

Patrick Henningsen: Attack on Iranian Tankers Will Trigger counter Strikes

Watch Patrick Henningsen, Like & Subscribe to him on YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/@21stCenturyWireTV> Also visit Patrick's Substack here: <https://patrickhenningsen.substack.com> See all of Patrick Henningsen and his team's work here: <https://www.21stcenturywire.com> Follow Patrick's daily shorts on Instagram: https://www.instagram.com/21wire_media/ Follow Dialogue Works: Substack: https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page X (Twitter): https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA Patreon: https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=

#Nima

Hi, everybody. Today is Sunday, May 10th, 2026, and our dear friend, our brother Patrick Henningsen, is here with us. Welcome back, Patrick, from Europe.

#Patrick

Yes, that's right. Great to be with you, Nima.

#Nima

And Patrick, let's start with, you know, the latest confrontation between Iran and the United States. We've had it in the last 48 hours, the two sides firing at each other. But the latest one is what came just before going live, what came here. The latest news is the IRGC Navy struck a bulk carrier, a cargo ship off the coast of Qatar. And this is the game that is going on with the blockade that is happening. The United States is attacking Iranian tankers who are trying to get out of this raid or get into this raid for most. Iran is attacking the United States. We've seen that the Iranian side said they attacked two destroyers. They hit at least two destroyers. The United States rejected it, said that it didn't happen.

And the United States is arguing that they hit five or seven speedboats, which was rejected by the Iranians. So it seems that they're talking about negotiations. Donald Trump is saying that we're going to reach some sort of agreement, but it doesn't seem that we are reaching anything. We're not getting anything through these negotiations because we don't know, actually. We don't know what's going on behind the scenes and what is the level of these sorts of messages going to Iran

and to the United States. But at least defining a framework, it takes a lot of time, in my opinion, to reach that. But in the meantime, you see these sorts of confrontations, which may lead to a drastic or a big escalation between Iran and the United States. Your understanding of what's going on?

#Patrick

Yeah, thank you, Nima. I think the first thing is how I look at this. I'll just explain my methodology, is that I really don't take on board anything seriously that's coming out of the U.S. in terms of—I take it seriously, but not in terms of it being consequential to actual negotiations. I take it seriously in that these are signals that are coming out of Washington. The Trump administration needs to be seen to look busy. They need to be seen to be making progress, to be doing something, because the onus is actually, if you think about the situation realistically, the onus is on the United States to make progress on the situation as far as their position goes. The onus is not on the Iranians. The Iranian position has already been staked.

It's a much more straightforward position because theirs is a defensive position, and this is their territorial waters. This is their territory. There are sea lanes, effectively, that they're managing, not the U.S. So for the U.S., for political reasons and also for their reputation internationally, they have to be seen to be making progress. That's the first thing. So a lot of these announcements from the U.S. are performative. There's also the additional element with the U.S. that it's now become kind of understood that many such announcements from the U.S. are being used to manipulate the markets, so that people, traders, institutional traders, people within Trump's inner circle, his family, are able to put options on things like oil and put in call options for the rebound in the market, stocks, et cetera.

So they're basically using announcements to play the markets, or the threat of a deal, the threat of peace, the threat of a resolution, or the threat of stability. I think that's one way you can kind of look at it. But there's no sincerity at all, and none of these are reality-based. That's the thing. But they're still real because they're strategic, and the U.S. is doing this in conjunction with military strategy. And it seems to me, just having watched this game back and forth for the last few weeks, that the United States has been running, ever since the Islamabad negotiations, the first round, when Steve Wyckoff, Kushner, and J.D. Vance showed up for a day and then left.

But what happened was that was the beginning of the U.S. testing the Iranians with different tactics, different sort of attack vectors, different things that they could do to see if they could find a weak spot that they could exploit, and then take advantage of and then try to leverage a weakness that Iran might have in defending the straits. So the U.S. is testing its military power. They're testing Iran's response to it. That's a big part of it as well. So they're, in a way, setting parameters. But eventually this is going to settle into a type of stalemate, if it hasn't done already.

So then that leaves the U.S. with the next thing, which is they have to decide whether they're going to escalate or not, when they're going to escalate. So if you look at this latest claim by the U.S.,

they're claiming that there is a memorandum of understanding, a one-page MOU, which they've issued to the Iranians. And the Iranians have responded pretty predictably, saying that, yes, there are draft proposals, we are looking at them. But then the U.S. is adding this extra condition, which is a deadline. So they're saying, oh, there's a 24-hour deadline for this last one. So my interpretation of this is, and they continue to do this, the U.S. continues to sort of impose these deadlines, whether they're 24 hours.

They used to be a week. Then it was like two weeks, 13 days. Remember a 67-day deadline last June that ultimately ended up being a bombing run by the U.S.? So now it's a 24-hour deadline. This is not serious negotiations. You can't, at this level, with this much at stake, the United States—unless they're just crazy in Washington and they're incompetent and insane, and I wouldn't rule that out either. But to me, it seems like, yeah, there's a bit of insanity and incompetence there for sure, quite a lot of it, but I don't think these are real. I think they're just performative, and they're just trying to keep the news cycle going on this issue. The U.S. can't—it's going to be very hard for them to mount any kind of military attack in the next week, namely because the Trump administration is planning to have a high-level meeting with a major superpower in China.

So it's just going to become a lot more complicated because you can't predict what would happen once escalation takes place. So I just—even from Trump standards, that's a bridge too far. However, I wouldn't rule out the Israelis trying to preempt some kind of hostilities because they really don't care. As far as the Israelis are concerned, Donald Trump could cancel his meeting with Xi Jinping, and that would be fine by them. They really don't care. It's not an issue for Israel. And that's the other problem here, Nima, is that the U.S. has proven itself to be agreement-incapable. Okay, we have that. There's still a chance that somehow, over a period of time, some negotiations could net some positive interim steps that might lead to some kind of stability, at least in the interim.

And that's very possible. However, the U.S. is not capable of restraining Israel. That's the problem here—it's not just, and that's part of the facade of this media, is that people are looking at the U.S. and Tehran and thinking it's between Trump and the Iranian government. It's not. It's between Trump, Israel, and the Iranian government. But Israel reserves the right to stay on the sidelines, and Israel is not capable of not inserting itself into the situation if any such agreement is reached between the U.S. and Iran. There's nothing stopping Israel from inserting itself into that situation and just wrecking the whole thing and maybe even escalating it to a worse position than it was before.

