

# Patrick Henningsen: Iran War vs. Vietnam: Why This Is Far More Dangerous

See Full Interview: [https://www.youtube.com/live/-Ive2x2utoY?si=eYS69TyX\\_rz9q8dj](https://www.youtube.com/live/-Ive2x2utoY?si=eYS69TyX_rz9q8dj) Follow me:  
Substack: [https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm\\_campaign=profile&utm\\_medium=profile-page](https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page)  
X (Twitter): [https://x.com/Dialogue\\_NRA](https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA) Patreon: [https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?](https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=)

## #Nima

He keeps comparing the war with Iran in the Middle East to what happened in Vietnam. Why is he doing this? Because in his mind, the duration of that war is comparable to what's going on in the Middle East. So they were fighting for years, and I'm just four weeks, six weeks into this war against Iran. So I have a lot of time, I have no pressure on me. But it's totally the opposite, because the Vietnam War, we know it was a tragedy. But after all, it didn't hit the global economy the way the case of Iran is hitting the global economy. And it's totally different—two different scenarios—and they're not even comparable on any scale.

## #Patrick

But he keeps bringing that up. Trump is so funny once he gets a soundbite in his head. He's not very, like, his intellectual capacity is—he's got ADHD or something. He just can't grab on to—like, he's not interested in actually knowing what he's saying. He just says, "That sounds good." He says, "How long will we have been in there?" confidently, as a U.S. president. This is a guy that dodged the Vietnam draft, okay?

He went out, I don't know how many medical dispensations he got for his bone spurs or whatever, but he actively—and he's probably quite proud of the fact that he's a draft dodger—but he's saying that we were in Vietnam for 18 years, we were in the Vietnam War for 18 years. Where does he get this number, 18 years? Because the U.S. did not engage in combat operations in Vietnam until after the Gulf of Tonkin incident. And if I have my math correct, I believe the Gulf of Tonkin incident was 1964. I'm not looking it up right now, but let's say it's 1964. And then the official end of combat operations would have been, I believe, the Paris Accords. I believe that was in 1972 or 1973—1973, I'm just guessing. Again, that's eight years and six months or something like that.

That's how long combat operations were for Vietnam, not 18 years. It should matter to a U.S. president, just out of respect for all of the hundreds of thousands. And by the way, the U.S. did not lose only 56,000 soldiers in Vietnam. Many, many more died after they came home. There are a lot of excess deaths, plus Agent Orange, all of that. Not to mention, forget about the 2 million

Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian civilians that died. They don't count, obviously, from a U.S. point of view. Any Arabs or anybody in Southeast Asia is sub-Africa, subhuman. They don't count. All that counts is dead U.S. soldiers in U.S. wars of conquest. So he's lying. It's just disrespectful to the history, to all the people that gave their lives for another stupid war by Uncle Sam.

Nothing to be proud of, the Vietnam War. Nothing to be proud of as an American. And Donald Trump just can't even get—he's not even in the neighborhood. So where he got that number, 18 years, is Stephen Miller, one of the sort of geniuses that works for him, went to Wikipedia. And it said this was the duration of the Vietnam conflict from, you know, as a post-colonial French insurgency and then U.S. advisers coming in. This isn't advisers coming in. This is the U.S. deploying the full force of their air force and navy against the Islamic Republic of Iran, and threatening them with civilizational annihilation and expending munitions at a rate never seen before in the modern era. This is not sending military advisers to help fight the Viet Cong.

If he can't get that right, in terms of U.S. basic history, then I have no confidence that this person can process what's actually happening today in any meaningful sense. You know, he's just kind of an ignoramus. You could pick somebody off the street that's probably got a better grasp of these issues than Donald Trump does. But he's just play-acting like president, because for him it's just another kind of extension of a reality TV show. He just goes from one press opportunity to the next, and he's got the sound bites, and he says, well, in the Korean War, how long was that? How long was that? This is nothing. So because this isn't like dragging on for years, shut up. Stop criticizing us. This is an unprecedented military victory. It's not. It's an illegal war.

