Iran FORCES US Army to FLEE UK Base, Bessent HIDING | Patrick Henningsen & Daniel Davis

Analyst Patrick Henningsen and former Combat Veteran Daniel Davis discuss Iran taking the gloves off triggering panic in the US military's ranks as fake talks meet a difficult reality. Why is the US military fleeing Europe and Bessent hiding in a bunker? This stream answers these questions and much more. https://www.youtube.com/@UCWDN5zr5ttctoIAhZwW6tcQ https://www.youtube.com/@UCY_sGiAswJNo8HQBOKme01g Patrick's YouTube https://patrickhenningsen.substack.com/ 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/spiritofho #yemen #trump #israel

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. As you can see, I am joined by Danny Davis, host of Deep Dive with Daniel Davis, and Patrick Henningsen, host of 21st Century Wire, to go over the latest developments. Well, gentlemen, thanks so much for joining me today. I wanted to begin today's show by talking about the peculiar situation we are in with the U.S. war on Iran. Now, the United States has evacuated aircraft from an RAF base in the U.K. after what it says are threats from Iran. People may note that, in the last 48 hours, Iran lifted its 2,000-kilometer missile strike limit, and the United States has evacuated aircraft from RAF Mildenhall. About 10 KC-135s have been moved to various bases in Germany and Spain.

This comes as planes are not the only things on the move, gentlemen. Scott Bessent, according to The New York Times, is now essentially on a military base himself. He has moved out of the White House, out of Washington, and into hiding. So, Patrick, I wanted to first get your reaction to where we are in the war right now. Iran is saying that European countries should be very fearful if they get involved in a war in Iran, knowing that these assets have been moved around. But we've been told that talks are going on. Iran is also rejecting the claim that there's any meaningful communication right now with the United States. Your thoughts on what's happening?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, this has been a long time coming. I did report on this in the summer. I was at a press conference in Iran that was being held by Ibrahim Azizi, who is the head of the parliamentary national security committee for the Iranian legislature. And I asked him this question straight off. I said, "Are you going to treat the European countries the same as you do the Gulf states that host U. S. bases that are used to attack you? Are they potential targets for retaliation? Do you view them as legitimate targets?" And he said, without hesitation, "We absolutely do." It should be viewed in that way. So they kind of left the door open to retaliate at a time of their choosing, if they so choose, and they seem to be vocal about it now. I think that's probably sending a strong deterrent message, practically.

I can't see them wanting to drag Europe into what is, at the moment, a conflict with the United States and Israel. However, it is a credible deterrent in a certain way. But it's unclear whether the movement of these aircraft is a direct result of that or whether these were just scheduled rotations, because they also had a hoax, a fake terror attack at RAF Fairford, a month and a half ago. There's no evidence that the Iranians were involved. There's no evidence that anything actually happened. Nobody knows quite what happened, but the politicians are running with it like Iranian terror had come to the shores of Britain. I mean, it's like Skripal all over again. So it's hard to gauge exactly what's going on. The press just react immediately.

So they could be riffing off this announcement, and it could be a scheduled movement. But what it does, I think, is draw attention to the matter, and European countries now have to consider it. And as Trump is at a low ebb right now following the midterm meltdown, that's also sent a message to European leaders and European countries that Donald Trump and the U.S. are not omnipotent, politically speaking, at home. So that changes the international conversation considerably—the fact that you have a leader in Washington who doesn't have the support, who does not have a mandate from his own people. And that does carry a lot of weight, that sort of realization. So, again, I would defer to Daniel on the actual tactical question there regarding that base and the movement of U.S. assets.

#Danny

Yeah, Daniel, please.

#Daniel Davis

You know, from a military perspective, the fact that they just dispersed and went to Spain and Germany and various different spots around there makes it sound to me like there was some sort of threat, and the military said, "No, there's a legitimate threat here." You know, if they had just moved them to one place or if they had come back to the U.S. or something like that, then you could say, "Oh, there's probably something scheduled."

But definitely not scheduled to go from one European base to a bunch of others spread around. That's not something that would ordinarily be done, because you'd like to keep them together for logistical reasons and operational concerns. It's a lot easier if you have them all together for refueling and all the other kinds of things that go along with that. Obviously, from a national security perspective, it's better to disperse them so that you can't get a lot of damage in one shot. What that tells me is that it's likely there was some kind of specific threat posed to those aircraft right there.

And so they wanted to move because, obviously, KC-135s are nearly the center of gravity in any kind of renewed air war that we may have. If you don't have the refuelers, then your ability to launch a lot of these weapons from F-35s, F-15s, F-16s, et cetera, is dramatically reduced, and that would put us at a lot more risk. So, just from that operational perspective, I think there probably was a legitimate threat. I don't know what it was—whether it was drones or something like Operation Spider Web, which Ukraine demonstrated could be effective against large aircraft deep inside a country, as happened on the Russian side there. So they kind of opened that Pandora's box, and now it could come back and hit us.

Or if it's a missile, like Patrick was mentioning a second ago. This morning, just hours ago, actually, the ISNA news source out of Iran quoted General Rezaei as saying, "We now openly declare"—I think that was the actual phrase used—"that any country that facilitates attacks against ours will immediately be considered an enemy." And so one wonders—that's right around the same time we're moving these aircraft—if they didn't just announce they're going to extend the range on these missiles, but maybe they already have. And so now they can reach those targets. And maybe we said, "Oh, snap, we better move these guys out and get them spread out a little bit so that we don't lose them all in one shot," or something like that. That part I'm speculating on.

I don't know. But along with that statement, in a separate release this afternoon, about a couple of hours later, Rezaei was also quoted as saying, "And by the way, anybody who thinks that we're going to get rid of our nuclear dust, as Trump calls it—yeah, that ain't happening." He said, "We're not going to send that to anybody. We're not getting rid of that. That's not even on the table." So all I see, over and over, is that the Iranian side is hardening its position and increasing its threats. And they're continuing to hit more ships in the Persian Gulf area that are not abiding by their rules. And it just feels to me that this thing is getting ramped up to maybe get started again. And if we don't start it, Iran might.

#Danny

Well, before I get back to Patrick, I was just going to ask you, Daniel, if you believe Iranian missiles have the capability to hit the areas where the United States is scrambling these KC-135s.

