, and then basically Tulsi is advocating for war. She's playing a pivotal role in pushing us toward World War III now. That's a huge change—180 degrees from where she was two or three years ago. And many of us are now asking, was she ever sincere about her anti-war views, or was that just a game being played to get from one stepping stone to the next? I think that's a legitimate question at this point. But she has big political aspirations for 2028, and that probably explains a lot about what she's doing right now.

## **#Nima**

Yeah, thank you so much, Patrick, for being with us today. A great pleasure, as always.

## **#Patrick**

Yeah, thanks, Nima. These are very difficult times for the world, especially for people in Iran, people in West Asia. And it's also going to be increasingly difficult for people in America if they allow their leadership to take them down this reckless path. That's my firm belief, and I'm not alone in that belief either. So all we can do at this point, Nima, is try to raise the issues as honestly as we can and pray at this point.

## **#Nima**

Exactly.

## **#Patrick**

See you soon. Yep, see you soon. Thanks.