

Patrick Henningsen: Cracks in the Shield - Israel Facing New Missiles of Iran

#Nima

Hi everybody. Today is Tuesday, March 24th, 2026, and our dear friend, our brother, Patrick Henningsen, is here with us. Welcome back, Patrick.

#Patrick

Great to be with you, Nima.

#Nima

Patrick, the war in the Middle East is somehow reaching the next level. Donald Trump is now talking about negotiations of some sort. We had a report on CNN saying that the United States is trying to talk with the Iranians through, you know, the Turks, Pakistanis, and Omanis, and they're doing everything possible to reach an audience. And here's what Donald Trump said just moments ago about what's going on.

#Speaker 03

Great. The borders are great. The military is great. We're having, by the way, tremendous success, as you know, in Iran. We had one in Venezuela, and now we're having one in Iran. They have no navy left, no air force left, no anti-aircraft equipment left, no radar left, no leaders left. The leaders are all gone. Nobody knows who to talk to. But we're actually talking to the right people, and they want to make a deal so badly. You have no idea how badly they want to make a deal. And we'll see what happens. I want to thank Pete Hegseth. The job you're doing over there is really incredible—you and the general, and all the other generals and colonels and captains and majors and everybody else, right? It's a perfect, amazing thing. We make the best military equipment in the world. Now we're going to make it faster—we want to get it faster. But we make the best in the world. We're doing a job. Yeah.

#Nima

I think the points he mentioned, Patrick—something has changed in the tone in Washington. The way they're talking about the war has shifted since Iran hit the Mona.

#Speaker 03

Yeah.

#Nima

And the Israeli defense system—just yesterday I was talking with Professor Ted Postol. He said they don't have any air defense system left in the country to defend Israel. That's a huge, huge factor to consider in the calculations on the part of Washington and Israel. What's your understanding of this new rhetoric going around?

#Patrick

Yeah, it's good that you pointed this out. I do a lot of dialogue analysis—I try to break down and analyze the dialogue, and also look at the tone, the psychology behind it. And it seems to me Trump is taking evasive action right now. He's trying to create a narrative of victory, like, "we've achieved so much." He's repeating all these boilerplate talking points: we've gotten rid of their navy, we've gotten rid of their air force, we've killed all their leaders—it's a great success. You know, just as an aside, for a President of the United States to be trumpeting great success by the level to which he's tried to destroy, or has destroyed, another country is quite disgusting. But let's put that aside for the moment. Let's read into what he was saying there—he's basically saying there are no leaders.

We don't know who to talk to. I've heard this before—I can't remember who says it all the time. I know it's Benjamin Netanyahu. This is the Israeli tactic: "Oh, we want to negotiate, but there's nobody to talk to. They're all terrorists, and we've killed them all," basically. So that's the Israeli strategy—you can't have negotiations if you've killed the opposing negotiating party, which is normally what Israel does, and gets away with because they have the United States backing them up on that. Now the United States has adopted this type of barbaric savagery, this medieval-level sort of diplomacy, if you want to call it that. But this isn't true. The Iranian leadership is intact, but they've stated very clearly on multiple occasions that they're not going to talk to the United States.

There are no negotiations because the U.S. has already burned those bridges by using previous negotiations—which were done in good faith by the Iranians—as cover for a sneak attack. So they've said that, or Raisi has said that. I don't know how many times he's said it in the last couple of weeks—at least twenty times publicly. So that's what the president should be repeating if he's being honest with the American people: saying, look, we want to talk, but the Iranians have said there are going to be no talks with the U.S. because we burned them so badly in the past, and that they're going to settle this on the battlefield. Or, when they're satisfied that their security interests have been met in Iran, then it will come to an end. It's not going to be through negotiations.

I've not heard a U.S. leader say this, because they don't know how to sell that to the American people or to a Western audience—that a supposedly weak, lesser power is dictating the terms for the settlement at the end. Now, you can argue about whether Iran's going to be successful in those terms. That's an open question. This is open for debate and discussion, and it's an answer we won't

get immediately either, because this looks like it's going to be a long, drawn-out drama that could take place over weeks, months—who knows, maybe years. It could simmer down, and it could reignite again once the U.S. and Israel have rearmed, which is what they did eight months ago after the 12-day war. So this could be part of a similar cycle here. But the U.S. cannot say—cannot admit to the world—that somebody else is dictating terms. It just can't.

The fact that Iran is even doing this, or attempting to do it, is really a big challenge to U.S. authority—to U.S. hegemony in the region. And if you look at how the Gulf states and their so-called allies in the region are in total disarray at the moment, and also torn between people within countries like Saudi Arabia, even the UAE, Bahrain, and others, they're basically saying, "Actually, no, U.S. bases are posing a direct risk to us—an existential risk to us existing as countries—even before you mention the damage to our trade, our markets, our energy, etc." They're making those statements at the same time, so there's not even a consensus or unanimity within the Gulf states about whether they're going to lean heavily toward the U.S.—their traditional ally, you could say, meant to protect them—or whether they're going to lean away from the U.S. as a potential risk, because of what hosting U.S. bases means for their relationships across the Gulf.