This is not going to go down as a victory, Donald Trump and Pete Hegseth and everybody else in the Trump administration. It can't be a victory in the history books. It's an illegal war. It's a war crime. You're guilty of war crimes. Every single U.S. serviceman and officer that's executing illegal orders is also historically and legally guilty of war crimes. Every single minute you continue this war, it's illegal. It's not going to be a victory. Just like, unless, you know... unless you're like Philip K. Dick imagining what happened if, in *\*The Man in the High Castle\**, the Nazis won the Second World War. That's kind of a glorious victor writing history there — the Japanese and the Nazis, like the Philip K. Dick novel. So that's fantasy land. But that's where the Trump administration is.

They're envisioning, like the Reich, that they're going to rule the world and be the greatest thing on the planet, and this is just one big conquest. It's not going to end like that. It's not going to end like that. It's not even going in that direction right now. So it's really hard to take it seriously, what anything that these people are saying in Washington right now. I don't think they have a grip on it. The only chance would be some kind of dramatic removal of this president — either resigning for health reasons or a military coup, perhaps. That might work. I can't believe we're even saying this. I would never have imagined this in my lifetime, but it's kind of reached that sort of period where that's what would have to happen. And the Straits of Hormuz are not closed.

They go on TV saying Iran has closed the Straits. They're not. They're closed for some people, but they're open for others. So that's a fundamental lie that the U.S. government and the media are telling their own people. They're making the U.S. blockade, which is an act of war, which is illegal. They're making this blockade seem like it's reciprocal and somehow justified. So, like, on every level, it's a lie. Everything that Trump is saying about the Iranians — that they've been killing Americans for 47 years — that's a lie. The U.S. has been killing Iranians. The Iranians have not been killing Americans.

They say, oh, they killed our soldiers in Iraq with IED roadside bombs and slaughtered our men in Iraq. Hold on for a minute. That was Iraqi resistance. Wait a minute, didn't you invade and occupy Iraq under false pretenses? Fake weapons of mass destruction claims, like the fake Iran nuclear weapons claims that you're trying to pull right now. Same exact thing. So you're occupying Iraq, and there's an Iraqi resistance that are pushing back against U.S. soldiers who are legitimate targets in that sense. And you're blaming that on Iran, claiming Iran's been killing Americans.

So they're just using these lies to motivate the American people to back this illegal war. That's all they're doing. No apology or anything spoken about the United States shooting down an Iranian passenger airliner and killing everybody on board. That doesn't come into the conversation. If you did that to America, you'd have American people out in the street saying "Death to Iran" if Iran did that to an American passenger airliner. But America does it, and the president at the time, George H. W. Bush, who they named that aircraft carrier after that's pulling up right now past Madagascar, said he refused to apologize.

I don't apologize for the actions of the United States of America, said George H.W. Bush at the time in the 1980s. And the lies just continue that the JCPOA was a bad deal. No, it wasn't a bad deal. It was a good deal. And now he'd kill for that deal right now, Donald Trump. He'd kill for it. But he is killing, but he's not going to get that deal. So that window is closed. It's not going to happen. He had that deal. He had a better deal, in fact, during the last round of negotiations with the Omanis. You couldn't get a better deal than that. But the thing is, the U.S. is not capable. And Iran now knows that even if they sign a deal with this president or the U.S., they can come back and attack them periodically at any point in the future.

So they go build their infrastructure. They rebuild their petrochemical production and distribution. The U.S. and Israel, or they'll rebuild their civilian nuclear power plants. And Israel and the U.S. reserve the right, because it's an undeclared war of aggression, to come periodically and destroy Iranian infrastructure. Well, that's not going to fly. It's not going to work. Not to mention the fact that Iran reserves the right to retaliate in kind. And then the West and Israel say, this is unacceptable. They're terrorizing us. Or Israelis have to run to the bomb shelters in Tel Aviv. They're traumatized. We can't allow this to happen.

And so they're kind of opening up a narrative that the only way to stop Iran, because Iran won't surrender, it's the same type of narrative that the United States deployed to justify dropping two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which is that the Japanese are fierce fighters, they're not going to surrender, so we must use nuclear weapons to bring this awful war to a close and to, quote, save lives, and to stop the economic catastrophe that's resulted from this war and the disruptions in trade and supply routes. The same type of justifications was made at the end of the Second World War. They would deploy similar talking points here to justify using weapons of mass destruction against a country that doesn't have them.

