Iran HUMILIATES Trump in FATAL Loss, Israel War READY | Patrick Henningsen & Col. Larry Wilkerson

Iran has scored a major blow to Trump in the midterms tsunami that is throwing the reeling US administration into panic mode as Netanyahu holds an emergency meeting to begin for another round of war. Is Trump TACOing or is the US trying to lull Iran to sleep before major escalation? Patrick Henningsen and Col. Lawrence Wilkerson join the show for a full round of geopolitical analysis amid post-election fallout. https://www.youtube.com/@21stCenturyWireTV Patrick's YouTube https://patrickhenningsen.substack.com/ LIKE the video and Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong Telegram: https://t.me/DannyHaiphong Support the channel in other ways: https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: $Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: https://paypal.me/spiritho #israel #iranwar #trump

#Danny

Welcome, everyone. Welcome back to the show. As you can see, I am joined by 21st Century Wire's editor, Patrick Henningsen, and Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson to go over the latest developments. We'll begin, gentlemen. The shock is still reverberating from the midterm elections. Donald Trump yesterday acknowledged that the Iran war had a lot to do with why the Republicans were hit by a blue tsunami on Election Day, November 4th. And Iran has been taking credit for the results. Mohsen Rezaei, the Security Council head, said that the Iranian nation handed Trump a strategic defeat on the battlefield and in Hormuz, as well as a political defeat there in Washington, with Americans getting stuck with the bill.

Now, there are a lot of political machinations happening in the Trump administration. J.D. Vance, after his very public tweet claiming the Iran war had a lot to do with their defeat, is reportedly telling people in private that Netanyahu has been wrong about everything on Iran. Marco Rubio is considering resigning very soon from his post to distance himself from the Trump administration after this resounding defeat. Now, war is still very much on the table, it seems, though, gentlemen. Israel's Channel 14 reported that Netanyahu held an emergency security meeting on Iran yesterday.

And then, just after that, The Wall Street Journal and other U.S. media outlets reported that both Israel and the U.S. military have their plans drawn up for renewed strikes on Iran. And Washington is ready whenever the order is given. Patrick, how about we begin with you? I've been hearing that

Netanyahu has been on the phone with Trump quite frequently recently, almost daily, pushing for these strikes. That could just be a narrative. But I'm curious about your reactions to both how the midterms transpired and Iran's role in them, as well as what role Iran is going to play in the escalation that still very much appears to be on the table.

#Patrick Henningsen

Sure. Thanks, Danny. It's great to be with you. Great to be with you, Larry, as well. It's indicative of today's politics. Well, Iran had a lot to do with the election results. If election results are affected negatively because of a military operation or a war, that means you're losing that war. So what they should be saying publicly, which they won't, is, "We lost the war against Iran, and that's why we tanked and crashed out so hard in the midterms." But, you know, it's funny. A month ago, wasn't it J. D. Vance talking to the White House press corps, saying that, well, "It's not really a war"?

"It's not really a war. There's not really any serious shooting going on." And then suddenly, yesterday, he tweets out his mea culpa statement, saying that our loss had a lot to do with the war. The thing that, to me, really speaks to where America is at is this cynical political calculation. Because think about it: J.D. Vance and everyone else who's turning on the Iran war right now on the GOP side—their opposition to the war is now only contingent on partisan election results, if I'm getting this right, which is a very, very cynical position.

So if the GOP kept the House or the Senate, then Vance would be tweeting out, "Well, this is just a referendum on how good President Trump's war against Iran has been." That's how cynical the state of the American polity is in 2026. And if that's the state of our country, then there's no consideration of the legality, the morality, the strategy, or some of these other serious considerations to do with the war. No, no, no. It's really just based on whether it played well in the midterms, in the polls or not. And it's like, "What did we get from it? Well, we got oil from it." So Venezuela, that's a good war because we stole Venezuela's oil, and we're now about to privatize all their assets.

So that's been a great one, and it hasn't affected us badly in the midterms. It does say a lot about the American voter as well. I'll extend that to them. People have no problem with the heist in Venezuela. I will say it's kind of encouraging news that Marco Rubio might resign, because that could be a stay of execution, a reprieve for the country of Cuba. So that could be a positive result as well. And don't discount a major left-wing insurgency in Venezuela in, I would say, less than a year, based on a lot of the reports we're seeing. There are signals to that effect throughout South America, in fact. But besides that, I said on your program, I think it was many months ago, Danny—so it looks like the midterms have accelerated that process a little bit.

So he wants to distance himself. It looks like Rubio would be doing something similar with his resignation as well. So, you know, I love the fact that you have these tweets by Vance admitting that the war was a bad idea. But to me, these are not serious leaders. They're political operators and opportunists. And it's very disappointing to see that, among other things that are disappointing. But

as far as Israel's relationship with the United States goes, these results are very bad for Netanyahu. Very bad, because he derives a lot of his mandate, his power, from his relationship and alignment with the United States and from how powerful Trump is in his support of Israel.

So this can only be construed as a negative for Israel in terms of plans to attack Iran. I think this creates a lot of problems, definitely a loss of momentum. And, you know, whatever wind was left has been drained out of their sails. But it does mean we're in a dangerous interregnum before the new Congress is sworn in, because any military escalation after that point could be huge—you know, really problematic. And I'll go even further. We can talk about Trump. I'll hand the floor over to you and Larry, but I have an idea of how this is going to end up, and maybe we can discuss that a little bit later.