That's always going to be a risk. It's always going to be a threat lingering there. And for this reason, I don't think... I really don't see any chances of this working. It would take some kind of just drastic change by the Trump administration in its relations with Israel. And I just... for some reason, I can't see it. So it's going to be really difficult. And Trump will come out, you see his statements are just completely incoherent, and he's constantly undermining his own previous position, or his secretary of

state saying something different than him, and so forth. And he's saying Iran wants to sign a deal, they want to sign it badly. And quite frankly, they want to sign it much, much more than we do right now.

You know, they really, they're looking at this. None of this is true. This has proven time and time again to be just absolute public relations fiction. And he will just spit out anything. You know, once he gets off the helicopter or Air Force One, or is standing on the White House lawn, as soon as the cameras show up and the mics get turned on and the questions start hurling at him, he then goes into performance mode. He just goes into reality TV acting mode, and he'll say anything. He'll say anything, like he'll make statements that are just demonstrably false. He'll make claims about Iran or the Iranian leadership that aren't true.

He'll make claims about things the Iranians have said in private, which nobody can verify. We don't know who he's speaking to, or if he's speaking just to Steve Witkoff, and Steve Witkoff says he's speaking to a guy in Pakistan, and that guy's speaking to the Iranians and speaking to the right people. No, nobody knows. Nobody knows. There's no way to track or verify any of this. And for that reason, I'm going to say, Nima, that it is my very strong conviction and belief, based on what we've seen and the lack of progress over the last, say, four weeks, that Iran has shifted into third gear. And I'll call that—I call that Ukraine mode. Iran has shifted into Ukraine mode.

And I believe that's a large part of the substance of the conversation that they had with the Russians in St. Petersburg. In other words, how do we deal with the Americans? And I think the Russians gave some advice. Not that you have to give the Iranians any advice on this, because I think they know very well. They've been playing checkers with Trump now for quite a few months on this. But they're into this kind of mode because the U.S. needs time. So this is very similar to the Ukraine conflict. In Ukraine, the U.S. is buying time to arm its proxy, and it's buying time for the Europeans to rearm as well and to restock. So the negotiations are going nowhere with Ukraine.

And they haven't gone anywhere for the last year. At least, let's talk about this presidency. They've gone nowhere. And I think the negotiations with Iran are kind of entering that similar sort of mode, this Ukraine mode. And it's very interesting. Just look at how Russia is managing the U.S. and managing Ukraine. Putin just came out with a statement that said, I'm ready to meet Zelensky face-to-face anywhere, even in a third country. However, one condition: before we meet, there must be a comprehensive, long-term peace plan ready to sign. Now, we both know that as long as Zelensky is president, that paper, that document will never show up. So that's effectively what Putin is doing.

And I think Iran's in a position to kind of do more or less the same, although they don't have to because, again, they're in a defensive position and they don't have to run to go and meet the U.S. halfway at all. So just from a negotiations point of view and how frameworks are laid out and basic game theory, Iran doesn't have to go and meet the U.S. halfway on anything. But what they can do

is play this performative media game back and forth with the U.S. because also it does suit Iran to buy time as well. I think we can all agree, Nima, that it's very likely, it's more than 50% likely, that there will be a resumption in hostilities between Iran and Israel.

#Nima

I think that will happen.

#Patrick

We can bet on this with a high probability, at least over 50%. And if that's the case, both sides are going to benefit from the additional time to reorganize and to rearm. But strategically, Iran has the upper hand. They've established the upper hand. It's clear they have the upper hand. It's a fact of geography, quite frankly. And for the U.S., it's just a logistical handicap that they find themselves in because the U.S. is in a much weaker position in the region than it was before February 28th. And that's a reality. So the U.S. had a much better hand militarily before February 28th. Now it's much weaker.

And we can talk about the different aspects of the different Gulf states that point to that, but these are just realities that you can't get around. These are like immovable objects in this equation. So much of this is media noise, but that's part of the challenge of dealing with this Trump administration — you've got to be able to filter out what is meaningful and what is completely just superfluous noise. And a lot of people, or some media, are kind of, I think, learning this and adapting to this. But then you have outlets like Axios in the U.S., which is effectively, you could say, in the mainstream sense, kind of an Israeli propaganda clearinghouse.

So it's like an embedded Israeli mainstream foreign agent within the United States. To me, that's the kind of role it fills. And it does U.S. politics, and they have real reporters there. But on foreign policy, specifically to do with anything Israeli-related, it's absolutely, I think, front-run by the Israelis, by Israeli intelligence. So that's also part of this media churn — the announcements and the leaks and the anonymous sources coming out of the Israeli outlet. I call it the Israeli outlet because, in my opinion, as far as the Middle East goes, it is an Israeli outlet, Axios, which is embedded in Washington, D.C. And that's just part of the general ecosystem of propaganda and strategy.

And the strategy, Israel's strategy, is to pursue its objectives in the region, but it's also there to nudge and to hem in the U.S. government and the Trump administration. And it uses its media proxies in the U.S., whether they're at Fox, whether they're at Axios, and they use those like a kind of sheepdog to corral and direct Trump into positions and direct the U.S. government into the positions that it needs it to be in at any particular time. It's a very well-coordinated operation, and most people have no idea how sophisticated this is. But this has been going on for decades, quite frankly. It's nothing new — it's just now you can kind of see it in action, you can see it in action more than ever.

#Nima

You know, with the case of the blockade and confrontation between Iran and the United States, what we've seen so far is that the Iranians are learning how to saturate the air defense systems of these destroyers, easily saturate the air defense system, hit the target, and sink these destroyers. I think they have shown that without doing that to American destroyers, to show how capable they are, to make the Trump administration understand what's at stake for them if they continue with this sort of attitude. Just yesterday, last night, they said that they're done with Donald Trump and this blockade. With each and every tanker being hit, Iran is going to respond the same way, and they're going to hit the tankers and the destroyers and the warships of the United States in the region. This was announced by the IRGC last night.

And on one side, you see this. Donald Trump is desperate before going to China to calm down a little bit the situation because he needs this, you know, to calm down, to have some sort of, you know, I would say a ceasefire, close to a real ceasefire, not the ceasefire we've seen so far. And once he gets back from China, that's, I think... as you've mentioned, the escalation is going to happen. I think that's going to be the point that we're going to see the escalation. But the problem, Patrick, is looking at the war so far, who's gaining, who's losing? The United States, before this war started, they didn't have the issue with the Strait of Hormuz. They had all those big, beautiful bases in GCC countries. And many of these people, pro-Western analysts in these countries, were arguing that the United States is here.