#Daniel Davis

Well, if they have the ability to hit RAF Mildenhall or Fairford or any of these other places, then they definitely have the ability to hit any of the other ones because they're, I think, even closer to Iran. I don't have any idea, though. I'll just be honest with you. I don't know how hard it is to reprogram them to go beyond 2,000 kilometers. I know that early in this war, allegedly, Iranian missiles hit Diego Garcia. So that implies they have a range of more than 2,000 kilometers already. I don't know. It's safe to assume that they do. Hope that you're wrong, but assume that they do and take precautions appropriately. But I don't have any idea.

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, I just might interject. Daniel, you might be able to answer this question. You remember, months ago, we saw a lot of KC-135s lined up on the tarmac at Ben Gurion Airport. It seems to me that after the Iranian strikes on the bases in Jordan and the other Gulf states, there's not a lot of safe haven for large contingents of aircraft like that. And so, is Israel one of the last places where they can stage tankers?

#Daniel Davis

Yeah, you know, two weeks ago, I believe Suleiman posted on his X account a photograph that somebody had taken from the tarmac at Ben Gurion. And you could just see, as far as the eye could see, all these KC-135s, wingtip to wingtip. And that was when it looked like there was a lot of concern that the United States was going to restart this right after the midterms, or maybe sometime before. It was in that really hot, uncertain period. And I wrote at the time—I replied to his post or retweeted it.

And I said, it's incomprehensible that, if we are actually close to doing something like this, you have these things just sitting on the tarmac. You are literally either taunting them or incompetent to a high degree. You're leaving our most strategic asset, which allows us to project power, just sitting within easy range of what the Iranians have. And I'm told that our air defense is a lot more robust there, and that's why they have them there. But even in the best case, it's adequate, not great. Even there, this stuff is going to get through. And if they wanted to saturate it, they could literally wipe them all out on the tarmac if they chose to attack first, which obviously hasn't happened yet. But I just think that you're rolling the dice and hoping that they don't.

#Danny

Yeah, very, very interesting, Daniel. Thanks for that. Well, Patrick, and then, of course, to you, Daniel, after that: your thoughts about the movements of Scott Bessent now? Because it was just sort of announced today that he is now in hiding. Of course, Marco Rubio and Pete Hegseth have also been hiding in various places at times during this war. But what's the significance of this, especially since Scott Bessent has definitely taken a leading role as a spokesperson for this war?

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, that's the point there. The last thing you mentioned there, Daniel, is: since when did the U.S. Treasury Secretary become nested in the Pentagon? That's the kind of role that Scott Bessent has bestowed upon himself, or that Trump has bestowed upon Bessent. Who knows? But he's doing military strategy. He's representing the State Department. He's effectively doing Rubio's job. He's making all these sweeping statements about all the outcomes that are going to happen as a result of military sanctions and what he's doing, which is basically economic warfare. But this is unprecedented for a U.S. Treasury Secretary to be this much out front. So, I mean, what are they expecting? Ninja assassination teams from Iran to be deployed at night in Washington, D.C.? It's very unlikely.

A couple of these so-called assassination plots against Trump were clearly hoaxes. And some of it was just, I think, fabricated Israeli tip-offs. And The Grayzone did a fabulous job breaking down some of these alleged death threats that they were using to kind of nudge the president, basically. And I think they're doing the same here. So maybe Iran's trolling them somewhat, but it's well within their rights to make such statements anyway. Whether they can carry through with them is another matter and, to me, seems unlikely, especially on U.S. shores. But the U.S. just seems to forget that they very openly and proudly assassinated Iran's supreme leader of 37 years and his family, including a 14-month-old granddaughter.

And then they're boasting about it for months afterwards, saying what a great achievement this was. And they don't think that there's going to be at least a rhetorical response from the Iranians. I mean, it just shows you the bubble and this kind of false reality that a lot of people in Washington, especially this administration, live in. I mean, they're just delusional to think that. And we take offense at that, like, "How dare they threaten America? You can't get away with threatening our country like this." And okay, fine. They haven't actually done anything, but the U.S. has actually done something that will guarantee that Iran will be hostile to America for at least a generation.

That's what the U.S. needs to take responsibility for: what they've done and who gave them the intelligence and told them that the regime would collapse overnight if they took out the head of the snake. It didn't happen. And Trump still talks to the press like, "Oh, I've taken out two regimes," he said the other day. Like, one regime and then another regime. What's he talking about? What are they talking about in this administration? So that's what I say. Firstly, Scott Bessent shouldn't even be in the firing line as Treasury secretary. That's just unbelievably stupid and ridiculous. It just shows the level of ridiculousness that this administration is operating on. That's my opinion on it.

#Daniel Davis

And I want to pick up on something that Patrick said there because it reminded me of something I saw and replied to on X yesterday. And that is the well-known peace activist Ari Fleischer, who was responding to the claim, or the news, that Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent has reportedly relocated

to a military base. His response was, “This is BS. No foreign country should be allowed to get away with doing this to our government. I hope the president stands up to Iran. He knows what needs to be done, I hope.” And I'm thinking, “You've got to be kidding me.”

Because basically, now what you're saying is, look, we can assassinate anybody we want. If we want to assassinate Qasem Soleimani, if we want to assassinate the supreme leader, if we want to assassinate Ali Larijani, one of their diplomats, if we want to assassinate their scientists, if we want to hit their apartment buildings in downtown Tehran and kill their whole family along with them, that's no problem. That's because we want to. But how dare somebody even think about doing it to us? And if they do, then we'd better be taking some action.

That is, to me, one of the most grotesque immoralities—and there are many to choose from—of the rotting core of those who pass for elites in the Western world, especially in the United States. We are so bereft of any morality or ethics that we are bragging about assassinating people from other countries and talking about it like you're, I don't know, taking a glass of water and just throwing it on the ground, like it's nothing, no big deal. But how dare somebody do to us what we're doing to them? And see, this is one of the things that I'm just anguishing about. You go down this path, you open up this Pandora's box, and then you're going to make a lot of people want to do the same to you. Whether they can or not, to Patrick's point, I don't know. They sure do want to. And everybody that I've talked to—and Patrick, I think you were even one of them—who's been on the ground in Tehran since this war started…

With all these flags being waved at these pro-government protests every day, there are more red flags calling for revenge than there are national flags. And they want some revenge for the assassination of their leaders, for the killing of the family members that Patrick referred to. And so, for us to just think it'll never happen because, I don't know, we're Americans, there's a flag on our shoulder, or something like that, is just delusional. And you're just begging for somebody to finally do to us what we do to somebody else. And this whole idea that there could never be consequences to our actions, that we can do what we want at will—it's just not going to play. And at some point, I fear it's going to come back on our heads, and it's not going to be pretty.