#Danny

Sure. Well, Colonel Wilkerson, certainly, jump in here with your reactions and analysis.

#Larry Wilkerson

I don't have too much disagreement with what Patrick just said. And I would add what Scott Ritter said just a few hours ago, as I recall: How come it's being said that it's based on the impact on gas prices, food in general, and other costs of living? How come it's being said it's not based on 300,000-plus dead Palestinian women, children, old men, rats, dogs, cats, and other creatures, added to by now hundreds in the West Bank, and others in Lebanon and so forth? How come that's not what people are saying is the reason they changed their votes? I think Scott's got a really good point there. We're not looking at the real impacts of what's going on in the world as a result of Bibi Netanyahu and Donald Trump's tandem operation. We're just not looking at the things we should be looking at. Now, okay, there's euphoria over the blue wave, or whatever you want to call it.

I don't have much euphoria over it because I see Chuck Schumer, the Mitch McConnell of the Democratic Party, standing in the wings to lead the Senate. And I see Hakeem Jeffries, who seems to have no problem whatsoever with taking money from AIPAC, hovering over the House. So I'm eager to see how this is going to change anything. And were I Donald Trump, I'd make a small political move here, which would be astute, I think. Tom Massie has guaranteed that the moment the House resumes, his first mission is going to be to renew the impeachment proceedings against Hegseth, and I think there'll be colossal support for this. If Trump were astute as a politician, he would immediately fire Hegseth and take Massie's plum away from him, and avoid the impact of Congress having done that to one of his principal cabinet officers.

Do it himself. Fire him. Get rid of him. Make him a scapegoat. I don't care what you do, but I don't have any personal angst over Massie doing what he's doing. In fact, I'm for it. But that's an elaborate, elongated process Trump could take care of immediately. And he needs to, because Hegseth is destroying what is left of the American military. He's doing it through two methods. One

is his Christian nationalism. And Americans just don't understand what this means. He's taken it to the point where any infantryman, artilleryman, Marine, or sailor who's coming into the military is under a contract, which is what we have now. We have a contracted mercenary force, the all-volunteer force.

Any of these people who've come into the military, sworn their oath, and taken their $75,000 bonus or whatever can now go up to Pete or someone he's appointed and say, "I want to be a Christian chaplain." And immediately, his contract is negated. He puts on a cross, and he becomes a Christian chaplain. You can't make this stuff up. This is what Hegseth has done. Not only is this a violation of the Constitution's clause on the separation of church and state, but it's also illegal in terms of the way the military accesses people. You can become a doctor, you can become a lawyer, you can go to JAG school, you can go to medical school—you can do any of those things.

If the military approves it, they'll even sometimes pay for it if they think you're good enough to graduate and come back and pay back six or seven years as a doctor or a lawyer or whatever. But not a chaplain. That's a very different kettle of fish there. And that's what he's done. The other thing he's done is put together this advisory committee that's composed of just Silicon Valley and similar AI types. That's against the law again. Congress passed a law some time ago because they didn't like these committees that were designed to do nothing but reward Lockheed Martin.

Well, you can't do that. That's a violation of the law. Your committee has to be balanced across different fields, and you have to have that kind of approval from Congress before you can do it. Think of the Defense Policy Committee, for example. Congress watches that like a hawk. So Hegseth is ruining the military. He's ruining the military. There's another issue with the military, which is important. Every O-6 looking to be an O-7—that is, a colonel or captain looking to be promoted to brigadier general or rear admiral, lower half—and on up the chain, from one star to two stars, three stars to four stars, and so forth, has to be approved by the Senate of the United States.

If I were sitting over in the Pentagon right now, and I were one of these people, and I thought I had a good prospect of being promoted to flag officer, or even to two or three or four stars, I would be looking back at what I had done in the last few weeks and how I'd been a part of what is happening with regard to Southwest Asia in particular, but also in the Caribbean, where we're still murdering people without due process, and in Venezuela and so forth, as Patrick said. I'd be thinking about that. I'd be thinking about what those congressmen are going to think when they see my record and know where I was, and that I didn't do anything or say anything or even offer to resign when all these illegal, unconstitutional actions were taking place.

If I were on that Senate committee looking at that person, I would not promote them, period. I'd say, "Send me a new crop. This crop does not cut the mustard." So the military is in significant trouble right now. And that adds to the trouble we have as a country if we're going to send them into combat again, because it is not a very happy military right now. In fact, good order and discipline, as we say in the military, is broken. And Hegseth has single-handedly broken it. Caine has

contributed, and others have too, but Hegseth is the biggest culprit there. So I think Trump ought to fire him immediately, just as a decent political act in terms of his own administration. As to the rest of it, I agree with Patrick again. We're not looking at the right things here, not just dead Palestinians and so forth.

We're not looking at the kinds of things we should be looking at, and that gives me no confidence in Hakeem Jeffries or Chuck Schumer. I mean, Chuck Schumer is Mitch McConnell with the Jewish backing. McConnell at least kind of hid it because some people in Kentucky didn't like that. But Schumer, he might as well be a policymaker like Huckabee in Israel. And Jeffries, as I understand it, in terms of taking AIPAC money, is pretty much the same way. And I don't see anybody agitating, and I don't think anybody's going to agitate to change that. It's going to be Schumer and Jeffries. That's sort of more of the same, but from the blue side instead of the red side. I hope I'm wrong. I hope I'm wrong. And I didn't even go halfway into it like Patrick did. But I'm not euphoric.