Nobody should be afraid of anything if the war is going to be four days. If it takes more than four days, we're going to have the United States here. Those calculations are off the table right now. They know what has happened so far. You know, even in Saudi Arabia, in Qatar, in the UAE, many of these countries are asking themselves, those pro-Western analysts or people, decision-makers in these countries are asking, what is the point of having the United States bases here if they're not even able to defend themselves against Iranian attacks? So I think the reality of what's going on, even with all these sort of, you know, with the case of bases, the war, what's going on, we're not talking about the main issue that the United States is trying to put and talk about — the Iranian nuclear program.

That's not on the table anymore. And I don't see China being willing to help the United States in this sort of thing, because I would say that Donald Trump would ask China to put pressure on Iran. One of the main objectives of this visit would be that, because they did that before with the case of Russia. But the problem is that the chessboard is not in favor of Donald Trump. It's totally against him. And he doesn't have any sort of leverage going to China. How is that going to be helpful for the United States to start the war once Donald Trump gets back to the United States?

Because we know, with the case of ammunition, what's going on — with the case of cruise missiles, the interceptors. On the other hand, we learned yesterday that Europe is running out of jet fuel in

six weeks. Look at the inventories of crude oil — it's just going down. It's unbelievable what's going on. And these are all pressures on Donald Trump and the global economy. It's not pressure on the Iranians, I would say. Iran is fighting — they know what they're fighting for. And these are huge problems that Donald Trump should consider in this meeting with Xi Jinping. Your understanding — how is he going to resume? Is he going to bring all these issues to the table to talk with Xi Jinping?

#Patrick

I think this is going to be a very different meeting with the Chinese than Trump has had, or any U.S. president has had in history. Arguably, this would be a very important meeting. I mean, I can kind of discount that a little bit because, you know, even if Donald Trump sat in a room at a table with Xi Jinping, and Xi Jinping brought forth the most eloquent Confucian wisdom ever, and geopolitical acumen and prose and poetry of international relations infallible, it would go right over the head, right in one ear and out the other ear of Donald Trump. It's of no consequence, Trump being there in that sense.

What is of consequence here is that China is now viewing the United States of America in a very different light, because now Trump has shown openly what the U.S. is prepared to do in order to achieve its maximalist goals. And that includes the destruction of entire countries. That includes the destruction of a civilizational state. China is a civilizational state. India is a civilizational state. Iran is a civilizational state. The United States is not a civilizational state. The United States is a very young, modern, colonial settler state. It's not a civilizational state. So for China, even the issue of preventing Iran from enriching any uranium — that is an attack on Iranian sovereignty — if China were to endorse that, that's a decision for Iran to make.

If Iran decides to make that concession in order to move the ball down the field towards a broader peace agreement with sanctions relief and all the rest of it, fair enough. That's their prerogative. But China cannot necessarily endorse that, nor can Russia, because if they are, they're effectively saying that it's okay for the U.S. to impose that demand on them in the future. So it's really an attack on basic sovereignty, not to mention the Non-Proliferation Treaty and all of these other international frameworks that have created stability and predictability between not just nuclear weapons states, but states that have civilian nuclear power programs, which are many. So from that point of view, for China, I think things have gone a little too far between the U.S. and Iran.

And so it is very possible that you could see also stern words or implicit threats given to Trump from the Chinese in the nicest possible way that I think would change the United States' calculus vis-à-vis what it believes it can get away with in China, because the Chinese have been very sort of patient and they've been sort of tolerant to threats. I mean, during the Biden administration, it was terrible in terms of Chinese relations — I mean, Nancy Pelosi getting on a plane to Taiwan, grandstanding in Taipei, Tony Blinken's disastrous summit with the Chinese, just the insults, the threats — and you

had the neocons on the periphery as well, and the Marco Rubio from the Senate threatening China and saying that we're going to arm Taiwan with whatever it takes and we're preparing for a major pivot to the Pacific.

It's like we want war. China is our enemy. Marco Rubio said they mean us harm. They mean us harm. I mean, where is all this coming from? So that's one thing. But now you can see what the U.S. is actually prepared to do. It's not just what the Trump administration is prepared to do; it's what the Democrats are prepared to do because they're not pushing back against any of this for the most part.

So the whole of the U.S. government, the media, and society is kind of — the majority are on board with this type of muscular, aggressive foreign policy. So I think for China, it's serious. And the U.S. has explicitly said they want to use this situation in the Persian Gulf, openly saying this is going to hurt the Chinese economy. The byproduct of this, why it's a great policy, is because it's going to hurt China's access to the energy it needs from the Persian Gulf. That is an act of war. That's a threat of warfare against the Chinese by the U.S., even though it's indirect. So they've been playing this game with the Chinese for a very long time.

And at some point, you know, the Chinese elephant — which moves very slow, but when it lifts its foot and puts it down, you will feel it. That's the difference between a power like that and the U.S., that's constantly flapping its wings and its gums and going hysterically on Twitter every 24 hours, making all sorts of threats and so forth. China will sit back, assess the situation, but they could put their foot down during this meeting with Trump. And if Trump comes back with some sort of conciliatory, slight pivot in the rhetoric, perhaps it would only be short-term with Trump.

Because even if Trump is faced with, you know, even if God himself came down and gave orders to Trump to back off, Trump would sort of nod his head, be scared for 24 hours, and then after the demons have been in his ears the next day or the day after, he'll be back to where he was before. That's what we know about this president. He doesn't have any strong principles. He has no moral framework. He has no intellectual depth to realize the situation that he himself is in and what he's pulled the United States and the world into through his own actions and his own lack of constructive actions himself. So it's no guarantee. Yes, it's going to be a serious meeting.

Yes, strong words could be made from China towards Trump vis-à-vis what's happening in Iran and more broadly, globally, but with the economy as an example. But that's no guarantee that's going to be an epiphany for Trump, because at the end of the day he only reveres one demigod, and that seems to be his own ego, unfortunately. I hate to personalize it, but sometimes it may come down to that. Not to mention the fact that whatever accord the U.S. reaches with China, Israel can undermine, and the Israeli lobby in the U.S. can undermine any progress there — any progress at all. They can undermine that immediately, and Trump will be sort of back to square one after that. And I think that's predictably what may happen.

I will predict there will be some big things coming out of this meeting with China in terms of rhetoric, in terms of a signal of a potential shift for the positive. But I think after a few days it will be knocked back into its previous position and the U.S. will just continue. So maybe their direct bilateral relations in terms of trade and tariffs and things like that might be somewhat resolved temporarily with China or look like they're going in a positive direction. But in terms of Iran, it's actually not in Trump's control. He does not get the final call. Netanyahu and the Israeli government have veto power over U.S. policy in the region, and that's just the reality of the situation. I don't see that changing. Until that changes, that's what's more likely to happen.