#Danny

Yeah, great points, Danny. And I know we have limited time with you, so I wanted to make sure I get to this part before you need to depart. Speaking of consequences, the Trump administration is in pretty dire straits after the midterm elections. There's a lot of talk about heads rolling. Well, Pete Hegseth just came up for an impeachment vote. And of course, 12 Democrats, I believe, decided to sit it out, so it did not go through the House. But still, there's a lot of talk about Pete Hegseth's time being very limited. And here's what he had to say in reaction. And as you said, Danny, you know, the U.S. never thinks it will experience consequences for its war criminality. Well, Pete Hegseth, I would say, is the poster child for what that looks like. Here is Pete Hegseth in response to criticisms of his tenure so far at the Department of Defense, or the War Department, as he renamed it.

#Pete Hegseth

As for the articles themselves—Iran, the cartels, Maduro, Yemen—every one was a lawful operation ordered by the commander in chief, then ordered by me, reported to Congress, and executed by American warriors who did their jobs.

#Danny

So they said he has thrown Trump under the bus. But maybe, Patrick, your reaction, and then Danny, yours.

#Patrick Henningsen

You know, at the Nuremberg trials, the final conclusion was that "I was just following orders" is not a legal defense. That's been established in legal precedent, at least in international law. And in terms of the U.S., the argument Thomas Massie is making is that it's a violation of the Constitution. So the fact that he's following presidential orders—that's the whole point of Hegseth being impeached: he was subverting the Constitution. He's following unlawful orders, unconstitutional orders. It's not a defense to say, "I was just following orders," but it kind of shows you the shallowness of someone like Pete Hegseth, and also his inexperience. And, of course, he's going to be defending himself, and he's got the vice president and everybody saying that he's done nothing wrong and that he is the model of piety and absolute cleanliness in his job. I mean, it is surreal to watch this thing unfold.

#Daniel Davis

It is, Danny. It is egregious and painful for me to watch this whole thing unfolding, because it's important that everybody understands. And by the way, I did a whole show on this because I was just so outraged by what he said in this whole, whatever it was, 25-minute-long mea culpa: "I'm great, and I'm guilty of nothing, and I'm going to kick everybody's ass," all this kind of stuff. It's just grotesque. But we've got to understand that these impeachments are purely political. They're not legal in the sense that you have to prove legality or whatever. It doesn't matter. It can be as clearly against the law as anything. But if the politics aren't in favor of the guy going down, he won't go down.

Or if they are, like in the case of Nixon, you'll go down no matter what the situation was. That's where we're at right now. So he passed the first vote on a party-line vote in this current Congress. So, of course, he got away with it this time. Things are going to change on January 3rd, as we certainly know by now. But in terms of reality, not in terms of what the politics are going to do, I think we have a pretty good idea where it's going to go next time. It is black and white that he

started off his whole tenure with this whole Signalgate thing when he attacked Yemen. That was on an unauthorized communications network that was not cleared for classified information. Black and white, that's against Army regulations, the DOD regulations.

Everybody knows that. They lied about it. They denied it existed because it was convenient. You certainly can't conduct offensive operations, which he was doing, on that network. You also can't conduct the operation itself without congressional authorization because you're going after another country. It was Yemen, and he didn't get any authorization for that. Then, of course, we get into the bigger issue, the moral degradation issue of this so-called anti-drug operation, which he bragged about, by the way. He even provided what I think is going to be some of the ammunition for his trial: how many people he's killed, how many boats he's hit, etc.

His argument, basically, is that because I just declare and say the words "narco-terrorist," somehow that means the rule of law goes out the window and I can literally do what I want: extrajudicial killings. I can just condemn them all to death, and then I can just kill them, which you can't do. Because even if they were terrorists, you still don't have the legal jurisdiction in international waters to just kill everybody. Then, of course, there's the biggest one of all, the double-tap situation, which violates the law of the sea, the Geneva Conventions, American law—everything. If you hit an enemy vessel, they're wounded.

You have to render aid, period. No question about it. And instead, according to reports, he authorized the double tap, which then went back and killed these guys. He authorized it. Then we get into the 2025 war. Again, it's black and white: without congressional authorization, without a declaration of war, without us being attacked. Being attacked is the only circumstance under which the 1973 War Powers Act or Article I of the Constitution allows the commander in chief to use forces without meeting any of those other conditions. It's black and white: they were violated. So I think one of the reasons why Hegseth is going out there and making this mea culpa is because the president is really worried that if he goes down for this stuff, it's also going to have reverberations for the guy who gave him the order.

I don't think that's lost on anybody in the White House. But that is a fact. That is the reality of it. It is illegal. It is immoral. It is unethical. And he should be held accountable for it, point blank. And let me tell you, one of the reasons why, aside from just the right and wrong of it, is that we want those laws to be followed because we're going to get into another war sometime. It's inevitable. And we don't want a situation where somebody gets the military upper hand on us, hits one of our ships, and then, instead of saving our sailors like the law requires, like the law of war requires, they sit there and just machine-gun our guys to death.

And we've seen how outraged we were when the Nazis did that to our soldiers a few times in World War II. And now you want to be doing it to somebody else, and you think, again, there's going to be no consequences. Our troops could one day pay the price for this. And the last thing I'll say here—I know you're running a little short on time—I found it utterly reprehensible, aside from all of those

things, that he's basically hiding behind the patriotism of our troops. He's hiding behind it like a shield, like, "Oh, all these people, these disgruntled congressmen, they're coming after all of you guys who did this, these great American patriots. I've got you covered. They've got to come through me." That's B.S. Nobody's coming after them.

People are going after you because you're the one who violated the law, and you're the one who gave the orders. So don't hide behind them and pretend like these little troops down here are the victims and you're going to be the big hero standing in front of them, because I don't think that's playing with anybody inside the Department of Defense. I don't think anybody's buying that at all. But Hegseth, as I think Patrick said, is basically a play actor, and he was playing a role on TV. Maybe he wants to go on Netflix when this is over. I don't know. Perhaps that's what he was doing. This was an audition. He did pretty badly, if it was. So I don't think he's got much of a future there, but those are my thoughts.