So that's my worry, that if the U.S. and Israel continue to paint themselves into a worse and worse position, then it's almost like they're—the only way for them to come out, because they won't admit defeat, they won't admit they're wrong, they won't cop and be accountable—their only way out is to double down, because that's the Israeli mentality. And Donald Trump might as well be flying an Israeli flag over the White House at this point, because his words and actions are indistinguishable from Benjamin Netanyahu's. So to me, it's a foreign government. There's a foreign occupation in Washington. I don't recognize this. It's not an American presidency. It's not an American administration. It's unrecognizable at the moment. But if you put an Israeli flag over the White House right now, it's perfectly familiar, and I understand completely.

## **#Nima**

Patrick, part of this war is what's going on between Israel and Lebanon. And we know that Donald Trump today announced that the ceasefire is going to be extended. They're going to have three weeks of extension. And then here comes the question: what is this ceasefire between Lebanon and Israel? It seems that it is between the government in Lebanon and the Israeli government, while they're attacking Lebanon in the southern part of the country. So what does that mean? And we've seen how Hezbollah is capable of firing back at them.

And at this time, I think they understand the problem—the shortage on the part of the Israelis when it comes to the interceptors—and they cannot hit each and every rocket going to Israel because of the shortage they're facing in interceptors. And this is a huge problem, not only on the part of Israel, but also, as it was reported in the New York Times, Washington Post, and on CNN, that the United States is running short of ammunition, running short of interceptors and cruise missiles. Your understanding of that?

## **#Patrick**

Well, again, we'll go back to the whole point of the United States' military orientation in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. While it was originally there to—it's always been there to protect Israel—but it's also to provide at least the veneer of defense for the Gulf GCC countries, the Arab states. And that was always in the U.S. interest because effectively the United States is protecting their

petrodollar. And not only that, they're making huge amounts of money by selling weapons to the Gulf Arabs. And so it's kind of a protection racket on one hand, and it's a huge moneymaker for the military-industrial complex.

And also, you know, Aramco, that whole concern in Saudi Arabia, the consortium of U.S. companies, you know, which used to be a U.S. consortium. It's not now, but it was before. So the Gulf has changed. So really what's left for the U.S. is to provide a giant Iron Dome for Israel. That's the main function of the U.S., from Djibouti to Diego Garcia to the Persian Gulf to every other U.S. facility in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, of course, all these other ones, although a lot of Bahrain's offline, so is Kuwait for the most part. But Iraq—previously the U.S. had a position in Iraq—northeastern Syria, Incirlik Air Force Base in Turkey, plus whatever they have going in Erbil in Iraqi Kurdistan and in Israel as well.

So that was all to protect Israel, all of it. And we've seen that. This has been proven now, through promise one, two, three, four, we see. And the U.S. naval assets are positioned to do that. Their first priority: interceptors defend Israel from Iranian missiles—number one priority—and Iranian drones—number one priority. Gulf Arabs second. Gulf Arabs second. And herein lies the problem. So not only are they not protecting the Gulf Arab countries, they're also drawing fire to the Gulf Arab countries because the Gulf Arab countries have become accessories to these war crimes by the United States and Israel. So now we're in a totally different region now, in a totally different situation.

Add to that the depletion, as you mentioned, of U.S. munitions, interceptors, and just the general redundancy and fatigue of U.S. naval assets that Donald Trump thinks he can move around like a game of Battleship on the board, and Pete Hegseth, while he's up all night doing whatever he does late at night with a bottle of whatever on the table, planning out the operation like the one snatching the enriched uranium from Isfahan, that great special forces operation planned by Pete Hegseth and Delta Force—a total failure. So they're not done with their failures, these guys. So that's going to be the main problem.

And so I don't—it's very hard to see how that's sustainable going forward. I don't think that the Gulf Arabs, the UAE and Saudi Arabia specifically, the main ones, can rely on their relationship with the United States to really protect them going forward. So there are all sorts of big, big red flags for the U.S. I really don't know what they're expecting to achieve here in the next couple of weeks. I really don't know. Sure, they can unload what they have left, which is not much, but forget about jets coming in at close range and doing gravity glide bombs. That's not going to work, as we saw with the various shoot-downs of U.S. aircraft.