#Danny

Yeah, me either. And I think we might all share that as a group here on the panel. You know, Hakeem Jeffries has been called the AIPAC Shakur. That's how much love he has for Israel. But, you know, Patrick, any reaction to that, as well as the role of Israel here? Israel keeps saying that they are ready for war, and they keep doing this. It feels like a psychological stunt, but at the same time, it also is happening. They keep deploying more and more bomb shelters across the country as they prepare for what the dominant conversation in Israel is, which is that this war is going to happen. The media, Channel 14, all of it says every single day that the political conditions in the United States are ripe for a re-escalation of this war—at least a deeper escalation. What are your thoughts about the role Israel is playing here, now that we are in this, as you called it, dangerous interregnum period? Sure.

#Patrick Henningsen

You know, those bomb shelters and that sort of media campaign and public emergency campaign, including in the West, a lot of that landed prior to these midterm results. So, as Larry says, you know, we'd be cautious not to put too much hope, if you will, into the election results—that you're going to see a revolutionary change. However, the political conditions are such that it's now understood among the Western public, as well as even among the Israeli electorate. And I use that term extremely loosely, to even call it or imply that it's a democracy after the opposition party has basically expelled the 19 Arab MPs—Arab Israelis, in other words, Palestinian Israelis living in Israel. They call them Arabs.

They won't allow them in the coalition because they're Arabs. Okay, that's a great democracy you've got going there. The opposition is willing to allow Netanyahu the chance to form a coalition just to impose a racist policy on their electorate. It's unbelievable. But the problem is, it's known, even in Israel, that an escalation would also be partly a political ploy. I think it was Avigdor Lieberman, of all

people, who had said before the elections in Israel, before October 27th, that Netanyahu should face treason proceedings for cynically trying to restart the war in the days prior to the elections. And there was evidence to that effect within Israel's national security apparatus—that Netanyahu was lobbying for a resumption of war.

So that seemed to be on the table. We don't have the particulars at the moment. Maybe they'll come out later. So we have the same feeling in America. That is, the fear that Trump, before or after the midterms, knowing that he was going to lose, might launch something to benefit Netanyahu. And it would be their last window of opportunity to hit Iran before that window absolutely shuts after January 6th, or to embroil all parties in a conflict such that there would be no way out. And it would just seem to be, well, we have to just, you know, continue and manage this conflict even into the new year.

So the fact that that's known and understood means the political conditions for escalation are increasingly difficult, and there's a political price to pay. Because here's what's going to happen. This is what I predict. Trump is many things, okay? He's a narcissist. He is an incredible megalomaniac. He views himself as a Caesar of sorts. He absolutely has no regard at all for the Constitution of the United States. He couldn't even bother to put his hand on it while he was being sworn in at the last inauguration.

That's another story. But if anything, he is very, very ruthless and cynical, and even, deep down, pragmatic in terms of his own survival. So to avoid a vicious impaling at the altar of impeachment in 2027 and 2028, he made a statement. He said, "I'm willing to work with the Democrats." When he said that, it was the first time I'd heard real, genuine fear in the voice of Donald Trump. So he's ready to deal. It might come down to some serious horse trading. The Democrats have a legislative program. Donald Trump has the power of the veto. So he's willing to deal impeachment for legislation, or legislation for war, or something like that.

You've got regulations, big issues with regard to regulations and antitrust, for the parties that he represents—the monopolists and the Musks of the world. I mean, Musk himself will potentially be under a major federal probe because of what he did during DOGE and the fact that he managed to land all these miraculous deregulated returns after letting his little cyber sleuths loose on every federal department, and all the rest of it. So the Democrats have to decide: do they want to really nail him in the next two years, or not nail him and then wait for the next general election in 2028, if they believe they can retain him?

So there's a lot at play. Israel is also on the table in terms of this horse trading. And I share your concern about Hakeem Jeffries especially being in the pocket of AIPAC. So Israel has both sides covered at the moment. But the public are not supporting it, because Israel was on the ballot. Israel was on the ballot. The war was on the ballot. Trump was on the ballot. All of these annoying

surrogates like Ben Shapiro and Laura Loomer and Mark Levin and all these sorts of people shilling for the Israeli position—they were on the ballot. And they were just thoroughly repudiated by the American people.

I mean, this is a historic blowout. This is the biggest blowout since ’76. And what do you have to remember about ’76? Larry could probably remember this very well: there was a huge exodus of Republicans following Watergate. And it was very unfashionable to be a Republican for a period of time post-Watergate. I know this personally because of my family. Pretty much everybody jumped ship to the Democratic Party. So if you look at it historically, that’s massive. That means what Trump has done in just two years has had the net effect of a Watergate on the electoral map. I mean, step back and think about that for a moment in American history. This is a major, major loss, a big L in half a term. And I don’t think we’ve seen anything like it.

And it just really shows you how off course and how out of touch the White House and the power structure in Washington are. I won't let the Democrats off the hook either, because they support these wars for the most part. However, what's interesting is that the War Powers Act could come into play again, because the last vote was 49 to 50. There was one abstention, and this was a Democratic senator from Maryland, Angela Alsobrooks, who had voted against the war previously but disappeared on voting day, saying she had urgent family matters. Well, if she had voted, it would have been 50-50. Who would have been breaking the tie on that vote but the vice president, J. D. Vance? And that would really have put him on the spot.

