

Patrick Henningsen: Global Crisis Incoming: The Hormuz Trap Nobody Saw

This interview argues that the attack on Iran's key energy infrastructure was a deliberate escalation meant to trigger wider regional conflict. It claims Washington and Israel are coordinating to weaken Iran, pressure Gulf monarchies, and reshape the Middle East while increasing dependence on U.S. energy exports. The discussion also says Europe is being pushed into the crisis around the Strait of Hormuz, exposing fragile alliances, fake security guarantees, and the risk of a much broader war with global economic fallout.

#Nima

The new escalation in the war in the Middle East was the attack on one of the main oil refineries in Iran, the South Pars, or Asaluya Refinery—one of the most important ones. This is a new escalation. From your understanding of this kind of move, it seems Netanyahu didn't do it without coordinating with the United States. Axios reported that they were coordinating with the U.S. before the attack, so the United States knew it was coming and went along with Netanyahu's agenda. Right now, they're opening something that gives Iran a lot of leverage if it chooses to use it. And as Iran is hitting Saudi Arabia—as we talked about—they're also hitting Saudi Arabia and Qatar. How do you see this escalation, and what was the main reason for going that far, knowing how fragile the situation 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 was intentional—it wasn't an accident. 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 raging, which I and others have been talking about. 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 evidence—the preponderance of evidence—says otherwise. So anybody 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—well, what they're really doing is 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, okay? And unfortunately, one of those tag team partners has much greater leverage over the other. The smaller partner, Israel, has greater political leverage over Washington. And that's evidenced—it'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 energy 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, are no longer useful in controlling 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 withdrew, for the most part, 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. So, uh, 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, you know, have the country torn to pieces and then come in after the dust settles to strike up a deal with these Gulf monarchies. 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 Iran's intention, but the 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 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 retaliation in kind, which is what we're seeing. I believe that's what we're seeing now, today. So, I mean, my best explanation is that there's a bigger plan here—

and that bigger plan is possibly to throw some of these Gulf monarch families under the bus for 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 it'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.

So 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 beneficiaries of this are going to be U.S. oil and gas companies. They'll dominate. Russia will also benefit, but I think that's a secondary matter. First and foremost, it'll be the U.S. So if you want to 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 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. I mean, 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 these Arab states would have on him—because they were bribing Donald Trump left and right. That's why they thought these guys were getting so much power in Washington. You remember, with the military cooperation with Qatar, they were somehow afraid—so much against it in Israel. And right now, the war is doing everything for them. The problem is, Patrick, it doesn't seem like the United States sees these countries as sovereign nations. They see them as some sort of territory with a few rich people—some rich people there in Israel. Is that going to influence the leadership? Or are they going to be in the same position as before, as they are right now, with the same sort of mindset?

#Patrick

There are two ways you can look at this—this is a very important question. Okay, this is the nature of the Gulf states: their ability to rule in their respective territories, and then what their exact relationship is 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. And 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 pumping up Wall Street.

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 been inflated and built up by Arab petrodollars. These are major institutions 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. 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 a diminishing amount 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—spend their money. They're just used to spending money on U.S. military gear. It makes them look tough, and it also buys them a lot of favor from the U.S.—politically, from the defense industry, and also from banking and finance.

And it brings them into the Western game in a big way, but it doesn't provide any real protection for them. Not really. It's a protection racket. 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, Patriot missile batteries, whatever. They know they're a soft touch. And they also know that the U.S. strategy has been to be aggressive toward Iran for years. Then they use Iran's sort of aggressive posture toward Israel and the U.S. to 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. And 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 U.S. You have no independent military at all if you buy from America. Nothing. You're basically just an outsourced franchise of the Pentagon. So politically, you have no independence at all.

So 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—they convinced Saudi Arabia, I think he was defense minister then, I can't remember his exact position at that time, but they convinced Saudi Arabia under Obama to attack Yemen and to 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 reclaim 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 U.S. There are even reports that the United States was flying the missions, but they had Saudi flags on U.S. jets. I mean, uh, they even got other countries involved in this coalition. And that was the peak of this arrangement.