The U.S. public doesn't have the stomach for any F-35s dropping from the sky, nor do they have the stomach for one U.S. naval destroyer sinking to the bottom of the Gulf of Oman, which is very likely to happen if hostilities resume. That's the one thing that will be the image attached to Donald Trump. Not only that, imagine a U.S. B-1 or B-2 bomber shot down. It has happened before, over Yugoslavia. So if that happens, that's the game changer because that means that air power and total

air supremacy are not guaranteed. Then this story is over at that point. It's really over unless the U.S. wants to further escalate, as we said, with unconventional weapons. And then that's another story we're into, unfortunately, there.

So it's really hard, Nima, to see where the potential benefits are, even pursuing this militarily. And then they're saying, well, we've got all the time in the world. That's what Donald Trump says. He doesn't have all the time in the world. Politically, he doesn't. He's on a short leash, and then economically he's on an even shorter leash. Militarily, he's really running on fumes, the U.S. If they attempt a ground invasion of any description whatsoever, this could only be viewed as a huge act of desperation and a huge act of vanity. And you can't underestimate, Nima, in these situations historically, the arrogance that comes along with a megalomaniac or a dictator.

There are storied tales throughout history of dictators and autocrats that have just lost their minds and are literally throwing men at the front line in the hopes that somehow they're going to teach their opponent a lesson. And I think that level of arrogance could seep in where there are people – Donald Trump, he does not care about U.S. soldiers. He himself is a draft dodger. He's the last person you want to be giving orders for ground invasions. He doesn't care. At some point, he might decide that U.S. manpower is expendable because the way that he speaks about the Korean War and the Vietnam War, that's no big deal. It's okay. We're doing our war differently. That was a bad war. I forgot.

It was J.D. Vance saying past U.S. presidents weren't as smart as Donald Trump, he said this week. That's why we don't have to be worried with Trump, because all the past presidents that presided over all those other wars, they were stupid. Not Trump. He's different. Trump's a cut above the rest. He's a stable genius. But by saying that, J.D. Vance, the 41-year-old neophyte, is disrespecting all of the U.S. veterans that died in massive numbers in those various conflicts. So that means that they probably don't really respect the lives of U.S. servicemen that they're basically forcing into an illegal war, propagandizing the hell out of them to get them to think that somehow what they're doing is justified or legal.

And then basically these people will not—Trump and Vance and all these crazed maniacs that are occupying the White House now, these glorified Israeli surrogates—they have no problem throwing U.S. servicemen into the fray as cannon fodder. In their minds, they think that this is a holy war at this point. They're saying this is the crusade to defeat Iran from the Christian Zionist point of view, of which Hegseth himself is an adherent. He's actually a member of that cult. He's a Third Temple cultist, the self-styled Secretary of War. So if it's a holy war, then you don't have any problem committing, you know, a few thousand or maybe even 100,000 U.S. soldiers in service of a greater cause, a holy cause.

And he's not alone, by the way. And Trump's surrounded by all these religious fanatics putting their hands on him in these embarrassing scenes of praying on the president. So they accuse Iran of being a theocracy. They accuse the Islamic Republic of Iran of being a religious extremist regime. I

don't think so. No, it's not extreme at all. It's very rational, level-headed if you compare it to the Americans right now and a president that's tweeting out that he's the second coming of Jesus Christ. He's done that. He's the Messiah. So who are the religious fanatics from the global perspective?

You know, the world's looking at America and this president, and they're laughing at the country. They're laughing at this president—what a clown and a joke he's become, to himself, past the point of shame. And then they have the temerity to point the finger around, calling other countries religious extremists or theocrats. You've got to be kidding me. It's like, I mean, we're at a really difficult, really dangerous point, because the public in America are very disengaged from this, Nima. I'm in America right now. I go out in the street—nobody cares about this war. They don't.

They care a little bit more in Europe because they're getting hit a lot harder economically, and they're more in proximity. They're closer to the conflict, of course, and they might very well receive the brunt of massive waves of refugees if the conflict does escalate and become worse. Europe will bear the brunt of that. But Americans don't care. Generally, they don't. You travel around—I've been traveling around this country—people don't. They really don't care. A very small number of people do, and there's a lot of people that are pushing back and are vocal against this illegal war, against this regime in Washington.