#Nima

You mean something like what we've seen in Anchorage, Alaska?

#Patrick

Yes.

#Nima

A lot of positive things happening, and it's going to be a game changer coming out of that, and Donald Trump saying everything was amazing, it was all good and excellent. And after one week, everything disappears from the scene, and we're back to the same old policies.

#Patrick

Yeah, I think so. I think so. I think you can kind of—so the optics will be there. For Trump, he'll want to cultivate any political capital from the photo ops of him with Xi. It'll be great photo ops. It'll be fantastic. China knows how to craft a state visit better than anybody, so it'll be fantastic. But you can't change this fact that Trump's reputation as a president, why he got elected, is he convinced the American people that he is the master of deal-making, that he is the art of the deal, and that's his brand. But the reality people need to understand—and he still trades off that mystique with Americans—but the reality is he's not able to make any deals internationally. And he's made none. He's made no deals because you don't do deals in international relations.

Trump believes that he can redefine international relations just based on the force of his character, his brand, and his marketing approach to what he sees as international relations, which for him is really just transactional interactions with other leaders—not even governments, other leaders. So the U.S. government is not locking in with other governments to get agreements, to draft accords, and to formulate peace treaties. They're not doing that. It's just his singular executive leadership position, and he's interacting with other leaders, some of whom have a mandate, others who don't—

prime ministers, presidents, etc. So there can be no agreements. There can be talks of deals, there can be draft deals, there can be tweets about deals, but deals are not what sticks in history in international relations between countries.

It's much more complex than that. Because Trump doesn't have the ability to understand this or the appreciation of history, and because he has surrounded himself—and the Israeli lobby have appointed—a whole gaggle of amateurs and charlatans around him, and people who are highly compromised, uh... and also who are highly corrupt, uh... there's no incentive or ability for anybody to engage in actual meaningful international relations. Which means that there will be a lot of talk, there'll be a lot of spinning of the wheels, but nothing's going to come of it. And I'm sad to say I've been watching this roadshow, this, uh... pantomime of a diplomatic roadshow now for a year and a half, and I have seen nothing of substance. I've seen a lot of show.

I've seen a lot of fake initiatives. I've seen the Board of Peace. What happened to all the money that he managed to bill for from the board? We're talking billions of dollars. What happened to it? Where is it? And that's just one example of many wanting to privatize the United Nations with the Board of Peace. I mean, what kind of scam is that? So when he believes, and the U.S. believes, with this type of mindset, that they can negotiate with the Iranians while they have their hand on the Iranians' neck, and they press the boot on the neck, either through blockade or sanctions, and then ratchet it up during talks and things like that.

And we already saw they're willing to mount bombing raids, full-on war, military strikes during negotiations. Because of this insistence that they have to have increased leverage, like a vice grip squeezing during negotiations, you cannot have any serious negotiations with any real country. Uh, if you do it this way, it's just, it's impossible. And the Iranians now understand, and Russia understands this. And so there, Russia has been playing the performative game diplomatically with the U.S., and meanwhile, uh, they've quietly and methodically been getting on with their sort of program, if you will, to achieve what they need to get in the long run out of the situation around the Black Sea. And likewise, Iran is settling into the same similar mode as the Russians, where they're not expecting anything of substance from the U.S.—nothing.

It's all performative. And I think this is a dangerous thing for the U.S. to get involved in, because can they outperform Iran on the global stage playing this game, this performance? I don't think so. I think one thing Iran has shown is that it's won the PR war between the West, the U.S., and Iran. Iran has won the public relations war. They're winning the media war with very little in terms of resources. But what Iran has done is crowdsourced with the global community. They've crowdsourced their sort of media leverage. And so if they want to play this performative diplomatic game with Iran and the U.S., the U.S. is going to lose, and it's going to lose badly. And the price to pay at home for Trump is high. It's going to be very, very high. His legacy, I think, is just finished. He'll never recover.

He will never reach poll numbers even approximating those he had when he came into office a year and a half ago. It's just not going to happen. The economy is continuing to tank. That can't be undone. And you're just looking at a real bunch of amateurs, just very disorganized, very sort of high on their own fame and clout. We're talking about Trump. Scott Bassett has effectively destroyed the U.S. economy through the tariff wars, which they had to repeal. They're giving refunds on the tariffs because it collapsed. It's a total failure. But the media is afraid to cover it too aggressively because a lot of the media are afraid of the White House and the repercussions. So the tariff wars were a failure, the sanctions have been a failure, everything they're doing vis-à-vis Iran is a failure.

Just the Treasury Department, Scott Bassett, insisting on pressing these sanctions on Iran—it's not going to incentivize Iran to do any kind of political settlement. It's a threat. It's, again, squeezing the neck during negotiations. It's counterproductive, and that means it's going to be counterproductive to the global economy, to the global energy supply chains, and to the U.S. economy. So the U.S. is undermining its own economy during a midterm election year. It's absolutely insane what's going on. So, like, who's pulling the strings here?

This isn't America first. This has to be Israel first. That's the only logical explanation. Why would the U.S. government destroy its own economy, destroy its own military, risk all of that, gamble all of that? Why would it do that? I mean, how could it possibly do that? You have to be very incompetent and stupid, and a bit insane, or you're doing it on behalf of a completely separate foreign interest. That's the only logical explanation at this point, because it makes no sense. None of this makes any sense on paper, logically speaking, anyway.

#Nima

Patrick, I remember when Donald Trump was a candidate. We really thought, I really thought, that he was going to—because he was giving us various interviews—he said that he's not going to start a new war, that he's going to put an end to the war in Ukraine. He was talking nicely about Russia and Iran. Why do we need them to be our enemy? And imagine what he was saying. He was talking about making deals without starting a new war, without these senseless wars, and that he was going to bring the jobs back. It was all about positive signs. And imagine what it was. And right now, just yesterday, look at what he was posting in his AI photos—that the Iranian Navy is destroyed, their drones are like little butterflies, and they've been destroyed.

You may ask yourself, why does the president of the United States need to do this? It's unbelievable to see that the president of the United States needs to do these AI photos to somehow convince people that he's doing his best considering the war against Iran. And this guy is not five, you know. Many people are trying to say—I don't know if you know that lady who is supporting Donald Trump, Susan something like that—the way that she's talking about Donald Trump as though he's the master-class chess player, he's trying to do 5D chess and everything. But the guy is so simple. I

think what we've learned so far is that the guy is so simple, and he can be easily manipulated by Israelis.