And Iran right now—yes, you could say on paper that it's weak—but the fact that Iran is still fighting after four weeks, dictating terms, and managing the Straits of Hormuz, that doesn't look like it's losing. You can't say Iran is losing. It's not a clear designation. I think, if anything, this conflict is probably in a kind of stalemate at the moment—on the escalation ladder. We'll see what happens. But those factors you mentioned before, Nima, are the important ones: there aren't infinite resources for the U.S. in terms of armaments and munitions, or for the Israelis in terms of Iron Dome, Patriot missile interceptors, U.S. interceptors, and anti-aircraft systems.

This is a finite resource—just like having a full package of naval attack groups, strike carrier groups, all the air-to-air refueling, and the logistics that go with that. This is not infinite. You can't keep doing this. This isn't George Orwell's continuous war against East Asia—it's not going to work. So they have a finite timeline. The United States does. Trump himself has a shorter timeline, which is the political one. Israel has a finite timeline, and Netanyahu has a very short political timeline.

He has to declare results, or they have to draw a line under this—surrender, declare victory, or whatever. They have to do it in a very short space of time because they're in danger of political collapse in Israel. The Netanyahu regime is in danger of collapse, delegitimized by his own hand, as is Trump as well with the upcoming midterms. Compare that, Nima, to Iran's timeline. Is Iran working on a short timeline, or are they working on a very long timeline? I would say they're working on a very long timeline. So if this is a war of attrition, I'm probably not going to bet against Iran at this stage.

By the same token, I never bet against Russia with the proxy war in Ukraine, because it's a similar kind of dynamic. The public appetite for an unpopular war is limited. You have a limited window to achieve your military or political objectives if you're the West, if you're the U.S. That was true in

Ukraine with that proxy war, and it's true here. In a way, the U.S. is using Israel as a kind of proxy, but what they're doing is a fake proxy—like a tag-team wrestling act. Good cop, bad cop. "Oh, we're talking with the Iranians," says Trump on Truth Social. And then, as soon as he says that, the Iranians say two hours later, "No, no, no, we're not talking with them." And then an hour later, Israel strikes energy infrastructure, and the U.S. says, "Oh, we had no idea Israel was going to do this."

I mean, wow, Netanyahu—we need to have a talk with him. He's being very naughty. Yeah, and we're supposed to believe there's no coordination between these two staunch allies? It's just not credible at this point. Anybody who still believes these are two separate actors, that they're not working absolutely in concert—come on. And I think Israel is leading. I think Israel is definitely setting the pace in this tag-team act. But I will say, Nima, this reminds me a lot of the Suez Crisis on many different levels—not least because during the Suez Crisis, the British and the French teamed up with the Israelis to attack Egypt and retake the Suez Canal. But they were doing it with a fake tag team; they had secret agreements that were later exposed.

The Sèvres Agreement was a secret pact between the French, the British, and the Israelis, where they'd use Israel as the lead attack dog and pretend to restrain it while they maneuvered their British and French assets into position to ultimately checkmate Egypt. But unfortunately, it didn't work, because the United States and the Soviet Union moved in to support Gamal Abdel Nasser at that time, in 1956. And why this is significant, in terms of historical comparison, Nima, is because the Suez Crisis marked the end of the British Empire and the end of British domination in the Middle East and Central Asia, where the United States then took over the role of the lead superpower with custodial stewardship over the region.

And I think what's happening now with the Straits of Hormuz is very similar to the Suez Canal in that sense, where we could be watching a change in the world order—where the United States is losing its hegemonic, dominant position in the Middle East that it's enjoyed since 1956—and we're watching the end of an era. Who takes over that role? That's a whole other question and a whole other debate. But I would venture to think this could increase China's involvement, and Iran itself as a regional hegemon. And who knows what will happen as a result of this revolution—whether Pakistan's role will also increase in terms of the security architecture of the Persian Gulf, providing some kind of support for the Iranians.

But again, these are all open questions. I will say that in both cases—Suez and Iran—the current war we're seeing right now shows that a change in the global order is in progress because of this conflict. It started for similar reasons, and it's being executed in a similar way. And the debacle, the failure—if it turns out to be a failure by the U.S. and Israel—shows they haven't learned some of their lessons from history yet. If you really look at the dynamics of the Suez Crisis, that could be a whole other discussion. We could do a whole show on that.

#Nima

I think Iran has adopted the Russian strategy in Ukraine, which is basically no ceasefire until all objectives are reached. And that's exactly what we've heard several times from Iranian officials. How do you see the role of the Arab countries in that scenario? Because right now we've learned that Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Kuwait are gathering—they want to form some kind of unified force against Iran. But that's not going to happen anytime soon. So how do you see Iran's approach, the way it's laying out its objectives?

#Patrick

First of all, I do see talk of—and most of this is goading, by the way. This is goading from the West and from Israel. They're trying to goad the Gulf Arabs in the media, basically in the political space, saying that, well, you know, Iran may have had the Gulf countries on their side before, but after what the Iranians have just done, it just doesn't make any sense why they would turn the Gulf states against them, and that they could join the fight against Iran. I highly doubt that the Gulf states are going to join any kind of military action against Iran for the simple reason that that would basically give Iran the green light to start demilitarizing Saudi Arabia and demilitarizing the UAE. And Kuwait—it's just a U.S. base, as is Bahrain. And I don't know if I've left anybody out.