#Patrick Henningsen

He's trying to preemptively pardon the troops, the officers, or whoever took part in this operation, saying, "Our warfighters did their job, and, you know, that's all that matters." But they also committed war crimes because you ordered them to commit war crimes. So his defense is really pathetic, actually. And by the way, we left this out: would this also apply, Daniel, to the unarmed Iranian naval training vessel that was taking part in a joint training operation off the coast of India, which the United States sank in international waters without even rendering aid afterward? Does it apply to this? Does it apply to that?

#Daniel Davis

A hundred percent, yeah. I had pigeonholed that one. I'd forgotten about that. That was so early in this war. Yeah, that was also utterly reprehensible and illegal.

#Danny

Yeah, sometimes it's hard to keep up with the number of war crimes.

#Patrick Henningsen

And I might add one thing here, guys, that's really important: the indictment they served on Maduro that justified all of these operations was withdrawn because it was fabricated. There is no Cartel de los Soles. Maduro is not the head of a cartel. The U.S. DOJ put forward a fraudulent indictment, which they used to backstop the entire kidnapping and military operation. Then they withdrew it, and Maduro is still in federal custody. There was no Cartel de los Soles. That was a fabricated organization. It was actually a cutout for the CIA in the early 1990s—a separate story—but it had nothing to do with Nicolás Maduro.

#Daniel Davis

Well, then I'm sure he'll be released any time now, right?

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, right, on a technicality, I would think—if it were fair, if justice were blind.

#Danny

He should definitely be free. Well, Dan, I know you've only got a couple of minutes, so maybe your final words. I was going to ask you, as a combat veteran and expert on military affairs, for your final thoughts on the Hegseth situation, but take it wherever you want to go. Yeah, you know, it's just—

#Daniel Davis

On the bigger picture here, he keeps talking over and over, as so many of these war lusters do, about how this is all about the American soldier. We're doing this to protect them, and we're trying to take care of them. And they're our heroes, and they're on the front lines. They're only on the front lines because you made a front line that never needed to exist. You're talking about sending us back into war. I did another piece yesterday on a so-called military roundtable on Fox. It just made me sick. I was already finished for the day, but I saw it and had to go back on for one more because I couldn't stand it. All these people, mostly veterans, were sitting there talking about how we had to go back into Iran.

No concept of what happens next. You take out Pickaxe Mountain, whatever "take out" means. I don't even know what you're thinking of unless you're talking about nuclear weapons, and there are all kinds of problems with that. But whatever means you have in mind, you're going to go and take that out, and then you'll come back later if you need to. What do you think is going to happen when we drop this out there? The war that Pete Hegseth and Donald Trump started, which should never have been started and was illegal and unauthorized, has already resulted in 23 Americans dead.

And oh, by the way, it's not 18, like Hegseth said pathetically yesterday, just discounting the deaths of those who died after you administratively changed the title of this stupid war. You didn't even count them. You just said there were only 18. Well, there are 23 who are dead because of the war and nearly 900 who are wounded because of the war. About 20-something bases have been damaged or destroyed because of the war you started. And 40-some-odd aircraft are damaged or destroyed, plus the billions of dollars we've spent, plus the hundreds of long-range cruise missiles, the interceptor missiles, THAADs, PAC-3s, you name it.

All of this has made us weaker and cost us profoundly because you claimed that we had to start this war. And everybody knows—and Patrick has said it on my show a dozen times—everybody knows

because of Marco Rubio. Thank you, Secretary of State Rubio, for telling the truth in a moment of weakness: that it was because of Israel. It was because of Benjamin Netanyahu. They were going to attack, and we had to. They tried to walk that back. Too late. It's already on tape. You admitted it. So all of those casualties I mentioned, all of that shredding of America's Constitution, happened because of one man, Donald Trump, and his fealty to another man, Benjamin Netanyahu, dragging all of us into it.

And obviously, you had the issue with the Strait of Hormuz, with fertilizers, with diesel, and everything else that affects the entire global economy. And you guys want to go back for another run to prove again that you don't have the capacity to defeat Iran? And they do have the capacity, probably more so now, to cause profoundly more damage than what I just reeled off there. That is the most egregious thing that I can imagine—that there are still all these war lusters. And I saw Nikki Haley this morning—I'll be talking about that later today too—saying the same kinds of things. And at some point, man, the American people have to say, "You guys are all fired. I'm sick and tired of every one of you because you're all leading us to disaster."

#Patrick Henningsen

And just one more thing, Danny, and I would like your comment on this because of your military experience. One of the things Hegseth keeps pounding over and over again is that our warriors, our warfighters, were doing their job defending our country, defending the United States. How is any of that—any of these operations, the blockade of Cuba, starving Cuba, plus all of these other things you mentioned—defending the United States? It seems like these are offensive operations, not defensive operations, unless you consider Israel to be part of the United States, which is a ridiculous concept. But he really keeps drumming that home: that the warriors are defending their country, and therefore they're justified.

#Daniel Davis

Go ahead. This past Sunday, NFL Sunday, it was Veterans Weekend, so they were highlighting veterans at all the different games or whatever. And I know they mean well, but it's for the same reason: it always just makes me wince, and I just hate it because they're objectifying all of the soldiers. And that phrase kept getting used over and over: these people—and they would highlight this staff sergeant or that lieutenant or something—have been defending our country, and they have sacrificed on our behalf. And I keep screaming at the TV—so far, no one's heard me—"No, they weren't defending anything. No one attacked us. Iran didn't attack us. Venezuela didn't attack us. Cuba hasn't attacked us. Greenland didn't attack us." You know what I'm saying? We keep going on these offensive operations and then just making stuff up out of thin air and using the word "defense."

"We're defending our country." And so all these guys are dead and wounded, all this equipment is destroyed, and our credibility around the world has already suffered a severe setback because of the

mentality that we're going to take it to someone else, in violation of our own laws and our own morality—at least what used to be our morality. And now we're using the bodies of our patriots—and they are patriots, because the vast majority are country-loving people who want to actually defend our country. Instead, they're just being thrown away as carcasses in pursuit of the goals of people like Lindsey Graham when he was alive, or Nikki Haley, or Jack Keane, or all these people: Pete Hegseth, President Trump. All these folks who are just war lusters are doing it on the backs and the bodies of our troops, and I find it reprehensible.