Think about that, because he's positioning himself as the moderate, sort of leaning anti-war, moderating influence on the hawkish Trump, and that's his brand for 2028. And I would love to know what happened or who spoke to Angela Alsobrooks, because she's also very aligned with the Israeli lobby, you see. There are Democrats who voted against the war, on the Thomas Massie side, who also—some of them have taken money or even currently take money from Israeli lobby sources. So there's a story there. These are historic events, details that are potential game changers. But I don't see our sleuths from The New York Times or The Washington Post, or the Woodwards and Bernsteins of the world, pushing very hard on it. But I think there's a huge story behind things like that. But with those types of dynamics now, it won't be that close.

The vote won't be that close if they do it again. So that's real. That is like a sword of Damocles hanging over Trump right now, and I see a very limited window of time to escalate. With each passing day, it becomes more and more of a desperate, cynical, almost reckless act to re-escalate following this election result and the fact that Netanyahu is also weak in Israel. Even if he could cobble together a coalition, he is politically not what he was prior to the election, and everybody knows it. So the political dimension has seeped into this, and sometimes politics is the only thing that can save us, ironically, as much of a viper's nest as it is, right? There are moments in history where it can delay or disrupt something that was coming down the track. Yeah, Carl, same question to you.

#Larry Wilkerson

Well, you know, I go back to the War Powers Resolution, which I think is unconstitutional. Nixon should never have vetoed it. He should have argued that it was unconstitutional because the Constitution is very explicit about who has the war power. And what the War Powers Act did was water that down. So, in essence, it's unconstitutional. That said, when we pursued it fiercely, fiercely, Ro Khanna was one of the bravest people I had met in Congress for a while. We should still say that about him. The Progressive Caucus, the Black Caucus, and a number of others were involved, and Jim McGovern was instrumental.

When we pursued it with regard to U.S. support for the Saudis in the war against Yemen, I learned some things about it. I learned the Rules Committee had influence even over what is called privileged legislation. When it's about war powers, it's privileged legislation. So, all that to say, we passed it in the House, no thanks to Pelosi and Steny Hoyer, because they knew about these rules and they knew what would happen to it. They got credit with their supporters who were for getting out of that war. They got their credit there, but they also got what they wanted, because when it passed in the House and it passed in the Senate, Trump vetoed it.

And they didn't have enough votes to override the veto because it still requires a two-thirds majority to override the veto, even on that privileged resolution. So good luck getting the War Powers Resolution to do something that would be substantial. I'm not saying it's impossible with this change, but it's a terrible law. It's a terrible situation. We allowed people at that time, who were really looking for a way to get Congress out of being blamed for anything, to make that happen. It's an abridgment of their responsibility under the Constitution to be the only governmental entity in this republic that can declare war.

That's what needs to happen. Now, on the other side of this—and this is the dangerous side, in my view—I agree with Patrick. What Netanyahu has done with Zinni, allowing him to do what he's doing to the Arab list, is not just treating them like fourth-class citizens. It's treating them like they're traitors, like they paid for their election, like they took money and they cheated. He took this right out of Trump's book. But he's got Zinni, and even the people who are around Zinni don't appreciate what he's doing because it is a complete violation of legal procedure. It's a complete violation.

He doesn't care about any of that. But there are still some people in Israel, like the Attorney General and others like her, who don't like this happening. And so he is just making an ass out of himself and showing how desperate he is. And this is what worries me, because I don't see any way out for Bibi Netanyahu—not when he's confronted with what's going to happen if he does resume this war, with or without Trump. He's going to get to the point where he's going to have to use a nuclear weapon. That's the only way I can see him getting out of this. And I don't just mean one weapon. And that's frightening to me because I don't think Trump would object. At the end of the day, I don't think he would object.

He might not want his name associated with it initially, but I don't think he would object. And I think that's a very dangerous situation, an extremely dangerous situation. And it's ironic that the very platform from which he would probably fire these nuclear weapons at Iran—and I don't think it'll be one; I think it'll be multiple—is part of his problem as a criminal should he get kicked out of office. Because he cheated on that deal with the Germans so badly that, I'm told, the paperwork is blatantly indicative of his cheating and his stealing. So here he's going to use these platforms that he cheated to get and made all kinds of money from for himself, his wife, and his son—and they're all involved in it—to launch a nuclear weapon or two at Iran.

You can't make this stuff up. It's pitiful. Was it Bertolt Brecht, in that play he had about Galileo? He said, "Pity the land that has to search for heroes," or something like that. He had Galileo say that. We're in search. We're in search. We have none. And Israel is bereft, absolutely bereft. You look at whoever you want to look at—Gadi Eisenkot, Netanyahu. Eisenkot was the author of the obliteration doctrine. And I come back to my original point: Why isn't somebody talking about those hundreds of thousands of Palestinians under that rubble? That's the real crime we're looking at in that region. A terrible crime. In addition to what we've done to Iran, those are all crimes, too.

#Danny

Yeah, great points, Colonel Wilkerson. And to that, Patrick, you know, it did seem that the GOP's blowout loss in the midterms was partly related to this. Of course, Iran and gas prices and the economy and all of that took center stage in the polling. But it can't be discounted that inheriting what's happening to Palestine and Gaza from the prior administration, and pursuing an almost insultingly ridiculous Board of Peace plan that has done nothing to stave off the killings, couldn't have helped, especially when it comes to independent voters.