That went on for eight, nine years. It started in March 2015, and it really didn't end until probably around 2023. It was being wound down then, but it's still actually going. 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 take 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 do 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 to the U.S. And look what it got them: no protection. They couldn't protect Qatar from Israel. And in drawing fire, the whole facade of this phony relationship is exposed as 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 greatest challenges the Trump administration and the Israelis are facing in this war against Iran. And Donald Trump is doing everything—everything—to somehow push or 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, particularly 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 a viable option—it's just not a choice for them to go that far, because nobody would be able to open the Strait of Hormuz. I think the calculation on their part is this: what is 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, Italy, the U.K., France—they've all got troops deployed and attached to various U.S. bases constantly. That's because these European countries need to be involved in everything to maintain operational readiness. 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 secure 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—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've destroyed the Iranian Navy, if they've destroyed their Air Force and all their missiles—or half their missiles, or whatever Trump's claiming that particular afternoon or breakfast session—why would they need the 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, giant target. That's only going to motivate the Iranians even more, and it'll 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 alliance with the U.S. and Israel. But that's exactly what Trump wants—he wants to use the Europeans as shields. Yeah?

And so there are some European countries that are smart enough to see this. There are others that 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, and 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 Trump trying to play that card—in one way, this is good, because hopefully it will wake up some of these Europeans and these bureaucrats and technocrats who are completely lost and drowning in their own propaganda, okay? But what Trump will also do is perhaps leverage this to get some sort of 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 who's 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 will—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 is threatening us now."

The U.S.—and Israel as its partner—have become an existential threat to the world 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—it was significant. But Germany was fairly localized, aside from Eastern Europe and the Russian front, and a little bit in North Africa. The United States, though, 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 how Iran fits into this equation really 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, then it might lead to some kind of ceasefire, pause, or armistice in all of this. That's about all we can say at this point, I think.

#Nima

Patrick, when it comes to the Strait of Hormuz—recently, the Foreign Minister of Iran, Araghchi, had an interview with Al Jazeera where he said they're defining the mechanism of the Strait of Hormuz.

#Patrick

You know,

#Nima

They're trying to, but it's not going to get 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 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—can use 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, in the aftermath of this war—or during this war?

#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 Iran's production capacity to near zero if they choose. Now, that's not to say Iran won'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 can be severely damaged. And this is why Iran also wanted to pursue a civilian nuclear power strategy—because they knew their petroleum 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 why the U.S. strategically attacked 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, cut 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 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, 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 more than 50% of your energy is dependent, you're not really sovereign. You then have to do a lot of negotiations and trading to maintain some independence, but ultimately, you're going to be dependent.

And so you're going to have to maintain good diplomatic relations with your neighbors if you can't do that. 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 see 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 from the Persian Gulf right now—about eight million per day to the global supply.

And 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—just a month and a half. It's nothing. It's not a solution to anything; it's an act of desperation. The most Saudi can ship to the Red Sea right now, in terms of the capacity of that pipeline and the processing at the port, is about 1.5 to 1.7 million barrels a day, maximum. The current capacity of those facilities would need major upgrades to reach 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 before by Ansar Allah—the Houthis.

It's completely within range of the Yemenis, so it's another front in the war that's potentially opened up here. How can they manage all these fronts? This is a disaster. I mean, until the Gulf Arabs pull their finger out and realize—really prioritize—their own existence and the welfare of the region, the future of their people, and not their bank accounts in New York, not 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 went offline. What sort of, you know, racketeering or threats do you think you'd see from the U.S.? Look at what they're doing to Cuba—they won't even allow Mexico or Venezuela to send fuel there. 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.

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 in Europe pushing back 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 right now. And it's not because the U.S. is savage, it's not because Israel is brutal or 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, you know, 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.