Because this war, in my opinion, was the manipulation of Donald Trump, not anyone else. Because he's the commander in chief of the United States. His decision is his. It's not coming from Marco Rubio and Pete Hegseth and these people, Tulsi Gabbard. It's the president of the United States who was deceived by some people that he's gonna put an end to the Iranian so-called regime in four days. That's why they didn't have any sort of backup plan. You see this sort of mess that is happening, as you've just mentioned. And the guy is totally incompetent, in my opinion. I don't know if people still believe that he's somehow playing 5D chess. We don't see any sort of sign that this guy knows what he's doing.

#Patrick

No, I mean, you just have to look. I know it sounds overly simplistic to say, but if you look at his businesses—in fact, this week, Trump Media Group—it's just been reported that they're in debt. They've overspent half a billion dollars. And in terms of sales, \$870,000, less than a million dollars. So they went public, the share price got pumped up to \$100 a share, it's now trading at \$9 a share. Probably by the end of the show, it'll be \$8-something because it's tanking right now. So it wasn't a real business. And that's Truth Social.

That was one of their main products, and there's no income. It's not a real business. They have no sales. It is not operating like a real business. It's purely attracting capital from BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street. They put money in in exchange for what? Favorable business regulatory conditions? Who knows, probably. But it's not a real business. It is not selling anything. So he himself—and this is basically the story of his business career—as he's really selling everything, every deal where he's getting capital, it's based on his clout, his celebrity clout, the value of his celebrity. And being president, obviously, is the highest level of clout that you can have.

But it means that he doesn't have to run actual businesses. So he's not a very good businessman. He's not a skilled or accomplished businessman. He's good at licensing his own image. That's what he's proven to do. The problem is that's not going to work very well for the United States. He might get very rich, which he and his family have done. They have gotten very rich. So there's a level of incompetence there, of not having to actually perform to get results, just expecting results. So, for instance, those AI images you just showed, which he's putting out on his Truth Social—oxymoronic, the name Truth Social.

There's not a bit of truth that's ever been printed on it. But who's running his account? Is it his son, Barron Trump? Is it the buddy of his son, Barron Trump? Is it Laura Loomer, this sort of hysterical, mentally deranged MAGA supporter that's his surrogate? Is it the manager of his golf shop, Dan

Scavino, who was running his Twitter account during the first term, we're told, one of the people running it? And if they're going to an AI app like Grok and just producing some image with some destroyers or Iranian drones being blown up or whatever, he's probably pretty impressed by that.

He's probably saying, that's pretty good. Yeah, yeah, yeah, let's run with that. That's great. Thank you so much. Thank you for your attention to this matter. And he probably feels like he's looking at the Iranian sort of counter-propaganda, if you will—the Lego animation videos—because those are going viral. Everybody's talking about them in the U.S. media. The Iranians have won the hearts and minds of many Americans through the Lego videos, not to mention the global audience as well. So competitively, he's probably thinking, well, we need to hit back with our own AI, and we're going to show them who's boss.

We're going to show them how dominant we are, and we're going to do this with AI images. But it's all happening in the virtual world. It's not real. And just the fact that he's tweeting this stuff out—pictures of him with sunglasses and a machine gun saying, you know, "No more Mr. Nice Guy"—the fact that he's doing this as President of the United States is proof, is proof that he is highly insecure about this situation in the Persian Gulf, about himself, about his presidency, and the people around him are rank incompetents. Rank incompetents. So I think the U.S. is in the worst position it's ever been in in its history right now.

I think this is the low point for the United States of America in history, and Donald Trump—I wasn't sure if this was the case, but now I am convinced. I will bet 100% that he will go down in history as by far, by far the worst president of the United States. They will need to hire 24-hour security to defend all the statues that he'll be racing to erect in the next two years. He will be desperate to put up statues, get streets named, airports—whatever. They're gonna have to guard these things 24/7 after he leaves office because they're probably gonna end up getting vandalized by people that just hate him. And those are Americans that absolutely can't stand him, hate him, believe that he has brought the country into disrepute, has destroyed its economy, and has held the public in contempt—has even held his own MAGA base in contempt—has insulted, hurled insults, threatened his own MAGA base, all the people who supported him, who lifted him up in the first and second terms, that he won both elections, and campaigned to the death and went to jail for him in 2020 in his run against Joe Biden, defended the election fraud charges, the January 6th crowd, and all this. He's thrown pretty much all of them under the bus at this point. He doesn't care. So his legacy is set in stone. This guy is finished, and he'll be a running joke in American history.

And his sons are going to inherit that. His kids will inherit that. They will have to either distance themselves from their father, or at least from his policies, or they're going down into the same sort of tar pit. Historically, it's Donald Trump. It's inescapable at this point. Nobody has been so bombastic, ridiculous, childlike, and just an embarrassment to the U.S., to its own citizens, and to the world. This has never happened in our history. This is a unique point. So Iran's sitting back, China's sitting back, Russia's sitting back, and they're watching this train wreck. And they're being very quiet and very patient.

And they're not going to get in the way of this train wreck. They're not going to save Trump. He's not savable. This is a kamikaze run into the wall of history for Trump in America, and there's just no escaping it. The only thing I think that could save the U.S. off this catastrophic trajectory right now is if somehow Trump stepped down for medical reasons or leaves office for other reasons—who knows, health reasons or something related—or he's forced out of office. I don't think they can get an impeachment vote next year in the Senate. They won't have the majority for that. They will be able to impeach him in the House, but they won't be able to convict in the Senate. But that doesn't rule out the possibility of a military coup.

I know that sounds insane. It sounds crazy. But we're dealing with a crazy situation with this president that's running his own country, their economy and their reputation, and probably their military by the end of it—running it into the ground, literally, just like he did all of his businesses, including Trump Media Group, which we now know. And then the Trump phone. I don't know if you heard about this one, Nima. He launched a Trump iPhone to compete with the iPhone, and he took deposits from tens of thousands of people. I don't know, got like \$60 million in deposits from people who put money on hold for this \$500 phone. They all put like, I don't know, \$100 each or something like that. They put a deposit in.

And then the Trump Phone Incorporated, or whatever they're called, just announced that they changed the terms and conditions, saying that we do not promise to deliver any product anymore. And we're really sorry about that. So this is the U.S. president. He's using his name to run scams while he's in office, and Ponzi schemes. It's just too incomprehensible. It wouldn't be acceptable, not even in the most corrupt banana republic, could they get away with some of this stuff. But Americans have been so desensitized, I think, to push back or really go after him. Maybe the Democrats will do some of this after the midterms from the House, but I can't. It's like a bad joke at this point. I don't know. So this is virgin territory, really, for a lot of Americans.

#Nima

The guy is, you know, just look at the statue—his golden statue.