#Nima

You don't need to go to Kuwait. The Iraqi resistance.

#Patrick

Yeah, it's not a real country anyway. That would be the death knell for the Saudi regime—they'd be finished. I mean, they might even be finished already. Time will tell. So yeah, it's just not credible. And also, look, Saudi Arabia, in their infinite wisdom, when MBS was defense minister—he was like 32 years old—the Obama administration convinced Saudi Arabia to go to war with Yemen in 2015. They fought that for seven, eight years. How did that end up for Saudi Arabia? They couldn't even beat the Houthis. And this was before Yemen had developed the kind of fighting units they've built in the last couple of years, before they had missiles and drone tech—and they still couldn't subdue Yemen.

Saudi Arabia, with a modern, full-blown American military and U.S. personnel basically running the war for them, still couldn't beat the Yemenis. So what makes you think Saudi is going to put up any kind of credible fight against Iran? It's just laughable to even think about. As soon as Iranian missiles land and take out Saudi's air force and a couple of their main bases, you'll see so many people fleeing that country—heading off to Paris, Miami, Montreal, London. That's where they'll go—the south of France, that's where the Saudis are going. And whoever stays, I mean, it'll be the end of the regime. Now, that raises an interesting question, which I think we spoke about before: is this part of the master plan—to weaken and ultimately achieve regime change?

I'm sure the United States and Israel might be entertaining that possibility. Maybe Iran could benefit from it as well. We'll see. But to me, that's a natural consequence of what we're seeing now. If the Qatari regime can't extract any meaningful profits from their gas sector over the next five years, I don't think there's going to be a royal family there in five years, quite frankly. I don't think there's going to be much of anything in Qatar in five years. I mean, where's the money coming from? It's not going to be from tourism. I just can't see how these Gulf states are still toeing the U.S. line after what's happened in the last four weeks. If they're that incompetent and don't have the courage to stand up to the United States after the last four weeks, then I think they're toast.

Honestly, I don't think there's a future for them. They're not accountable to their populations anyway. And there's not much of them in the Emirates or Qatar to begin with. How many native Qataris are there living in Qatar? What is it, 200,000? How many Emiratis live in the Emirates? 300,000? And the other four million or whatever are all foreigners—slave labor, management class, retail class, financial class—all foreigners, all from the U.S., from Europe, from the Far East. There are no Emiratis there, and there are no Qataris in Qatar. So, like, what are you dealing with here? What exactly are these countries, other than glorified U.S. outposts and maybe tax-free offshore havens for money laundering and other kinds of offshore finance? I mean, that's kind of what they are. That's not really the basis for a real country.

And having no independent foreign policy, not even being able to stand up for your own basic interests, that doesn't bode well for your long-term future. So they should be very worried. The longer this war goes on, and the fact that their energy infrastructure and economies are going to be damaged to a degree—they're not going to be able to flex or show the kind of largesse they're used to, which is very inefficient—means that you've got more money than you need, so you're able to do things normal countries wouldn't be able to do. You don't even have to think about it. You can make mistakes, like building The Line in Saudi Arabia, which is this futuristic wall city that runs through Neom, a concept city. You're able to do this stuff because you've got more money than you know what to do with. And, you know, you're not really accountable.

It's just like, the king has a vision. MBS has a vision. Let's all get on board with his. He's so forward-thinking, this MBS, you know? You know, that's basically Saudi Arabia. I don't think this is going to happen anymore in the region. I think the region has changed now, in the last month. I don't think it's ever going to go back to this fairytale land of fake civilizations in the desert that are completely unsustainable—financially, economically, and politically. That's the reality, and Iran has exposed this. So either get on board with reality in the Gulf, or I think they're finished. Eventually, they're going to be gone. It might take a year or two, maybe three or four or five, but I don't think you're going to see these same regimes in the future at the current pace—unless they adapt. Unless they adapt to the new reality. Then maybe they have a chance to survive.

#Nima

Patrick, we had a new assassination in Iran—a scientist, a university professor, was killed by the Israelis. Many people in Iran are arguing that if Israel continues with this kind of action, then Iran should respond by targeting an entire building of researchers connected to the Israeli military. And, you know, this is becoming very sensitive in Iran. If Israel keeps up these kinds of attacks on Iranian civilians—these are not military people, they're university professors, mostly academics—then what do you think, in terms of a long-term strategy for Iran, would be the solution? Because these people, they assassinate anyone they decide to. The Netanyahu administration, as you've mentioned before, is bragging about these assassinations, bragging about all these heinous acts on their part.

#Patrick

It's beyond the pale at this point. Israel has proven to the world that it is a despicable criminal regime, with the level of savagery and absolute barbarism on display. I mean, just basically—yeah, we're going to kill an entire apartment block of people to get one academic or one scientist, because we want to take out the intellectual leaders in STEM fields in Iran, since they might be helping with the civilian nuclear power program. And therefore, we're justified in killing an unlimited number of women and children around them—and we'll call it collateral damage, and we don't care, because we are Israel.