#Larry Wilkerson

Let me say something right there, if you don't mind, because this is critical to understand, I think. The reason Netanyahu has no problem cutting off the roughly $4 billion that goes to him annually is because what we've done with these two amendments to the NDAA is give him permission to do it clandestinely, as it were. In other words, if it goes through the previous procedure, it has to go through Congress. Josh Paul resigned over it. Others resigned over it. It has to go through the legal system, at least, if it's to go toward weapons. Now it doesn't have to, because they're plugged into Lockheed Martin, they're plugged into RTX, they're plugged into Boeing, they're plugged into Grumman, they're plugged into everybody. And they're plugged into our intelligence community, too. Under these amendments to the NDAA, we legalized Jonathan Pollard's treason.

#Danny

Yeah. Patrick, you know, can the United States—Washington—really stave off what Colonel Wilkerson just outlined there? There is a huge push, of course, by Netanyahu and the Israeli regime

to restart this war. But they say the political conditions are favorable in many respects. I'm wondering what your thoughts are, because I've been watching what's been going on in the weeks leading up to the midterm elections. And it does seem like they're moving away from the February 28th model and more toward maybe the June 2025 model for doing this. But what are your thoughts on that question?

#Patrick Henningsen

The first thing I'll add is just an extension of what Larry was saying there about the underlying burning, smoldering moral issue, which is the genocide in Gaza and just the unbelievable crime against humanity there. What the Iran conflict has done—and this is part of the Israeli playbook throughout history—is provide an incredible diversion to put all the world's attention on that conflict, the catastrophe that has ensued, and the fears of what's impending, be it economic escalation or the use of nuclear weapons. And it's really diverted people's focus away from Gaza, because that's where the world's focus was squarely for two and a half years. So from that point of view, that's been to the benefit of Israel, the war party in America that is absolutely complicit in that, and Trump to some degree as well.

But it didn't stave off a total defeat. There are a couple of potential examples. You know, the James Talarico Senate race in Texas—a blowout, a total rout. And he absolutely understands the Gaza issue as an incoming U.S. senator. Abdul El-Sayed, I think, is the same way, although I disagree with El-Sayed's, you know, statements on Iran. And I don't know what his view on Syria is, but I can take a wild guess that I'm not going to be that happy with it. But that said, on the Palestinian issue, he's very clear, very committed. And that's the case with a number of others coming in. And so this means that the conversation can elevate a bit more. And it was absolutely on the ballot.

And the public is very clear on that in America. So this could potentially shift the U.S. relationship with Israel, albeit gradually, and not to Israel's benefit. And I think this is why Donald Trump announced on Election Day that he's going to cut off $4.1 billion in aid. It was almost off the cuff. On one hand, the fact that he waited to do that on Election Day and didn't make that big, bold statement on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, or Monday showed me that he was indecisive, and it was a last-minute sort of desperate blurt. But more than anything—and this is the important point—that's an absolute admission that support for Israel is a liability.

That's the president de facto admitting that by making that statement at that time. So he's definitely caught in the middle on that. But on the nuclear fear, the thing that terrifies me is a recent statement by the president saying, "We might do a strike. We might not. But if we do, it's going to be quick." So when he says "quick," if anything, we have to take this administration seriously on one thing, and that is they're very good at branding their actions ahead of time. They're very good at marketing. So when they say "quick," you do pay attention. Donald Trump likes to do that foreshadowing, as do people in his administration.

So that scares me, because what does a quick strike look like? Because we know what the retaliation from Iran will be. It's going to be comprehensive. It's going to be devastating for Israel, for any U.S. positions in the region, and for the Gulf states as well. And so that does worry me a lot. What does that mean? What does "quick" mean? But you have to think through the political reaction to this globally, not just domestically in the U.S., but globally. If Israel acts alone by deploying a thermonuclear weapon without having been attacked, or in a war that they started—a war of aggression they prompted, with the U.S. running behind them.

I think that's really kind of the end for Israel as a viable political entity going forward in history. So I can't see how they would want to do that. And the same goes for the United States if it acted unilaterally with the deployment of a nuclear weapon for symbolic reasons—to destroy Pickaxe Mountain and declare victory, or to intimidate the Iranians, or, God forbid, hit any significant population areas. The environmental blowback from this would be regional, and the economic reaction is going to be overwhelmingly negative on every single front. So I don't see the positives in either of those scenarios. However, if the United States and Israel did it as a joint strike, what would the Europeans do?

What would the G7 do? Probably not a lot. And that's frightening. So it could be a real kind of mafioso move for the U.S. and Israel to do this in concert, or for the Trump administration to do this in concert with Netanyahu, just to really intimidate. And that's a bold hand to play, but that's the only hand they could play if I were testing all of these different permutations in game theory and looking at the political fallout and what that would mean to the United States globally. Because if the U.S. is weak, that means Israel is weak. Because Israel derives all its support—politically, financially, militarily—from the United States.

So it's not in Israel's interest either to have a weak U.S. So all three of these scenarios that I've just outlined have huge problems. But the last one is the most frightening because that's the kind of imperial move, if you will—the unapologetic, hegemonic move to maintain some kind of order that sort of resembles what it was prior to this war that they started. But the message is that we should be concerned. We should be very vigilant, very much on alert, and preparing for the worst possible outcome. But at the same time, I take a lot of solace in the political winds shifting. And that's one thing we can all pray might get us somewhere and get us to a better place, hopefully.

#Danny

Yeah, Colonel Wilkerson, you know, Iran and its media were showing a video of them educating the population on what to do in case of a nuclear attack. I put it up yesterday. Patrick, your thoughts on that?