#Danny

Daniel Davis, Daniel Davis' Deep Dive. Thanks so much for joining us today. We'll have to get you on again soon.

#Daniel Davis

Yeah, back at you, man. You got me fired up there. I appreciate that.

#Danny

Thanks, man. I'll see you guys later. Yes, yes, yes. All right, Patrick. Well, you know, speaking of some of the things that Daniel was talking about, I saw a report that Iran now has more missiles than Russia and China combined. And from what I'm seeing, Patrick, Iran is not behaving right now as if there's some kind of peace push by the United States. What have you made of this kind of facade? The only one who's been, I think, a little honest about it is Marco Rubio, maybe the biggest snake in the administration. He's been throwing cold water on all this talk about negotiations. Your thoughts on Iran's current posture here?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, just briefly on Rubio, he's stepped back from all of the major hot issues and flashpoints. He's clearly preparing for his exit from the administration. He doesn't want to get his hands dirty, doesn't want to get his shoes dirty on pretty much anything because even he, as you rightly point out, is an absolute snake and a political creature, an indigenous swamp creature of Washington, D.C., and the Everglades in Florida. He knows that it's a tar pit, that everything Donald Trump has created, every single turmoil in the world, is a tar pit—legally, militarily, economically, politically, geopolitically. It's a failure on every front. I think even Rubio can acknowledge that. And he's not rushing to defend this administration. I think J.D. Vance was pushed to defend Pete Hegseth.

And probably because Rubio didn't want to participate in the sort of ring-fencing of Pistol Pete, you know. So they drafted in Vance. It always amuses me: J.D. Vance has to do these long, bloviating tweets, you know, 2,000-word tweets. I mean, a real leader—which he's not—could make a point in one or two sentences, three max. I mean, that's what leadership looks like. Vance doesn't have the

gravitas, doesn't have the depth. And so he's constantly trying to explain these things. And he's basically saying, "This is absurd. These accusations against Pete Hegseth are absurd." They're not absurd, right? So it's very interesting because Vance, if he does run for president, which he may very well do, has taken an anti-constitutional position.

So this is somebody who markets himself as a libertarian. I don't see how that is applicable to Vance, but anyway, he's kind of centrist, moderate, or whatever—not neoconservative. But he's taken an anti-constitutional position on the biggest issue that faces the nation. The biggest issue, the most serious issue to face any country or any government or any leader, is the decision of whether to take your country to war. That is arguably the most important and profound and consequential decision that any actual leader has to take. So, from an American point of view, if you believe that the United States is a constitutional republic—and not all politicians do. Most of the Democratic Party don't recognize that. They describe the U.S. as a democracy.

And very few will invoke its true form, which is a constitutional republic. But on the Republican side, you have the same thing with RINOs. They're the same as the Democrats. They're terrified of the Constitution because the Constitution demands accountability from its elected leaders. But even the second president of the United States, John Adams, said many years ago that the Constitution is effectively worthless if the government doesn't have a moral framework or some kind of moral foundation. The Constitution could be perfect, could be perfectly formed, perfectly written, but it's not going to function. And this is the problem with this government and everybody serving in it, who have basically spent the last two years backslapping the worst president in the history of the United States of America.

Donald Trump is going to get that mantle. People don't realize it. Pete Hegseth is making this speech, which, to me, is his farewell speech. That was Pete Hegseth's last stand. That was his Alamo. That was his Davy Crockett moment. So he's making that speech as if the midterms didn't happen last week. The midterms were a referendum on this undeclared, illegal war of aggression that took a wrecking ball to the global economy, energy markets, and the U.S. economy. It took a political wrecking ball to the Republican Party and was just basically a shellacking of the Trump administration on every single level, especially over the war and the other wars as well that they've taken part in.

So he's talking as if this didn't happen last week. They don't have a mandate for anything. But he's putting up this brave front, which shows that he has no capacity for introspection. And he's terrified of the fact that, after being pumped up on steroids for the last two years, he's going to come crashing down to Earth very soon. And he should be afraid because Pete Hegseth is the ultimate artificial actor. He was plucked out of nowhere. He was a failed weekend host at Fox News, and he was placed in this position—the most unqualified high-level U.S. Cabinet pick, according to many experts, in the history of the United States of America. At 40, whatever he is, 45 years old, his military record is threadbare. He didn't do anything in the military.

His highest rank was major. He was a reservist. He was a guard at Guantanamo Bay who did some other tours and managed to parlay that into a couple of medals or something. He has no qualifications. So he was selected by the Israeli lobby. Anyone who's paid attention to the whole process of him coming through, being shortlisted and then confirmed by Trump's transition team—which was Jared Kushner and Howard Lutnick, who are basically looking out for Israel's interests—knows that. But they shortlisted Hegseth because he's a religious fanatic, a Christian Zionist. And so he caught the eye of Netanyahu many years ago, in 2018 or 2019, when he went to Jerusalem and was talking about rebuilding the Third Temple on the Temple Mount, on top of Al-Aqsa Mosque, and then the red heifer cult, basically.

That's Pete Hegseth. So he was talent-spotted by the Israeli lobby, and they wanted him in that position. They wanted him. With no experience, a checkered personal life, allegations of alcoholism, allegations of abuse against women, all these sorts of things—just a train wreck of an individual. Short temper, doesn't take criticism, snaps at the press, banning them from the Pentagon, demanding that the AP and others run their reports by his desk for approval before they publish. Like, this is insane. This guy is bonkers. And then he renames the Defense Department the Department of War, which is basically saying, "We're going to go out and look for wars. We're going to start wars." And he now renames soldiers "warfighters." This is intentional propaganda.

This is Goebbels-level. This is Nazi-level propaganda. "Department of War." That's just a regressive move. It used to be called the Department of War, but we graduated from that. We evolved from our Neanderthal ways—or so we thought, anyway—and he is the ultimate revanchist. So it's unbelievable. But he's not recognizing the fact that he has been rejected by an overwhelming majority of the American people—him, the Trump administration, everything they've done for the last two years. So that's the whole point. And if J.D. Vance is defending him, that's going to go on his record, because the most principled constitutionalist in the U.S. government right now is the one that the Israeli lobby and Donald Trump primaried. His name is Thomas Massie.