And yeah, this kind of ethno-supremacist mentality—it's the same thing. You see the same sort of barbaric, racist mindset, violent state terror. Just look at Gaza—look at the hellscape of Gaza. That's a direct result of this same criminal, murderous, genocidal mentality. That's the problem with the state of Israel. And the problem is that the United States supports this. The U.S. backs it; they endorse all of these actions by Israel because they themselves share the same values as Israel. It's a deeply held, racist, anti-Muslim, anti-Arab, anti-Middle Eastern, anti-Central Asian mindset.

And this is just, to me, if you really step back and look at it, not much has changed since the colonial era. And quite frankly, if we go back further—since the Crusades—it's unfortunately the same mentality. It's a Eurocentric, racist, ethno-supremacist mindset, and they dress it up with religion to sell the idea that they're somehow better, when in fact they're carrying out the most heinous crimes against humanity on a daily basis. I mean, look at what the Israelis are doing in Lebanon right now. Nobody cares. Nobody has a word to say about them. They can just kill, maim, plunder, and commit genocide through the entire region, and nobody in Europe has the courage to stand up.

No government is saying, "No, we're going to sanction Israel now." Because let me tell you, if enough countries started sanctioning Israel, you'd start to see things wind down pretty quickly. But they don't have the courage to do that, for various reasons. Either they're being co-opted, bribed, blackmailed—who knows. But the results are pretty clear to see. And the other unfortunate part about this is that it does demonstrate that Iran is prosecuting its war differently. From the beginning of this conflict—and if we go back to the 12-day war, we can go back to True Promise 1, 2, 3, 4—Israel attacks civilians with impunity and brags about it.

When Iran retaliates, they've always done so in a very measured way to avoid civilian casualties, because Iran's been vocal and very clear that their fight is not against the people but against the regime, the government, and the source of the aggression—which comes from the military, intelligence, and defense establishments in Israel and the U.S. But unfortunately, the U.S. doesn't have the level of honor to reciprocate in kind, so they're quite happy to just ignore the rules of war. I mean, you even have a sort of psychotic U.S. Secretary of Defense who's self-styled himself as the Secretary of War, in a kind of DC-comic, cartoonish way.

He's basically saying, we need to get rid of the, quote, "stupid rules of engagement," so that our warfighters can implement maximum lethality, right? We need to unshackle our warfighters. They don't even call their soldiers "soldiers" anymore. I mean, even the Nazis still called their soldiers soldiers. But the U.S. is rebranding their soldiers as warfighters. That was even a bridge too far for Goebbels. That's how far gone the American administration and the military establishment are at the moment. They're so lost in their own sort of delusional fantasy land, thinking they can bomb and kill their way to victory right now, because that's the only discernible strategy coming out of Washington.

They're bragging about how many people they've killed, how much deprivation they've caused. The same with Cuba—"we're so proud of the fact that we've starved the Cubans and their hospitals aren't running. We've really shown them a lesson. We've shut down all their hospitals and people are dying in the corridors. And it's been a great success," says Trump. "It's been a great success. We're winning in Cuba. Look at this famine, starvation—we're winning." You know, it's just deranged, depraved. It's—it's, uh, this is the low point in American history right now. This president is the worst U.S. president by far in the history of the country, and he has brought the country into such dishonor and disrepute. And unfortunately, he's surrounded by cowards—Democrats and Republicans in Washington—who are afraid to restrain him because they might hurt their own stock portfolios, since they're all getting rich off this.

Trump himself and his inner circle are placing bets on the price of oil. Look at the S&P stock market—it goes up when Trump tweets, "Oh, I've done a deal with the Iranians, we're having talks." He did that yesterday. Total lie. Total lie, because the Iranians came back at noon and said, "No, what the hell is he talking about?" So the market went up when Trump put his "truth" out. What he calls truth is so stupid. Truth Social is basically a platform for lies and propaganda. But Trump puts that out, and he knows the market's going to react. All his buddies on Wall Street have already done their call options.

And then the market surges by \$2 trillion in market cap. Then Iran's denial comes, and the market drops a trillion in market cap—it crashes. But all his buddies probably put their put options down, so they're making money on the surge and they're making money on the dip. Then Israel goes in as well and attacks Iranian infrastructure, while Trump, Witkoff, and the fake negotiations team do their usual shtick of pretending to negotiate a ceasefire when all they're really doing is running cover for an Israeli attack. Every single time. Their pattern of behavior is completely predictable.

I would always bet against them, the same way I'd bet against Jim Cramer and CNBC whenever he gives a stock market tip. I mean, always go against Cramer and you'll do well in the markets—that's the old adage. It's the same with these two Israeli operatives. And quite frankly, Steve Witkoff and Jared Kushner—what are they but glorified Israeli operatives who probably should register under FARA as foreign agents? And those are our head negotiators for the Middle East. That's a bit of a problem. Do you think they have a conflict of interest between American interests and Israeli interests? I think that's a legitimate question at this point.

#Nima

We've learned that the Pentagon is deploying 3,000 soldiers from the 82nd Airborne to the Persian Gulf. When we see these sorts of numbers—4,000, 2,000, then 3,000 gathering—I don't know, it's going to be like 12,000 or 20,000. It's just a joke. I don't know if he really believes he can do something on the battlefield, on the ground, going into Iran or somewhere near the Persian Gulf, close to the Strait of Hormuz. I can't just dismiss it, though, because I think Donald Trump and Pete Hegseth—these are not rational people. And I don't know what the escalation would be if that happens and they all get killed during the fight, because I don't see any other outcome. They're going to get killed by Iranians. So what would be the outcome of that for Donald Trump and his administration?