#Larry Wilkerson

The IRGC has already put out orders to all the military echelons, the militia, the National Army, and so forth, that go along with CBR operations. They expect them.

#Patrick Henningsen

Chemical, biological, radiological.

#Larry Wilkerson

As Patrick was talking there, I was thinking, what would Trump do? Trump would probably say something like this: "I had to do it to prevent Bibi from doing it." I could see that rolling out of Trump's lips. "I had to do it. I dropped the nuclear weapon. I had to do it because Bibi was going to do it—to prevent him from doing it." Because Patrick's right. The vehement condemnation that would flow down onto Israel would be considerable. And with regard to the United States, it would probably just be people looking and going, "Oh, God, I can't believe they did that." But we'd get away with it. We'd get away with it. I think it'd be the end of Bibi and the end of Israel if they did. Something in that statement makes me think it's happening.

As sad as it is to say, I feel that way. The other thing that bothers me tremendously about what's happening right now is that I don't see the Israelis getting their political act together anytime soon. And so we have these 45 days or so, roughly, from when things are pretty much settled—there may be some court cases and such, but nonetheless—until the 3rd of January, when the new Congress is seated. That's a period of time that's dead in terms of real power on the part of the president, unless he wants to do some really absurd things, or things we wouldn't even dream of right now that would come out of Laura Loomer, Stephen Miller, Russ Vought, and a whole bunch of other people.

And they worry me far more than Trump right now in terms of losing their power and knowing they're losing their power. So this isn't going to be a peaceful period between now and the seating of the new Congress, nor maybe even after the seating. It's going to be dangerous, particularly if we haven't done anything but prolong what's happening in Israel and Iran and the region in general. And the same thing with Ukraine. One of Iran's stated escalatory moves could be to regionalize the war even more than they have. For example, they said they might attack a target in Europe. This has every prospect of going wider and bigger and deeper, being more profound, and ultimately marrying itself up with Ukraine and the disaster that that portends for Europe.

#Danny

Yeah, well, Patrick, Iran has a say in this. I think a lot of what's been going on for a while now, for weeks and weeks and weeks in the lead-up to the midterm elections, too, is that the entire narrative frames this war as simply being about the United States and Israel. But Iran is the target of this war and undoubtedly will have a lot to say and do when it restarts. But what are your thoughts on the

broader context for Iran as it witnesses these massive political changes in the United States, as well as what's going on regionally?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, I think I'll start there, and then I'll backtrack a little bit on the nuclear thing, because everything seems to circle back to that strategically as an endgame point. But I think we can safely say that Iran has won the propaganda war, because that's translated into U.S. attitudes and how people feel about the war, whether they think it's right, and who they think the good guys or the bad guys are. And I think that's true globally. So the Lego videos have emerged victorious as one of the great weapons of mass destruction. And any great superpower has a great soft power complex, and Iran has proven and demonstrated that they do. They have it, and that takes great talent, skill, and, I think, a very realistic and clear worldview, which the Iranians have. We should all appreciate the political complexity of that country.

I say we, the people in the West, need to appreciate that it's not a backwater civilization at all. They're a leading-edge modern civilization, in some ways progressive—not by the Western definition—but they are a lot more than people give them credit for. But some of their leading defense spokespeople have also said publicly that if they are struck by a nuclear weapon, they're going to unleash incredible retaliation, which might very well entail the things that Larry was mentioning there: extending the conflict, even hitting the source of the aggression, which would, of course, be U.S. bases in Germany, potentially U.S. bases in Romania, very much within range, U.S. bases in Italy, U.S. bases in Greece, Cyprus—all of these facilities.

And Ukraine as well, because they owe them a few. There are a few IOUs there with Ukraine already, with the Caspian Sea. And so that's one thing. But what disturbs me the most is that stories have been floated this week saying that Iran has chemical weapons. And this is from an Israeli intelligence source. And, you know, it's just important to reiterate to people that the longest pipeline in the world is between Tel Aviv and Washington, and it's a sewer pipe. And it comes from Israel in that direction. It's full of something they call intelligence, which is just garbage. And this is just a perfect example of that. But because chemical weapons are classed as WMDs, just imagine, you know, the last well-documented use of them on a battlefield would have been Saddam Hussein using them against Iranians.

So Iranians have been victims of chemical weapons. Mohamed Morandi, who's been a guest on your show and who we all know well, survived two chemical attacks during the Iran-Iraq War, using weapons provided to Saddam Hussein by the Americans and the British. But the fact that they push that out in the media means that there's a campaign on, and it would be to equate the threats. And also, couple this with the fact that in every single speech made by Donald Trump, Pete Hegseth, Marco Rubio, or anybody else, the bottom line of every statement is that Iran can't be allowed to have a nuclear weapon. That's in every single public statement to do with this war. So that's not by accident. That's not just propaganda for decoration. That's not just a motif.

There's a purpose behind that, and it's to build up a public case, if you will, a consensus that Iran is a nuclear threat or Iran is a chemical threat. Whatever the case is, they're a threat. They're a WMD threat. Therefore, now we get into the interesting historical frame, which is that America has form in this regard: they could justify deploying nuclear weapons, multiple nuclear weapons, to, quote, "save lives." Because I went to American schools, I was state-educated from kindergarten right through to the end of my bachelor's degree. And everything I was told in every single history class was that we dropped two A-bombs on Japan to save American lives because we would have lost one million-plus soldiers. I remember even being told two million U.S. soldiers would have been lost trying to take the island of Japan.