And his constitutional credentials are impeccable. And he's being attacked here, effectively, by J.D. Vance and Pete Hegseth and Trump and everybody else. So, you know, listen, if they ran a presidential election next year, as it stands today, I would bet Thomas Massie would get more votes head-to-head than J.D. Vance. Thomas Massie would connect with the American people. Why? Because the American people understand what American principles are better than J.D. Vance and all of these empty suits in Washington, all these Peter Thiel bots. They know that the Constitution is the mortar that holds the building together. As soon as you undermine that, the building will fall apart. It will disintegrate eventually. And that's what our founding fathers warned us about.

And the Trump administration just scoffs. I mean, Trump openly mocks the Constitution. And he's done that. We've all seen him do that on multiple occasions, as if it's some kind of a joke or a piece of paper behind a glass case in the Smithsonian or something like that, or in Philadelphia or whatever. I mean, I've never seen a president who claims to be patriotic, who is constantly wrapping himself in American flags, and yet has such utter contempt for the U.S. Constitution. It's

unbelievable. And that goes for everybody in his administration. That's everybody in his administration. They might privately say, “Oh, I don't believe in those things the president said.” But they sure don't come out and oppose the president on these important points.

It's a bad look to the American people. And that's the point. And Pete Hegseth is like the ultimate poster child, as Danny Davis said, for illegality and rampant criminality in the military sense. I mean, if you want to look into these scandals at the Pentagon, if they do any proper audit or investigation of everything that's been going on in the last two years, I mean, it would just be something. But I think a lot of it will get covered up because it probably has a bipartisan quality to it. And so both parties don't want to go that far, and that's going to hit the defense industry, the military-industrial complex lobby, and so forth. So that's kind of what you're dealing with there, and we'll see. There were, what, 11 Democratic no-shows? I think it was 11 or 12, one of those.

They had the votes to impeach him, so they kicked the can down the road. So we'll see. It could be a different result in January, as Daniel said, when this comes back—or if this comes back. I don't know. There's a lot of pressure behind the scenes, though. The Israel lobby is working overtime to protect Hegseth and avoid another impeachment round against him. And they might get their wish. There are deals going on. There's horse trading going on. It's so disgusting and dirty. But, you know, like I always said, Trump would offer the Democrats a health care omnibus reform bill in order to save his ass in 2027. He'll do it. And so when it comes down to it—swamp creatures, reptilian brains—it's all about survival. And so that's politics.

#Danny

Yeah, well, you know, we'll have to see. As you said, there are a lot of deals going on. If you know that Netanyahu is calling Trump or talking to Trump or sending texts or whatever it is to Trump every single day, begging for the war to restart in a much bigger way, then you know that the Zionist lobby is working every single day around this new congressional regime that's about to come in to ensure that their interests are maintained. Alex Karp of Palantir just came out and said, oh, well, he's fine with a Democratic Party Congress because he knows how to be, quote-unquote, progressive, and that he is going to...

#Danny

be working hard to cut deals with them. And you know what that means. I wanted to play this for you, Patrick. You know, Thomas Massie did respond to the articles of impeachment, which did not pass the House because of what you just mentioned: the lack of votes because of so many absentees, so many congressmen who did not come in. But here's what he had to say about whether he defends his articles of impeachment, given that I think CNN was insinuating that there are those who think he's done a good job—Pete Hegseth, that is. Here we go.

#Speaker 1

…of impeachment, but that's what's before us. And he has been effective. He was effective at killing 200 schoolchildren. He was effective at bombing fishing boats that may or may not have had people who were guilty of smuggling drugs. He's been effective at waging an unconstitutional kidnapping in Venezuela. The president himself brags that they have captured this oil and that our corporations are getting rich from the oil that they've captured, that Pete Hegseth helped to capture. I mean, in some respects, he has been effective, and that's what we're impeaching him for: his effectiveness in breaking the law and violating the Constitution.

#Danny

I thought that was very well said. The news, too, Patrick, is that I think U.S. corporations have made something like $12 billion from Venezuela up until this point. But your reaction to this?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, Thomas Massie has the ability to communicate ideas very clearly and lay out the hypocrisies, and he has the ability to be a moral compass, to be a constitutional compass. But this is why he was primaried. This is why the Israeli lobby and other nefarious neocon financial PACs ponied up tens of millions of dollars. How much money did they spend to primary Thomas Massie and get this unpopular guy, Ed Gallrein, who's got as much personality as a Dodge Dart? How much money did they spend to shoehorn him into office? I mean, that shows you everything you need to know. And Massie has a very broad-based appeal, and there are just so few of these people left in the legislature.

And he is one of the last ones. Hopefully, he'll be replaced by some others. But they're very efficient about rooting these types of people out. They've used all sorts of tricks to get Matt Gaetz out. That was a real scam, how they got him out of office. And they promised him the attorney general position and then yanked it. And he had already vacated his seat at that point. So, I mean, it's a joke. Who are the other ones? I mean, Devin Nunes—Trump yanked him out of Congress and stuck him in as CEO of Truth Social. That's like a dead end for your career. He got a payoff. But again, he was one of the more principled Republican congressmen.

You do have, you know, Trey Gowdy. Where is he? They managed to run him out of Congress. That's just the swamp. That's what the swamp does. And Trump is the sort of primordial swamp creature, which is incredible because his whole campaign in 2016 was, "I'm going to drain the swamp." He didn't run on that, by the way, if you noticed, in 2024. That wasn't part of the campaign. I think he kind of ran on that a bit in 2020 against Biden, but that one was pretty much dead by the time 2024 rolled around. But yeah, I mean, Massie's laid it out quite well there. But do Americans really care? Are the media that interested in legality and constitutional, you know, thresholds? And it seems like they're not.

It's like he's speaking in hieroglyphs to them. They're not interested. You can tell they're not really enthralled by it. It's not like being on the Liberty Report with Ron Paul and Daniel McAdams, who actually understand and believe in these issues. Our media is just horrible, just generally. But, you know, fair play. They platformed him. He's not finished yet in his political career. He has a lot to offer the country. And I think he's an important figure in the future of the United States of America and the world. Thomas Massie—I'll go that far—and the world. Really, really important. The United States needs principled leadership, constitutional leadership. Otherwise, the country doesn't have a leg to stand on.

#Danny

Yeah, and I think any force in Washington that can support and reflect any actual sentiment that really exists among ordinary people is important to highlight. We need to make sure they don't get completely suppressed and repressed into the night, which is what tends to happen because of everything that you just outlined there.