#Patrick

Look, if you deploy 4,000 from the 82nd Airborne, and Texas Rangers or whatever—if you deploy those Marines to Karg Island to try to retake it, to occupy Karg Island or whatever—you're going to have at least one out of ten fatalities. So that means you're going to have 4,000 young dead U.S. soldiers. But what you have to understand about the mentality of this administration is the fecklessness. This is Marcus Crassus—that's Trump. He'll take the dead U.S. soldiers and use that as the battle cry to escalate further. That's the mentality you're dealing with here, with this particular regime and the coterie of war hawks and madmen and grifters, of which Trump is surrounded by the greatest of all grifters.

These are the only people who are magnetically attracted to serve in the Trump administration at this point. And so he would use them as sacrificial pawns. Let's just pose a question to the audience: do you think Israel cares? How much is Israel interested in, you know, 400 or 1,000 dead U.S. servicemen? Do you think they care? What would be Israel's interest? If you go to an Israeli planner and say, "A thousand dead U.S. soldiers at Karg Island, IDF general—what say you?" he would say, "Very good, very good. We can use that. Let's ramp that up in the U.S. media, get the Americans really angry, and then we're going to finish this war." So Israel looks at U.S. soldiers as cannon fodder.

And every U.S. serviceman, officer, and general needs to understand that this is the role they play. That was the role they played in Iraq. They were cannon fodder for the Israeli lobby. They were also

cannon fodder for Halliburton, for B.T. Balfour, for Bechtel, for Kellogg Brown & Root, for Lockheed Martin, and for Boeing. That's who you're fighting for if you're a U.S. serviceman. You're not fighting for freedom. You're not fighting for the stars and stripes. You're not fighting for America. You're definitely not fighting to protect and defend the U.S. Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. You're fighting for Israel—be clear—and you're fighting for big oil.

You're fighting for U.S. gas companies to achieve market dominance. You're fighting for Palantir, big tech, OpenAI. You're fighting for Sam Altman—that's who you're fighting for. You're fighting for Elon Musk so he can make another trillion dollars in the next decade. That's who you're fighting for, because that's the machine driving U.S. policy right now. Between the Israel lobby and the U.S. military-industrial complex, that's who you're fighting for. That's who you're going to die for at the end of the day. It has nothing to do with American freedom or protecting America—absolutely zero. So just bear that in mind, you know, because that equation isn't going to change.

But what the U.S. is trying to do—and you can see it in the rhetoric—especially with the false flag attack on Diego Garcia, which looks to be fake, is spin it to say, "Aha, Iran has long-range ICBMs that can reach the coast of the United States. Now it's an imminent threat to the American homeland." And therefore, we need to go in, and now we have a reason to fight. After starting the war—after bombing Iran, killing Iranian civilians, destroying their infrastructure, assassinating their leaders—we couldn't give the American people a decent excuse for why we'd launched this unprovoked war. But now, after four weeks, we've finally got that justification: they fired at Diego Garcia, our base in the southern Indian Ocean.

Well, it's very clear the evidence suggests that Iran did not. That was a false flag attack. It was either launched by the Israelis, by the U.S. itself, or by a third party—but it definitely wasn't Iran. That was the best they could do to manufacture a story that Iran poses a threat to the American homeland. And they did the same with Britain, because Diego Garcia is shared between the British and the Americans. There are only about a hundred British servicemen stationed there, compared to thousands of U.S. personnel. But the British used this to pressure the British prime minister—the war press, like the Telegraph and some of the right-wing Murdoch press. They're pressuring Keir Starmer, saying he's covering up the attack on Diego Garcia.

And this means that Iran has struck British interests. They did the same thing with what looks like a false flag attack on RAF Akrotiri in Cyprus, which many thought was initially an Iranian drone attack, but it turns out the evidence is clear that it wasn't. But the British press used it to draw Britain into the war. So who benefits from that? Israel benefits from that. But this is exactly what they did, Nima, in 2003. They said, to get Britain into the war—when you look back at the propaganda campaign, especially with the tabloid press, which was dominated by News Corporation and the Murdoch press back then—they needed a narrative to claim that Saddam Hussein was threatening Britain. Otherwise, it was hard to get Britain to go, quote, shoulder to shoulder with the Americans.

And the Americans couldn't go in unilaterally because they needed to have a semblance of a coalition. They didn't have international buy-in from France and other major European countries that just weren't having the Iraq War in 2003. So what they did was invent a story that Saddam Hussein had Scud missiles he could launch in 45 minutes or less, potentially hitting an RAF base in Cyprus. That was the headline dominating the British media that week: "45 minutes or less—Saddam's targeting Britain." And it was really on that basis.

So I look at this Diego Garcia fake event, this false flag from the past week, and it's identical to Saddam's "45 minutes or less" in terms of how it was leveraged politically in Britain—to push the government into a closer, shoulder-to-shoulder relationship with America in what is clearly an illegal, undeclared, unprovoked war of choice and aggression. I'm going to try to spin it here and say that this is, again, like the Suez Crisis, Nima. You know, the Suez Crisis—Anthony Eden was the British Prime Minister at the time, and this was his graveyard, this operation. It killed him. It was the end of his career, and it was the end of the British Empire. So it was a double fatality for the British Empire.