#Patrick

I can see the look on Moses' face coming down the escalator, like, what have you done? I mean, for the Christians, do they not read the Bible? Daniel 8:13, or Moses, or whatever. I mean, it's just ridiculous. The irony is just too unbelievable. Like, how could this even—this is not good. That statue will not last very long, I predict, either. But that's a separate thing.

#Nima

He put his name on the Kennedy Memorial.

#Patrick

He's alive, he's part of the... Yeah, and renaming the Kennedy Center in New York. Nobody wants to perform there. I mean, you don't do these things.

#Nima

Usually, when you're not in office, you're gone.

#Patrick

Yes, yes, you do that after. He is desperate because he knows, I think subconsciously, he knows what's coming. But the minute he's out of office, everything is over. They have so badly overplayed their hand, the Trump family. Trump and his family, too. You know, they believe that they're owed these billions of dollars because they believe that they were bankrupted unjustly through all the lawfare and all the rest of it. And you know what? They were, I think, victims of lawfare, Donald Trump and his family. They were done badly by the Democrats, by the deep state, by the FBI, and so forth. That's true.

But your reaction to that, if you do regain power, a smart reaction would be to be magnanimous about that and to go forward to show that not only are you not corrupt, but you are, in fact, the opposite of corrupt, and you're extremely generous and humble, and you're not going to use the public office to enrich yourself or to trade off your brand. And they didn't do that. They went the opposite. They're running Ponzi schemes, memecoins, every scam imaginable, trying to claw money off the Arabs to dump into their private equity funds, to get the Arabs to back their fake memecoin. And they did all this. And they used it. It was a pay-to-play, just like the Clinton Foundation.

The Clinton Foundation was a pay-to-play slush fund that was trading off of Hillary Clinton being the future president. It's just Trump doing Clinton pay-to-play while he's president. It's not like the run-up to his presidency, although Kushner did with the Saudi wealth fund. That was a pay-to-play where the Saudis were betting that there'll be a Trump 2.0. But that's what they're doing. It's pretty incredible. And the price they're going to pay for this is just going to be tragic, unfortunately. They will not be able to escape the gravitational pull of this. It's going to be tremendous. To steal a word from Trump—tremendous. It's going to be tremendous.

#Nima

You know, Patrick, if we want to be... you know, let's go totally positive, 100% positive. And let's assume that they can get a deal with Russia and with Iran. What would that be? I would assume that for Russia, in the case of Ukraine, they're not going to get anything close to what it was in December 2021. And Ukraine has lost everything. You know, just to imagine the importance of the eastern part of Ukraine, it's something like 80%, 75% of their GDP. I think Odessa is in the process

of being lost, not militarily, but politically. They're going to do something with Odessa. They're not going to let it be in the hands of Ukrainians.

#Patrick

No, it'll collapse from the inside. Yeah. That was always the long-term Russian plan, as they knew, because Odessa is nominally Russian. It's a Russian city. It's historically Russian. It's Novorossiya. It has a long and storied history with Russia. But to try to take it militarily would be a disaster, and that's why the Ukrainians fortified that city first. That was the most fortified city from the beginning of the conflict. And Russia knew there would be a bloodbath to try to take Odessa by force. But I think Russia is very smart. They can play the long game with Odessa because you have a minority of Nazis, and the most hardcore racist Nazis—Azov and Aidar battalion types—were sent immediately to Odessa.

So when they're pulling people off the streets and impressing them into military service and stuff, you've got an extreme minority ruling over a majority Russian population in Odessa. That's what you've got. But Russia's smart. They know that it's impossible to take the center of that city militarily, how well it's been fortified from the beginning of the conflict. But it will collapse from within. But the danger, Nima, to the beginning of your question, which is the important part—suppose that there's some kind of a resolution. I don't think with the Trump administration there can be a formal resolution.

There can't. There can't be a formal political settlement. There can only be a quiet withdrawal of the U.S. in terms of material support, military support. Why is that? And Russia could, and through, as you said, attrition—political attrition in Odessa, internal collapse—that's all very possible. But what's the danger with all of this? And this is the danger with the U.S. rhetoric, which is a trendy rhetoric. When you hear J.D. Vance and you hear Trump's inner circle saying, oh, we've had it with the Europeans, they're freeloading off us, they're not paying their fair share, NATO's not paying its fair share—none of that's true, actually.

None of it's true. The Europeans pay more than their fair share. They buy U.S. weapons. They hold U.S. dollars as reserve, eurodollars. They provide the U.S. with a military presence on European soil so they can launch attacks against Iran. This war wouldn't happen without Germany and the U.K. and Greece and the U.S. bases there in Italy. NATO is just a lily pad for U.S. domination. Libya is a perfect example. Although the U.S. didn't fly the majority of the air sorties against Libya, the bombing sorties, I think Norway, Britain, and a collection of other European countries flew the overall majority of air flights in the bombing of Libya.

The U.S. did as well, but... but the point is this. If the U.S. is not brokering that deal or that treaty to end the Ukraine-Russia conflict or the European-Russia conflict, you could say that's dangerous because it just opens the door for other forces to be working behind the scenes to accelerate a conflict between Europe and Russia. The U.S. needs to be there as a world power if it was an honest

broker and if it had, I think, the welfare of Europeans and Russians and people in the world in mind, they would do that, but they don't, and that's the problem.

Because the cynical profiteers in Washington know that if they withdraw from the Ukraine situation, while encouraging the Europeans to arm up, ultimately they'll provide the finance or the lend-lease or the credit line for them to do that. That might ultimately come, in part, from the U.S. in some way, shape, or form. Then they can let them start the war with Russia, and then the U.S. can come in again and sweep up the dust, the ashes, and then help with the reconstruction of Russia. That's what the U.S. did twice. They did it in two world wars. The Marshall Plan was a huge, huge thing for America. That was an economic reset for the United States, for the benefit of the United States.

And it did benefit a couple of Western European states, Germany specifically, economically speaking. But there was no sovereignty for Germany in any of that, you see. And now you can see the end result of that is you have a German country right now with a leader that's basically a manager from BlackRock, and all he's interested in is ramping up the defense industrial complex. Same in Finland, same across the board, all of these new NATO states. So it's dangerous for the United States to withdraw, but not that the Trump administration would be able to find a resolution. They don't have the skills or the personnel to do that, or the will or the courage to acknowledge that they started the war in Ukraine.