#Patrick Henningsen

One last point I want to make—I mentioned this when Daniel Davis was on a few minutes ago—is that what the Pentagon has done to the press is unprecedented. I'm a big critic of mainstream media war propaganda. There's no bigger critic than myself. I've been deconstructing mainstream media propaganda for many years, even lecturing on it at the college level, so it's something that I know very well. But I've never seen anybody in the US have the stones to go and ban a whole slate of mainstream news agencies—all these longstanding news agencies—from Pentagon briefings, and then demand that they run their reporting across his desk for approval.

That's fascism. That's what that is. So Pete Hegseth is a fascist in the pure sense of the word. What's crazy is that this needs to be in the articles of impeachment. That is an absolutely blatant violation of the U.S. Constitution—to go and pull press credentials because they're being critical of your military operations. The press has been critical of your unconstitutional and illegal military operations, so you ban the press. That's a perfect definition of fascism. Perfect definition. That should be in the articles of impeachment. So when the Democrats go back—Democrats, if you're listening, you need to add that.

There should rightfully be probably 15 articles of impeachment against him, 15 or more. And that's one of them. So we mentioned the boat as well, the Iranian naval boat that was unarmed and carried no munitions. They sank it and then didn't go to render aid. That should also be another article of impeachment. So we've already identified two additional articles just within these 45 minutes here. So Democrats, if you're listening, you've got some work to do. You need to prepare the next round, which you'll be presenting in the new year after you're sworn in on January 3rd. But anyway, I just wanted to add that important point, Daniel.

#Danny

Yeah, those are important points, Patrick. Now, I just want to pull this up in our last five or so minutes here. This is the list of the Democrats who were absent. There were 11, and there are their names. And just look at the AIPAC totals that they've received. Yeah. Wow. Look at Haley Stevens. Holy crap. I mean, Haley Stevens—people might remember her from the fiasco of her endorsing the Republican candidate during the Michigan congressional race with Abdul El-Sayed. Your thoughts on this? I mean, what this shows, too—and I've seen it also—I've been commenting a little bit on the comments AOC has made about the Speaker of the House situation.

Even in the Democratic Party, you know, there is the same kind of swamp, the same kind of PAC issues, lobbying issues, the same kind of money and Zionist influence on these politicians, basically owning them to the point that even the so-called progressives tend to very much fall in line. I mean, I was on record in 2018, before RT was scrubbed by the censors here in the United States, saying that AOC calling Nancy Pelosi "Mama Bear" in 2018 was a huge indication of where these Democrats would ultimately fall on these questions. But your final thoughts, Patrick, as we head into the last couple of minutes here?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, the one at the top of the list right there, Haley Stevens: $15.9 million for a congressional seat, and she lost money. Hugely unpopular, very unpleasant individual—unpleasant in her manner, unpleasant in her appearance, and also in how she talks. And then she goes and endorses Mike Rogers, a neocon. And so, like, what are her Democratic Party credentials? For her, it's just a grift. At some point, the United States Congress needs to pass a law prohibiting contributions from foreign governments. If there's one lobby you can just eliminate, it should be foreign governments.

Now, corporations are one thing, but governments are another. And this should give them time to divest, give them time to cut ties, and then pass regulations. And any elected federal official who takes money from a foreign government—that's tantamount to treason. It should be. Look at this list. So they've all sat out, and this directly benefits Israel. That's the way I'm reading this. So is that not treasonous behavior on the part of all of these elected officials? Technically, it kind of is.

It's just not viewed that way in the eyes of the law at the moment, but maybe it should be in the future. Do you think that would be a good start? I mean, everyone talks about getting rid of lobbyist money in Washington. The easiest place to start would be with foreign governments. I would think so. And Israel is extremely unpopular at the moment, so I don't think that's going to be a hard push, because this is a perfect example. These are people acting against the interests of the American people. These are Democrats acting against their own mandate, Danny. Are we seeing this the same way? Yeah.

#Danny

I mean, it's always a mask-off moment. We're going to see a lot of this when the Democrats come in too, Patrick, because there is a huge mandate. You used the word “mandate.” There is. I mean, for how many years now has that mandate been building? I think the war in Iran just absolutely supercharged that. Israel couldn't be any less popular than it is now. Well, it could be, but it hasn't been. And that's only going to get worse and worse and worse. It's not going to get better, especially as the chaos inside the Israeli regime and Netanyahu's attempts to stay relevant continue. I don't think that's really going to stop. So, yeah, I definitely think so.

And, you know, some people do make this point, Patrick. They say, well, you know, the Israeli lobby is just a percentage of the overall corporate influence, corporate lobbying that happens. And I think that's true. But that percentage, even if it's small, is not only indicative of the broader problem, but it is also highly connected to all the other kinds of lobbying that happen there. And the fact that it's so difficult to effect any change at all on the Israel question, on military support, on all the wars that Israel conducts—and that the United States ultimately agrees with Israel on all of that—I think is maybe the clearest example that so many more people now see.

I think it gives us an opportunity to open up the conversation and even take action around this really big problem, maybe one of the central problems in the United States, which is that monopolies, corporations, and banks control the government. They dictate policy, and they use money in large part to do that. Israel, you could say, is just a government operating as another corporation inside the United States and getting what it wants every single day of the year with its largesse. Yeah, I think it's not only a good place to start, but you could do a lot of good. If Pete Hegseth were impeached, it would delay things for the United States. Of course, people say he's just a guy, but it's not like this regime is stable already.

#Patrick Henningsen

The main point, Danny, is that impeaching Hegseth and whoever else deserves or needs to be impeached is about accountability. It sends a message to future presidents and future cabinet members that you can't just go and rapaciously ride roughshod over U.S. law, over international law, treaties, and conventions that the United States has ratified. They're codified in U.S. law. They're passed and ratified by Congress, the representatives of the people of the United States of America. That's U.S. law. So a lot of U.S. law is perfectly aligned with international law, treaties, and conventions for that very reason. But these people, especially Republicans, talk about it like it's some elective, opt-in, opt-out sort of woke international law: "We don't have to abide by it."

No, you've already codified it. I mean, Daniel Davis earlier was just kind of running through the framework of that. And it's, you know, very instructive. He's absolutely 100% correct. And Pete Hegseth doesn't understand or know any of this stuff, clearly, because it's not important to him. He thinks the only thing that's important is maximum lethality. He's talking about the rules of engagement and how they're cumbersome, they're a waste of time, and they need to be dismantled

because they're tying the hands of our warfighters. It's ridiculous. Yeah, the problem is accountability, and the impeachment needs to happen for that reason. This arguably is one of the easiest slam dunks in history.