But his calling card going into it was, "We cannot appease Nasser, because Nasser is an evil dictator. We appeased Hitler and fascism in the Second World War just a decade and a half earlier, and look what it did—it led to the Second World War." So he used that idea, or that popular propaganda point. And the British really didn't appease Hitler—by the way, the British were supporting Hitler right up until the very last minute. Everyone was betting that Hitler was going to be the future of Europe until things took a drastic turn toward the end and the Allied forces reconfigured their geopolitical positions on that. But this idea that we need to stop the appeaser...

You hear the Americans say it all the time. They did this with Saddam: "We can't appease Saddam, he's a brutal dictator, he's the next Hitler." They used those tropes. It's the same thing they're doing here. What they've done, very cleverly, is bring back the old appeasement line—saying that if we don't act, it'll lead to a world war. That's why we must act now. That's exactly what the British did in Suez. And then they do the same thing with Iran. The talking point in America is that Iran is the number one state sponsor of terror. That's the historical equivalent, in propaganda terms, of "we must not appease Hitler again," basically. But the claim that Iran is the number one state sponsor of terror is not true.

It's a fantasy, a fabricated propaganda talking point. What they're doing is trying to push Iran into the global War on Terror—the post-9/11 propaganda bracket that the West has maintained for the last 25 years. And by doing that, it creates the impetus: "We must act now because we don't want to see another 9/11." That's the underlying psychological progression behind that propaganda. That's why it's effective, and that's why they can leverage it politically in America. Whether it's true or not is beside the point. Whether there's any evidence that Iran is the number one state sponsor of terror—basically, that's according to the U.S. and the Israelis—because anybody that fights back

against Israel, be it Hezbollah in South Lebanon, the IRGC, or Hamas, is labeled that way. Hamas is under illegal occupation by Israel according to the U.N. and multiple U.N. resolutions, and so are the Palestinians.

So they have a right to an armed liberation struggle. But fighting back against Israel? That's called terrorism. Hezbollah—same thing. Hezbollah wouldn't exist if Israel hadn't invaded and occupied South Lebanon, carrying out a brutal occupation of the native Lebanese population that led to the rise of Hezbollah as an armed defense militia for South Lebanon. Later, it was designated a terrorist group by the Israelis, who lobbied the Americans to do the same, then lobbied the British, and then the Europeans. So everybody in the West thinks, "Wow, these must all be terrorist groups." And they labeled Qasem Soleimani a terrorist, which became the justification to assassinate him.

In fact, the reality was that the U.S. and the West were arming, backing, and providing military and logistical intelligence support to al-Qaeda and its affiliates everywhere—and to ISIS affiliates, and possibly ISIS itself—who were invading and destabilizing Syria for over a decade. That's the reality. And who was fighting al-Qaeda and ISIS in Syria and Iraq? Qasem Soleimani, the Iranian Quds Forces, Hashd al-Shabi, and Shiite militias. They were fighting on their own territory to expel a foreign invasion of jihadist terrorists who were armed and backed by the U.S. and its allies, and financed by Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the Gulf states. So the real state sponsors of terror, beyond any measure in history, are the United States and its allies—the U.S. being by far the world champion in that category.

Uh, and with Israel underneath them, as well as the British, probably the French, and the Gulf States. Okay. And Turkey did its part in supporting those terrorist groups for the destabilization of Syria, because that was Israel's number one strategic objective. So everybody who was chanting "Assad must go, Assad," they were carrying water for the Israelis, because that policy originates from the Israeli lobby. Just look at the "Clean Break" document, which was pushed forward in the mid-1990s. Those were all Israeli lobbyists, Israeli operatives within the neoconservative movement. And you can see the articulation of regime change, the destabilization, the toppling of governments like Syria, like Libya, and others came straight from that exact group of people.

And it became U.S. policy, and that includes backing terrorist proxies. So again, what I'm doing is just deconstructing the whole edifice of Western political propaganda that's used to frame events we're seeing in the Middle East and to demonize a country like Iran, when in fact the reality is the opposite of what the Americans, the Israelis, and the British are framing it as. And they're doing that to justify their own sort of criminal largesse—war crimes, crimes against humanity, and just outright theft of resources as well. So, long and short of it, Nima, I'm sorry, but I've lectured on propaganda before at the university level, so it's a topic I'm very knowledgeable and passionate about.

#Nima

I think, Patrick, on the front in Lebanon, the Israelis are talking about occupying the southern part of Lebanon up to the Litani River, and they're moving their forces in that direction. Do you think we're going to see a new battle on the ground between Israelis and Lebanese—some sort of escalation? We have clashes right now as we speak, but could there be a new escalation happening on that front? Just imagine that: while Israel is dealing with what's happening in the southern part of its own territory, it also wants to occupy the southern part of Lebanon up to the Litani River.

On the other hand, you see Israeli officials desperately asking—like you mentioned, the false flag operation on Diego Garcia—desperately asking Europeans to join the fight because they don't want to fight the Iranians. They want Europeans to fight Iran. They want the United States to fight Iran. They want, you know, these Arab states involved. They did everything. You remember when the war started—the attack on Azerbaijan, the attack on Turkey, the attacks on Oman—they did everything to manipulate the situation.