I mean, that also has to be part of a treaty — there has to be a mutual recognition of the root causes of the conflict. Otherwise, you can't have an agreement. This is actually one of the fundamental problems that the U.S. has, is that they're so wedded to their propaganda and to their lies, and it's so deeply ingrained in U.S. political culture — their narratives that are not even remotely corresponding with reality on Ukraine, on Iran, et cetera — that it prevents them from acknowledging the root causes. They will never be able to be a party to any meaningful settlement or negotiation that's going to be accepted by all parties.

So that's why Russia's insistent that we must address the root causes, because there can be no treaty unless you do. And you may not like it, and that's going to fall within international legal parameters. World War I is obviously a good example of a bad post-war agreement that ultimately led to the next one. So the best we can hope for here is basically, in the absence of an international framework, we're going to have a repeat of the Versailles Treaty or some other ham-fisted, you know, half-baked agreement to end the Ukraine conflict. That's only going to seed the inevitability of another war in a few years' time.

Could be in 10 years, could be in 20 years, but it's not going to go away. So the same with Iran. Same exact problem here is the U.S. will never acknowledge their fault, because if they do, they have to pay reparations. It's inescapable. Sanctions, relief, and reparations — that is a political impossibility in today's United States of America. Ergo, there will be no treaty, no real political

settlement. That's the problem. The U.S. cannot face the truth of what it has done, and what Israel has done — its proxy, its partner, its evil stepchild. They will never accept that. Therefore, there can be no political settlement. That's the obstacle here. And it would take a regime change in America.

#Patrick

That's the only—you would need a regime change in America. You need a revolution in terms of, like, who is going to be in charge. It has to be somebody with a brain who's responsible and honest and is able to carry that through and is not a toady for Tel Aviv. And if it doesn't fulfill those criteria, then there's no hope. So what we'll do is the U.S. would withdraw from Iran. They'd withdraw from Ukraine. But that would not stop the situation from festering. And then they'll just quietly be arming, you know, the UAE and arming the Saudis and arming the Israelis and, you know, loitering around, poking here and there, provoking here and there, and saying, well, we're not actually provoking, we're just doing this, right?

Arming the KRG, the Kurds in northern Iraq, and Azerbaijan, playing all these different Baluchis, and that is just going to mean we're going to have a war down the road. So everything I've just told you, I'm sure they've already mapped out in Tehran. I'm positive because it's their natural disposition. But the U.S. is not in their natural environment. They're really, I think, at a huge disadvantage militarily, politically, and the economic pressure that's resulting from what they've done is actually going to make life extremely difficult for this president in the next six months. And he's not going to be able to do what he needs to do to get out of it unscathed.

And you know what? Until they come up with a solution in terms of how to deal with Israel, then it doesn't matter how damaging this is to the U.S. or the global economy. Israel does not care. It doesn't care, and it will pull the U.S. and it will pull the region back into war whenever it wants to, when it's convenient for it. But I think the last thing I'll say, Nima, is that one of the possible positives that have come out of this is the fact that there is now a wider acknowledgment outside of the region that the Lebanon and the Palestine issue are intricately tied to the Iran–Persian Gulf issue. And the common factor is Israel. And there's a broader acknowledgment of that.

So this is a huge positive step forward. And if that becomes more crystallized, that realization, then you may start to see some policy changes that might be able to constrain Israel because the U.S. can't do it. It has to come from other international countries and pressures. I don't believe the U.S. can do it. Maybe the next presidency could, if it's the right person, make steps in that direction. But I think the Israeli lobby is still going to remain dominant in the U.S., even after the next administration. It may take, you know, 12-plus years to see some serious progress. You'll see some changes in the midterms as a result of the AIPAC issue.

But they've still got a stranglehold over a lot of the U.S. media and politicians. And so they'll fight through the next presidency in 2028. If it's a Republican, it will still be difficult for the Israeli lobby. If it's a Democrat, it will be more difficult. So we're looking at 10, 12 years before we see some

major lasting policy shifts away from this Israeli issue, unless Israel implodes itself from within during that time, which is also possible. That could happen as well, or it could be militarily defeated by Hezbollah, by the Iranians, by other actors that come in to join in on that effort. But forget about the U.S. for now. It's a lost cause. Nothing's going to change, not in the short term anyway.

#Nima

You know, they thought that the harder they hit the acts of resistance, the weaker they'd become. But that wasn't the case. I think that made the acts of resistance even more unified and more powerful. That's why Iran right now is talking about, without Lebanon and Gaza, we're not going to have any sort of deal, any sort of agreement. Iran is not talking based on some sort of delusional thinking. They know the leverage they have right now on the United States, on the global economy. That's why they're asking for more, not only with Iran. Lebanon and Gaza, it's all important for Iranians. The second point, Patrick, is the Iranian nuclear program. We know what has happened during the JCPOA. And the way that you see the Biden administration, the people who were part of the Biden administration, like Jake Sullivan, Antony Blinken, is just criticizing the Trump administration as though they did their best, because we know what they did during those four years.

They didn't do anything to get back to the JCPOA. And they tried to put pressure on Iran to just, you know, force them into a new position, you know, to get more points from Iran. And this is the problem. You know, Iran totally understands that this is not an issue with the Republicans or Democrats. It's an issue with the United States and the establishment in the United States. That's why I don't see the United States, anyone, you know, even the most optimistic person in the United States would assume that they're going to get something even close to the JCPOA. It's going to be much worse than what they got with the JCPOA. They're not going to get anything better. And the center of most is gone.

#Patrick

Yeah, I mean, the JCPOA might be the last of its kind ever negotiated with the United States of America. I could see other countries could do that agreement. China, Russia, even the European countries might be able to co-sign into some kind of a joint. So having said that, there could be—this is the other geopolitical trend shift that we didn't discuss, which is also possible, which could begin from this China meeting—is that you have a... And I think you started seeing that a little bit with Russia, whereby it's starting to have, you know, meetings in the region without the United States. I mean, that's effectively what the Minsk peace process was. You know, it was Russia bypassing America.

And we... In fact, if you want to go back to the... The first good example of this was Syria. When the Syrian war, the dirty war on Syria, was in full swing, Syria and other countries—Turkey, Iran, Russia—they hosted the Astana talks. Now, a lot of people were critical that Astana didn't go far

enough and allowed the al-Qaeda factions to maintain their arms but just kind of moved them around in prisoner swaps and population swaps and so forth. But that's by and by. What was important about Astana was that that was a meeting that was supposed to happen in Geneva, managed and hosted by John Kerry and the U.S. delegation. And it didn't happen in Geneva. All the other actors went to Astana, to Kazakhstan.