It's easier now to hold this administration, this president, and his stooges in the cabinet accountable than at any other time in my lifetime. Much easier. Way easier than Watergate or anything like that. I mean, that was cryptic compared to this. So that's what it should be about. And the problem with the left is—I'll make a criticism here, and I'm sure many people on the left will agree with me—they spend more time attacking people on the left than they do attacking Republicans. And you have the most overtly bombastic, quasi-fascist regime ever in the United States right now. And if they can't take them down with all of these impeachment filings, then I find that to be just pathetic, really, at that point.

Then you really know that the system is rigged and it's completely dysfunctional. And as for Hakeem Jeffries and Chuck Schumer—Chuck Schumer is a dinosaur who should have been put out to pasture. I mean, he should have been forced into retirement already and gone back to selling ties in Queens or whatever he was doing before he became a gatekeeper for the Israeli lobby and all of the special interest groups in Washington. These two people are on the payroll of AIPAC, and they're taking Israeli money left, right, and center. They're publicly pledging their allegiance to Israel at those organizations' events, and that's on record. That's unacceptable. The American people have voted that agenda out.

So the Senate majority leader and the Speaker of the House should not reflect the old order, because that does not reflect the mandate that was passed overwhelmingly. It's been 50 years since we've seen this scale of a blowout in a U.S. election. Fifty years, since 1976. That's half a century. That's a lot in U.S. history. The country's only 250 years old. Half a century. We haven't seen a blowout like this. Why is that significant, Danny? Because what happened in '76? It was a major paradigm shift following Watergate. And you had the biggest exodus from a party ever in the country: people basically fleeing, not wanting to be identified as Republican. And so the Democrats had a huge bounce in '76, and that was reflected in the results.

But they didn't have that level of defection in this one, I would think, although a lot of people sat this one out—definitely independents and libertarians. Some of the third-party campaigns had very good staying power in a number of races across the country because that was definitely a protest vote. But if that's considered historically a paradigm shift in 1976, that's what this is. People need to realize that it is a paradigm shift. And if the Democrats are not going to respond to that in any kind of substantial way and recognize it in their actions and their choice of leadership, then what good are they, really? Who are they serving? Not the American people. And that's a really hard pill to swallow, actually. It's pretty shocking. The Massie impeachment articles and the 11 no-shows there—that's just a perfect vignette of this problem. So hopefully that's not going to be the case in January, but we'll see.

#Danny

Yeah, great points, great points. And it's also been frustrating to see, you know, what you called the left attacking the left. Basically, I see it as AOC attacking the constituents who want to see Hakeem Jeffries challenged, and her saying, "Well, it's a procedure, and I can't do anything about it." That's not really what people want to hear at this point, given that most people view the procedures in Washington as, to use your term, rigged. So that was her.

#Patrick Henningsen

That was her, Danny, in her $5,000 or $10,000 cocktail dress. Is that what we're talking about? That press opportunity? She was coming out of a gala ball or something.

#Danny

Oh, no, no. This was recently, like in the last day or so.

#Patrick Henningsen

They doorstepped her yesterday. Oh, that might have been it.

#Danny

Yeah, I don't know. I don't know. And she's coming out.

#Patrick Henningsen

She's wearing some $10,000—or whatever, I don't know how much it costs—but some uber-designer cocktail dress with all her chiffon and the press in there. And she was giving it all this. The champagne socialites are really the worst. Yeah. And that's what AOC has become. They have bought her off and turned her into a quintessential champagne socialite, completely worthless to the working class. I mean, her campaign was just so cynical, looking back at it. It was just so fake, but she's taking the fakery up to sort of new galactic levels, and she's going to try to cash in her chips to run for president in 2028. That's pretty certain. That's what it looks like, anyway.

I think you can tell in how she's, you know, very confident right now. Yeah. And by the same token, to save Donald Trump, to save the swamp, he may resign early, because this is where a lot of the betting on Polymarket is going: a Donald Trump resignation to avoid impeachment. And then J.D. Vance would give him a pardon in perpetuity, and Vance would be the heir apparent. He wouldn't have to run in the Republican primaries because he would be considered the incumbent. Interesting.

So they're going to pull a Kamala. The Republicans are going to pull a Kamala. But Trump would have to step down before, I think, September. He'd have to step down before the presidential debates and the campaigning gets into high gear.

So it would have to happen between April and September. April and September. And then Vance would be president, and I think Congress would select a vice president, if I'm not mistaken. So it could very well be a unity ticket. It could be a Democrat—a ranking Democratic officeholder or lawmaker. And that would suit Vance because then he wouldn't have to worry about running against somebody. Peter Thiel could have an open lane for J.D. to run against a Democratic challenger. And then Vance doesn't have to do the hard work of actually winning a campaign, which suits him down to the ground. It suits Trump down to the ground. It's very likely that could happen. It's very likely that could happen. Unless Donald's ego kicks in.

#Danny

That's what I was about to say. A lot of people in the chat are like, "I don't see that." But I mean, I think anything is possible because we don't even know. We're going to have to see how things go as the weeks and months pass and developments unfold, because a lot of things could happen. I think a lot will depend on the conditions at the time these decisions are made. So it'll be very interesting, Patrick, and of course we'll have more conversations leading into and during that time, for sure. I hope everybody liked the show today and feels good about hitting the like button before you go, because that helps boost the show in YouTube's algorithm. Thanks for signing on, Nadim, and for the super chat. I don't know if Aran likes J.D. Vance, though.

#Danny

I just think...

#Danny

There's really nobody in Washington to talk to. And Vance is probably the guy who gets tasked with that in the White House anyway. Patrick's Substack and YouTube channel are in the video description below. So subscribe, follow, and support his work. Danny Davis's Deep Dive is also there, so if you're not subscribed there, do that. Tomorrow, I'll be back with Lawrence Wilkerson and Anthony Aguilar. I think it's 1 p.m. Eastern time. Yes, 1 p.m. Eastern time, November 12th. I hope you have a great rest of your day, everyone. Hit the like button again and check out all of Patrick's work. Make sure you support him. And we'll see you all again next time.

#Speaker 1

Bye-bye.