#Patrick

That needs to come to light. If people understood that pattern of false flags and manipulation that the Israelis have basically gotten away with so far—nobody's held them to account, other than people in the independent media who are pointing out the obvious—there's no price to be paid by the Israelis. That should tell you everything you need to know about who has conceived and is driving this war. And even if you don't believe there's a tag-team relationship, a kind of fake WWF wrestling relationship between Washington and Israel, between Washington and Tel Aviv on this—even if it wasn't that—they're absolutely undermining any chance for a negotiated settlement, because they immediately attack any time there are talks.

So that's pretty obvious. But the U.S. also wants to draw the European countries into helping open the Strait of Hormuz. All they're really doing is trying to get European naval assets in there, European troops in there—paint a big target on them—and then use that, or any potential European casualties, to rally Europe and NATO along. They can bandwagon with the United States and Israel and drag them into this war. That's all Trump was trying to do: to diffuse the pressure by bringing in some additional European actors. And he insulted them. He shamed them.

He said, "Well, why aren't you coming to help us? You're good for nothing. And we shouldn't have helped you in Ukraine," even though the U.S. started the war in Ukraine themselves. Again, same pattern. But yeah, I don't think this is going to work this time, because there are European politicians now starting to come out and basically say the obvious—that the U.S. clearly started this. "We're not going to come in and clean up their mess." I've heard this, shockingly, from some high-profile right-wing politicians in Europe as well.

Usually they might be along for the ride with the war effort, but not this time. That's not a good sign for Trump and Israel if they're hoping to pull the Europeans in. I think NATO left—they had a

deployment in Iraq—and I think they cut and ran for that very reason. There was probably a conscious decision at the NATO level that European countries don't want to be compelled or pulled into this conflict unnecessarily, and that's why they left. But anyway, yeah, I could talk more about your other point, but you'll have to remind me what you ended up with on that.

#Nima

The other point—let me bring up something else, Patrick—which is the internal question, you know, the dynamics in the United States when it comes to support for Donald Trump. CNN was reporting that Trump's support is starting to bleed a bit. And there's a report on CNN that I think is important, because we're talking about Israel's air defense system, we're talking about how the war is reshaping things. But the other point that's important is what's going on in the United States, and that, in my opinion, is of particular importance to Donald Trump. And here's what CNN reported, Patrick.

#Speaker 04

Republicans won in 2024 because of support from male voters. The only way they can win, given the gender gap in this country, is with support from male voters—and male voters are abandoning Donald Trump. Take a look here; this gives the game away. Okay, Trump's standing with men: in November 2024, he beat Kamala Harris among them by 13 points—by 13 points. Look at where he is now on his net approval rating. Down he goes. It's a 20-point shift away from Donald Trump. He's now seven points underwater at this point among men. I think it's very difficult for Republicans to do well in this midterm cycle if Donald Trump is underwater with men. As my uncle once wrote, "Where the boys are, where the men are"—they're underwater when it comes to Donald Trump.

#Speaker 05

Okay, so that's overall men, but what about young men, who were really influential?

#Speaker 04

Yes, young men. Of course, there was a massive shift toward Donald Trump from 2020 to 2024 among young men. And look right here—whoa.

#Speaker 05

Yikes. Yikes. Yikes. Yikes.

#Speaker 04

Men under the age of 25 on Trump—he won them in 2024 by five points. Look where he is now: the net approval rating is way down there, down to negative 19 points. That’s nearly—what is that—nearly a 25-point swing against the president of the United States. When it comes to men under the age of 45, those who had switched their allegiance to the Republican Party are seeing what the president is doing. They don’t like what he’s doing, and they’ve really soured on the president—men under the age of 45.

#Speaker 06

What is it, specifically, that they don’t like?

#Nima

It’s so important for Donald Trump because he’s heading into the midterm elections. That’s why I brought it up—I think it all comes down to the calculation on the part of the Trump administration. What do you make of it?

#Patrick

Well, I’m in America right now. I’m in, ostensibly, a red state—Arizona—and I’m already hearing from the good old boys. We call them the good old boys. These are the lock-stock, gun-carrying, Second Amendment, MAGA conservatives, populists, okay? And I’m already seeing dissension among the ranks of the good old boys. So it’s not—I mean, there are people who are going to support Trump down the line no matter what. If he drops a nuclear bomb and we’re all incinerated, they’ll still be wearing their red hats, waving their flags right until the very end. He’s always going to have that percentage of people. But I think, in terms of the coalition he brought together to win—the margin that he won by in the 2024 elections—that’s been translated as a mandate in American politics.

As Stephen Miller constantly reminds us, we won the elections, and elections have consequences. The American people selected this president to go and, you know, beat up and shoot people in the streets of Minneapolis—that’s the party line from the Stephen Millers of the world. But the reality is, those poll numbers you showed there—they’re never getting those people back. Those Gen Zers, those millennials, those young males—they’re not coming back to Trump. You talk to young people, they’re disgusted by him. And these are people who would have supported him just 18 months ago. Why? Because he stabbed them all in the back. Because he campaigned one way, and now he’s doing the very opposite of what he campaigned on. And he would never have gotten all those independent voters otherwise.