And that was usually symbolic because that meant that the geopolitical center of gravity shifted east and that the U.S. was not required to broker a major settlement to a major war or situation. So this could happen with the Persian Gulf. This could happen whereby it's a waste of time talking to the U. S. about anything and just go on and pursue security architecture, which is what Iran has been asking for for the last 15 years, which is that we want—even Zarif was saying this years ago—we need a security architecture that's by the region and for the region. And, you know, I think I did a piece with Press TV while I was in Tehran, and that's what I said a week before the bombs dropped in February.

But, you know, so that will be China, that will be Russia, that will be other countries, stakeholders coming to maybe the Gulf or invited there. And they make that decision without the U.S. That might be the most economical, most expedient, and most practical way forward. Because going through Washington and hoping that Israel is not going to sabotage everything is just impossible. It's impossible. You can't rely on anything. You can't bet on anything. You can't. There's no potential for a stable outcome. It's always fraught with the threat of just being upended at any moment by the capriciousness of Washington or the psychopathy of Netanyahu. So you just have to at that point. So I see that, you know, Turkey—I would invite Pakistan to play a major role in that, of course.

India can come in. Qatar should be there leading the Gulf. Saudi Arabia should be there. Whether they are or not is another question. The UAE most likely wouldn't be. Bahrain is just stubborn, but they're becoming highly irrelevant anyway because the U.S. isn't really going to be able to use them as a lily pad. Kuwait might not exist anyway as an emirate in a year's time at this rate. But those in Oman and Russia and China, and invite Azerbaijan to this discussion as well. They need to be part of this, and Armenia needs to be involved. All these countries need to be involved. That's the solution going forward.

And Israel can't, they're not going to want to be involved. Israel's not going to want to, they're not going, they're not. So you just have to get on with it outside of that. And, you know, Israel might kick and scream and complain that the Iranians are still supporting Hezbollah. But I think global public opinion is now shifting in favor of Hezbollah. I see it very clearly. I've been banging this drum for years, saying that the labeling of Hezbollah as a terrorist organization is completely fraudulent by the Israel lobby. It has pressed the U.S. to do that, pressed the British government, pressed Brussels, and the French and the Germans.

And it's because of their lobbying and pressure that they have proscribed Hezbollah as an international terrorist organization, when there's no evidence that they're an expeditionary terrorist

organization, that they're anything more than an armed liberation struggle to end the illegal occupation of South Lebanon and defend their borders. Because the United States pressured the Lebanese government to make it so that Lebanon is not allowed to have an air force, not allowed to have air defense — that's because of the U.S. insistence as a precondition. That's the pressure the U.S. put on their puppet government in Beirut.

And that's because that's what the Israeli lobby has instructed the U.S. to do. So Israel is micromanaging Lebanese military policy. You see how that works. It's obvious as an American that's how it works, but still, people, even in Lebanon, will think that their government has this direct line to the U.S. and that somehow the U.S. is offering them money and loan guarantees and USAID funding grants in exchange for you can't have an air force and you can't have any air defense. You basically can't defend your country. You're not allowed to have a real military. You just have what is the Lebanese army.

They're dedicated. They're brave. They're hardworking. They work for no money at all. The salaries are ridiculously low. But it's not a real military. It's a glorified police force. It's a gendarmerie. At best, Hezbollah is a bona fide defense force that's working with probably very small money in terms of budget and resources. But they're very effective, as we can see, against one of the most powerful conventional militaries in the world, Israel, per capita. So... but that's the reality of that situation there.

So Hezbollah has, because of their sort of just enduring the punishment, and then people can see what the Israelis have done to the Lebanese in terms of slaughtering their civilians now, going on since October 2023. We've witnessed this, and I think public opinion has shifted in favor of Hezbollah globally, and that includes people in Europe. I'm seeing journalists, mainstream journalists, that have changed their orientation of how they're reporting that, and it's no longer that Israel's the victim. You see, it's kind of preposterous that they've been able to pull this one off for so long — that Israel's the victim and everybody else that they're bombing and slaughtering is the bad guy. That's just an incredible feat of propaganda. But they've managed to do that in Gaza, in the West Bank, and in Lebanon, and with Iran as well — that everybody that is being attacked, being slaughtered, being bombed is the bad guy, and Israel is the victim.

They rack up record numbers of death tolls of people they've slaughtered. But somehow we're not allowed to criticize that. We're not allowed to criticize genocide in the West. Otherwise, we'll be accused of being anti-Semitic or of being insensitive to Israel's anxiety as a victim state. We can't point out the fact that they're carrying out pogroms and genocide on three fronts. It's just preposterous how this has been allowed to get to this point in terms of the narrative management, but it's collapsing now.

It's collapsing on every single front. It's collapsing on the West Bank front. In Gaza, Israel has been defeated — categorically defeated — on their narrative front, their management there. And in Lebanon now with Hezbollah, they're getting defeated. And so people will soon, and this will happen

soon too — and this is hopeful — people will stop regarding Hamas and Hezbollah as, quote, terrorists, or the IRGC, the defense force of a whole country, as a terrorist organization, which is how the West is portraying them and legally labeling them.

The people, a lot of journalists in the West and academics and people with real intellects, they're going to stop playing this game of the terrorist label, because the terrorist label is the source of the war. This is the source of the violence. It's because when you label a political opponent as a terrorist, it gives you carte blanche to kill as many people as possible and just write it off as collateral damage in the war on terror because you felt threatened. That's been the Israeli scam geopolitically for the longest time, and the US has used the same scam. And Israel's got the British, the Germans, the French, and Brussels to buy into this absolute scam. And the results — look at the results, just look at the results — it's horrific. So I think that's the prime cause.

That's actually fueling more war, death, and destruction — the mislabeling of UN-recognized, armed liberation, indigenous, grassroots, organic, homegrown defense militias. Labeling them as terrorists has been the source of untold violence. It's given Israel a license to kill anybody they want and raze whole cities to the ground, turn them to dust. In their minds, in a justified war on terror — it's preposterous. And we're starting to see more people speak out about this, and people in prominent positions. And that's a huge sea change. That itself would transform the geopolitics of West Asia, I would argue.

#Nima

Yeah, yeah. Thank you so much, Patrick. Please go to 21st Century Wire and follow Patrick on patrickhenningsen.substack.com. Right below his name, you can see it. I'll put all the links in the description of this video. Go and find his YouTube channel — I'm going to put it in the description — and subscribe and hit the like button for him, helping him and his channel to grow.

#Patrick

Thank you very much, Nima. We've got Sunday Wire live today. I'll be live at 5 p.m. U.K. time, so you can catch us there. It should be an entertaining program every Sunday.

#Nima

Great, great. Thank you so much, Patrick.

#Patrick

Cheers, Nima. Cheers.