But on the whole, it's not really an issue Americans are taking seriously. Hence, they're not really interrogating any of the claims or statements being made by Washington or through their media mouthpieces. They won't really start taking it seriously, Nima, until the economy hits the wall, and it's going to happen. And even if Trump walked away and did a fake peace agreement, like he signs some paper himself and pretends that some Iranian signed it or somebody, he'll probably get like Steve Witkoff's buddy who's got a pawn shop in New Jersey or something, an Iranian guy, and he'll have him sign it. He'll say, this is the new president. It'll be like Juan Guaidó.

They'll find some Iranian somewhere to be like the next president, and they'll just go with that for a while until the next wave of this crisis comes. I don't know where they're going to go on this. It has to be a removal of Donald Trump from office. That's the only off-ramp. Or... I've ruled out an epiphany. I don't think it's possible with this president. He's just too ignorant and stupid, and he's doubling down. He's employed the methods of his mentor, the mob lawyer Roy Cohn, which is never admit you're wrong and double down. And that's the Israeli negotiations and diplomacy tactic. So I don't know. I don't know. It's very difficult to see daylight here.

## **#Nima**

Patrick, Donald Trump tweeted today that actually on his social, he posted that he talked with the prime minister of Armenia. And he said that the guy totally understands the situation, you know, how fragile, how weak Iran is. And he's ready to give us his, you know, the bases, you know, airfields in his country for us to use against Iran. And later on, he removed that post. I don't know why he removed it, whether it was something from his administration or Armenia contacted him.

But after all, Armenia—how can someone believe that Armenia could bring something new, or some sort of game-changing factor to the conflict? Did this guy even get this right? It's a little country. The population is not even considerable. It's small. And they're going to be destroyed like the other GCC countries. And do you think that Donald Trump—was it something made up? Because he said, if you don't negotiate with us in good faith, if you don't have some sort of agreement with us, we're going to use Armenia against you. What does that mean? I don't see Armenia being that stupid. I don't know.

## **#Patrick**

No, they're not. But you have a puppet, Pashinyan, and the people that have been backed by U.S. interests and vassalized for this very reason. But actually pulling that off is another thing altogether. And that brings us back to the Lebanon question, which you asked before, Nima, which I didn't answer, which I will. The problem with the Lebanese government is it's basically a U.S.-Israeli puppet regime. The president and the prime minister in Lebanon, Michel Aoun and Nawaf Salam, I mean, they've sold out their country. They have sold them out in the worst possible way. So it's a facade of negotiations between Israel and Lebanon.

By the way, it's illegal for their leaders to be negotiating with the Israelis because I believe that's against the law in Lebanon. So they're in violation of their own laws. So Israel is carpet bombing Lebanon, killing civilians, massacring Lebanese, bombing Beirut indiscriminately at will, not apologizing for it, and putting boots on the ground, occupying South Lebanon with the intent of keeping it, annexing it, as they're annexing the Golan Heights right now. Settlers are now, as we speak, moving into the Golan Heights in Syria with the full approval of the United States, of Israel, of course, but also of the al-Qaeda caliph, if you will, the self-styled president in Damascus, Mohammed al-Jolani, a.k.a. al-Sharar.

That's what's going to happen in South Lebanon. Settlers are going to want to make claims, and Ben-Gvir will be right up there in the front cheering them on with Bezalel Smotrich and everybody else. And so they're razing whole Lebanese villages that have been there for thousands of years and razing them to the ground. Israel is destroying Christian holy sites. And they're getting away with it. But if Israel occupies South Lebanon militarily, Iran can, with missile accuracy, destroy all of the Israeli encampments and bases. That's what's going to happen. That's why there's a ceasefire. That's why Lebanon is part of the negotiations. But Israel already broke the ceasefire.

Israel is destroying infrastructure and buildings and homes, schools, churches. They're wiring them with explosives, and then they're turning to the international community and saying, hey, this isn't a violation of the ceasefire because we're not firing anything, we're just blowing it up. And we're targeting journalists, and those are targeted strikes, so those aren't a violation of the ceasefire

because we're targeting journalists and not soldiers. So therefore, it's not a violation of the ceasefire. This is the really twisted, depraved mentality of the Israelis at the moment. They're killing with impunity. So the ceasefire is a facade with Lebanon.