I mean, that's how I and every other American have been raised. So we already have that programming in our heads. Larry probably is a lot more au fait with the truth behind Hiroshima and Nagasaki, I would think. But the argument I'm making here is that this is an argument that will be deployed in the event of American involvement, deployment, or a joint operation with Israel involving nuclear weapons against Iran. This is how it will be sold to the public in some way. And that's super important, because you have to be able to manufacture consent for this. And so when I see the media reporting, the talking points, the throwaway lines by Trump, I take all that very seriously. I'll leave it there, but I'd really like to know Larry's thoughts on this.

#Danny

Yeah, well, Colonel Wilkerson, I know you have just a few minutes left, so I'd definitely like to hear your response to that.

#Larry Wilkerson

Well, I'm trying to text the judge right now because I realize he can't send me the log-on details to my normal account. It's down. So I'll just give him another one. So you were looking for me to comment on… Yeah, Patrick, your question.

#Patrick Henningsen

The justification for Hiroshima and Nagasaki was that we had to drop the bombs to save American lives.

#Larry Wilkerson

No, that's hogwash. I mean, George Marshall might have had a Joint Staff that gave him a million casualties as a point of argument for some other way of doing it other than invading the home islands. That was the Joint Staff's real punch: "It'll take a million people." They were basing it on Peleliu, Tarawa, Iwo Jima, all that, and now you're going to do it on the home islands. That was not what was instrumental in the decision, though. And let me back up for a moment. The Japanese

aristocracy was eating rats. They were eating ants. They were eating anything they could get their hands on because the submarine warfare had decimated Japan's merchant fleet. They had nothing left.

So all you had to do was continue the submarine campaign for another three or four months, and you would have brought them to their knees. But the bigger problem, I think, was that we needed to demonstrate that what we had done worked. And we needed to demonstrate it, I think Harry Truman thought, and others too, to Joe Stalin. And we needed to make sure that the Russian hordes, as it were, stopped in Berlin and didn't keep going. And so we didn't do just one, because that could have been a fluke. We did two to make sure Joe understood that they worked. I think that was one of the primary motivations, not to mention the fact that we wanted to keep the Russians out of Japan and Korea. So, you know, it's an ignominious thing we did.

I don't necessarily blame Harry Truman because I don't think he was really up to speed on what he was talking about. And then they come up to him and get him to approve the thermonuclear weapon. He takes about five minutes to approve it. I mean, you know, that is an order-of-magnitude change in your ability to destroy the world. An order-of-magnitude change. Just look at that first test at Bikini Atoll. Look at the difference between that and Nagasaki and Hiroshima. It's 1,200 times more powerful. And yet he made that decision with hardly a blink. Harry was like that, I guess, with decisions. He made them. But this was a bad time, a very bad time. And we set a precedent we should never have set.

#Danny

Well, Colonel Wilkes, I know you have your next appointment, so I'll let you go, and I'll be in touch with you very soon. Thanks so much for joining. Take care. I'm sorry, I've got to run.

#Larry Wilkerson

Good to see you, Patrick. Talk soon.

#Danny

All right, Patrick, we can close it up with your final thoughts in the last several minutes that we have here on the situation as a whole, what you're looking at right now, and what's most important over the next few months, even the next few days and weeks. It does feel very much like—I like the way you put it—a dangerous interregnum period. But we're getting misdirected, and there are reports all the time that contradict each other about where this war is going and the world situation as a whole. Your thoughts?

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, I mean, along conventional lines, Danny, I just don't see any available avenues to justify serious escalation or even nuclear escalation against Iran. I'm talking about conventional avenues. Unconventional? Different story. And I hate to circle back to, you know, some of these toxic influencers like Laura Loomer, but she was tweeting a few weeks or months ago that there is definitely going to be an Iranian nuclear attack or a dirty bomb or something like that on U.S. soil. And it's coming, and this is what's going to happen, and da, da, da. And so, you know, who would benefit from that? Of course, Israel in its current predicament. I mean, is Israel capable of a false flag?

I mean, do we even need to ask that question? They actually have a historic record of doing that, plus statements made by many different people in Israel, and even Jonathan Pollard himself, the notorious superspy. So, you know, that would be, to me, the only play that I think could overcome the fact that they've lost the propaganda war. The Hasbara machine has lost so badly. In fact, now, you know, Larry Ellison is a big financial backer of the Hasbara machine, which is the Israeli government's propaganda initiative network. And so, because they've lost the argument globally, in the U.S. and in the West, they have to buy all the media outlets.

So they're having to pony up billions and billions of dollars to buy up every movie studio, every mainstream television network, social media, TikTok, all of that. But to do that, Larry had to parlay his Oracle stock as well. And right now, Oracle's corporate value, as it were, has been falling. So he has lost, on paper, a significant amount of his personal wealth, and a lot of people are losing confidence in some of these other corporations and their ability to chart a path forward—not just Oracle, but some of these big AI and tech giants as well. So the timing of this couldn't be any worse.

So they're having to earmark a percentage of their wealth to hold up the propaganda line for Israel, because isn't that what it kind of boils down to? That's what it is. So they're going to the billionaires, the richest people in the world, the International Jewish Congress, the Zionist movement, Israel, the Israeli lobby, the Mega Group—all of these different aspects of this network—and having to tap them to provide the capital to buy up media, to control speech, to control the debate, the narrative. And it's just bound to fail. It's bound to fail. I mean, everybody just laughs at CBS News. They laugh at it. They call it the Chabad Broadcasting System, basically.