He wouldn’t have gotten all those Democratic centrists and Bernie bros and everybody else. It was because of the anti-war stance—no more regime change wars. That’s how he got their votes. Many

people, including many conservatives, said that was the single issue that got Trump elected, that they voted for him on that one issue alone. They might hate him, they might hate everything about him, but these people in America voted for him on that basis. So he stabbed them all in the back. He's never getting them back. And if you look at the numbers on independents—which CNN wasn't showing there—but that same presenter, who does some interesting polling, did show, I think before Christmas or right around January, that he was at minus four with independents right around Christmas. So he'd already lost.

I mean, that was the swing vote—all the swing states with those tiny margins, and all the Rust Belt: Michigan, Wisconsin. Those are all independents, populist independents. And they voted. The war issue was probably one of their top issues. So he's lost them. He'll never get them back. They can't recover them for the midterms—they're gone. All these constituencies that Trump has basically shed in the last month and a half, he'll never get them back. They'll campaign against him. Many of them I'm talking to—I know Republicans now who are switching to Democrats so they can vote out warmongers.

They want to vote out Republicans in the congressional and Senate primaries because of the War Powers Act, which they basically killed in both the House and the Senate. And they want to vote out Trump in 2028, so they want to help the Democrats. This is what happens in politics. I just can't see how the Republicans can recover. But this brings up another point, Nima, which is that the Israeli lobby is all-seeing and all-powerful in U.S. politics. They spend hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars a year to influence the voting and policymaking of our congressmen, senators, and the president. They have particular ownership over the current president—and that's just financially.

I'm just talking about the money side. So, do they really care? How badly does Israel care if the Republicans keep the House or the Senate? They've got their war. They've got their illegal wars, their occupations. They've got their genocide already. They don't care, because they'll just work on the Democrats. The Democrats get in power, Israel will go to work. They have their lobby, their media arms, their attack dogs, the ADL—all these different tools at their disposal to shape U.S. political discourse, policy, and legislation. Even Homeland Security—people think, well, what does the Department of Homeland Security have to do with Israel?

I'm going to tell you everything—everything to do with Israel. And so, of course, a total pro-Israeli has been implanted, taken out of the U.S. Senate, I believe. Again, a safe seat out of the Senate and into the Department of Homeland Security. And why is that? Why is that? Because Homeland Security, and what they do and shape in the U.S. domestic sense in terms of defining terror threats—well, with this new Homeland Security Secretary, they're going to pivot from immigration to the so-called Iranian terror threat. And that's why the Israeli lobby selected Markwayne Mullin, I think his name is, as Homeland Security Secretary—because they're planning to pivot the domestic agenda to focus on creating the phantom menace of Iranian terror on U.S. soil.

And that's going to drive the U.S. narrative. So we might have another 9/11 scenario coming up soon, courtesy of our good friends at Central Planning. Who knows? But that's the thing—anybody could be DHS Secretary. You could get someone from the Border Patrol, from the U.S. military. Why would you take somebody out of an office? But all of Trump's cabinet picks are taken from the House and Senate because that's where Israel has control—through the entirety of each career, every representative in the House and every senator. From the minute they step foot on the campaign trail, the Israel lobby is on them like super glue, and they have them for their whole career.

And so what they're going to do, basically, is act in accordance with whatever that agenda is. This is why the Trump administration—practically the whole cabinet, all the main positions—were taken. The first president in history like that. It's an anomaly. There has to be a reason behind it, and clearly this is the reason. Because what do all those congressmen, senators, and members of Trump's cabinet have in common? The Israeli lobby, pure and simple. You, as an academic, Nima, if you were a foreign policy advisor or a national security advisor, you might be well qualified for that in the U.S. sense—but the Israeli lobby wouldn't be very interested in you, because they didn't have any access to you through your academic career.

But if you were a congressman in your sixth term, that's a different story. They want you. They want you because you've been taking AIPAC checks from them in six straight elections. So they want you as Director of National Intelligence because they have a relationship with you. That's how the U.S. system works. This is how Washington works for all lobbies, but especially the Israeli lobby—especially when it comes to national security and foreign policy. That's how our system is working at the moment. And I don't think it's working in the interest of America. I think a lot of decisions are being made, policies are being implemented, that are in the interest of a foreign entity. And I think this is beyond debate at this point.

#Nima

Hmm. Thank you so much, Patrick. As always, we've learned a lot. Basically, domestic policy, foreign policy—now it's all madness when you look at the whole scene.

#Patrick

It's crazy. I'm looking for an off-ramp right now, Nima, and it's very, very hard to find one. But this is what we were warning about weeks and weeks ago. We said this wasn't going to end easily, or quickly, or well. And all the things that you and your guests, and, uh, you know, ourselves as well, have been warning and talking about since as far back as January are actually happening. And everything Professor Miranda had warned about very explicitly—and has been continuing to warn about for a long time—is happening. So it doesn't give us any pleasure to see that unfold. And, yeah, I don't know. I don't know how things are going to go, but it's an incredible situation.

#Nima

Exactly. Thank you, Patrick. See you soon.

#Patrick

Thank you, Nima.