And Israel is just waiting for time to regroup and maximize its gains and consolidate its positions because it needs that fresh water supply from the Litani River. They see it as an existential issue for the state of Israel. They want to expand their borders. They're very open about that. And everyone's still in denial, saying, oh, there's no such thing as the Greater Israel project. It's a conspiracy theory. It's anti-Semitic to even suggest such a thing, even though Benjamin Netanyahu himself publicly stated that is their ambition this past fall. He publicly stated that this is the Greater Israel project. You're watching it unfold. And it's not going to stop in South Lebanon or Syria.

It also includes Jordan and parts of Saudi Arabia and Egypt as well. Forget about the West Bank and Gaza — it's gone as far as their plans are concerned. But the government in Lebanon has really—so the United States has spent decades buying off sections of Lebanese society, particularly the Christian community, in order to make it pro-U.S., to make it loyal to the United States. And they're sort of like Zionists in a way, because part of the payoff for this elite class in Lebanon was that the United States would give U.S. passports to basically everybody in all of their families, without even having, in some cases, ever gone to America — much less being born there or having established any residence.

So that's just part of the payoff. And they've done this strategically, and also with USAID contracts, giving money to certain families, influential Lebanese families, for, quote, projects over the years. And then just cash payoffs, of course. The CIA are probably very involved in that. And they have allowed Israeli intelligence and Israeli activity and Israeli companies into Lebanon as well. So it's been a slow process of degrading what used to be an independent state, Lebanon, in order to isolate Hezbollah. And now the special envoy, Tom Barrack, is openly, openly touting for a civil war, openly setting Lebanese against each other, religious factions against each other, to say, well, you need to help disarm Hezbollah.

And then Israel is saying the same thing. So everybody's—that's the chorus from the U.S. and Israel: we must disarm Hezbollah. And the bought-off class in Lebanon is going along with it. And while the Lebanese, they're watching their own people be slaughtered by the Israelis, and they have nothing to say against the Israelis about it. They just sit back and, you know, hum, twiddle their fingers, and hope that it's going to stop, hope that it's going to go away. The only people defending Lebanon are Hezbollah. And they're not a terror—you know, they'll say, the Americans will say it's a terrorist organization.

Well, under international law, it's defined as an armed liberation struggle against an illegal occupation because Israel never stopped occupying parts of Lebanese territory even before this wave of the crisis began. They still had stolen Lebanese land and were threatening Lebanon. That's why Hezbollah existed in the first place. It wouldn't have existed without Israel having for decades

illegally occupied and brutalized the people in South Lebanon. And the United States was fine with that. They did nothing to restrain Israel in any meaningful way. And it's even worse now. The U.S. is encouraging a civil war and encouraging Israel to come in, kill, and occupy. So this is the worst possible situation for a country like Lebanon.

And so that's why this is part—this is why Iran made this part of the negotiations, because it's about the threat that Israel poses to the region. And it's because Israel can use Lebanon against Iran. The Iranians know this. Israel uses Lebanon and threats of aggression or promises to withdraw or ceasefire. They're using that as leverage against Tehran via the United States. So it's all part of the same equation. You can't separate these issues. And so Iran is looking at this holistically and treating it as one theater. And because it is one theater, you can't separate it. And Israel and the U.S. have proven that their aggression will not be confined to Gaza or to this part or that part.

They will attack and declare war against anyone in the region, and they already have—against Yemen, against the Palestinians, against the Lebanese, against Syria, against Iraq, and against Iran. So it's very clear for people who live in the region where the main threat of violence and aggression comes from, and where security comes from. And it's very clear: it is Israel and the United States. Those are the two number one threats to security, peace, and prosperity in West Asia. There is no question about it. Everyone who lives in the region knows that. But we have this narrative that's being imposed from the outside for a Western audience, for an Israeli audience, and for a Gulf audience. But that's not reality. Everyone in West Asia understands this. They fully understand it now. So we'll see.

## **#Nima**

Yeah, exactly.