CBS with the all-seeing eye. I mean, it couldn't get any worse, right? And now they're going to own CNN. So there's a huge antitrust case there. In fact, I think the Democrats should definitely be focused on antitrust on the media side. It's out of control. It's almost like you're now consolidating down to sort of two major conglomerates. It was bad enough with five or six previously. So maybe they have to take another look at that. But all that regulation is potentially back on the table as part of horse-trading with Trump, basically saving his arse from a painful public impeachment for the next two years. So there's that as well hanging in the balance. There's definitely a political shift inside the U.S., and I'm not saying it's significant along ideological lines.

But there is a little bit of a shift in power. I still believe it's a duopoly for all intents and purposes. There are slight variations within the different wings of that duopoly. But the anti-Israeli sentiment, the pro-Palestinian sentiment, the rediscovery of compassion for people getting killed underfoot with powerful modern weaponry, and the opposition to ethnic cleansing and genocide—that's a potentially big factor, because so much of U.S. foreign policy is driven or steered, if you will, especially in West Asia, by Israeli interests. And ditto with the military-industrial complex as well—huge parts of the military-industrial complex. Ditto with the conflict in Ukraine.

I mean, there's a huge Israeli hand in that as well, with Igor Kolomoisky, their positioning of Zelensky as a kind of fake president, and the resurgence of the Nazi Azov Battalion, a violent, armed Nazi movement that is partly Israeli-financed and backed through Igor Kolomoisky, the Jewish-Ukrainian oligarch who I believe has fled to Tel Aviv, if I'm not mistaken. I have to check my records there. So the reduction of Israel's power and influence, first and foremost in the United States, could have reverberations internationally. And that could be positive in terms of reducing conflicts. And really, the source of all conflicts in the Middle East begins in Palestine.

And the U.S. is defending all of that. What the U.S. spends to defend Israel is more than $4.1 billion in military aid. Estimates range from $50 to $150 billion per year when you add in the entire U.S. defense envelope that encompasses West Asia. We all saw it spring into action during Operations True Promise 1 through 4. You could see all of these ships, naval assets, bases, and anti-aircraft interceptors. And so it's activated immediately to protect Israel. We've expended all those munitions to protect Israel. So it comes at a huge cost for the U.S. And what it's done to the global economy is devastating. I mean, we've all paid through the nose to protect Israel in terms of inflation, the cost of fuel, business failures, and the collapse of certain parts of the economy.

It does come down to that, actually, because it's been openly admitted that this war was an Israeli war. Top U.S. officials have publicly admitted that the U.S. had to go to war because Israel wanted to strike Iran. So there's no debate. And that has to be seriously looked at. So I think that political shift will also happen within Europe, and you will see a slight change there. So there's a little bit of conflict with Europe there. The coup in Poland is a typical front line there. The Serbian election as well, to some degree. Among the many issues raised by the student list is Serbia's arming of Israel.

I think that may or may not play a part in the Hungarian election, but Viktor Orban was a big champion of Netanyahu, you know, flouting ICC arrest warrants and all of that stuff when Netanyahu would come and do these glorious state visits to Hungary as a wanted war criminal. So, yeah, we'll see how the politics shifts. Certainly there's a shift in the UK on this, which is slow, but it's definitely moving. But in America, it's drastic. It's drastic in America. So I think that is significant. Now, if America stops focusing on Israel as its number one priority, then the United States has to look at what's happening around the world, the other security architecture arrangements that are going on, and the upcoming APEC summit. You have a potential Xi Jinping, Putin, Trump meeting. If that actually comes off, if that actually happens, that's significant.

That leaves Europe in the lurch, actually, which is amazing, Danny, because, you know, the EU spent decades building up its profile to be at that table. And here they are in 2026. The EU, with 420-plus million people and this massive economy, is not at the table at APEC. So it's not a good ending for Europe. It means that major decisions are going to be made in their absence. There are some interesting things going on, is what I'm going to say. And there's a major geopolitical alignment that's underway in West Asia as a result of this conflict. Iran has risen to the top of the hierarchy in the region, and it means that how things are going to get decided, what the consensus is, and how you come to a consensus are changing. And yeah.

#Danny

No, no, great. I mean, that last point you made about the APEC summit—it happens in exactly two weeks from now, I believe. So that two-week period is going to be interesting in terms of where things stand everywhere, particularly in West Asia, because I think a lot more will be known about what the U.S. and Israel can do, what they plan to do, and whether they're carrying it out as we speak. So, Patrick, it was a great show. We're going to head out together. I want to make sure people know that the 21st Century Wire YouTube channel, as well as your Substack, are both in the video description below. So people should subscribe, follow you there, and support you any way they can.

I want to thank everybody who gave a Super Chat. Thanks so much. I appreciate both of you for giving those. And everyone who moderated today, of course—I really appreciate all your efforts. And to everyone who watched, of course, thank you so much. Hit the like button before you go, everyone. Be sure to check out all of Patrick's work in the video description below. And I will see you tomorrow at 12:30 p.m. Eastern Time. I believe I'll begin with Trita Parsi, and then Alex Christoforou, I think, will finish the program with me. All right, everybody. See you then, November 6th, at 12:30 Eastern Time. Bye-bye.