

Trump PANICS as US Defeat in Iran War | Henningsen

Patrick Henningsen discusses why the US's defeat to Iran has exposed a chilling reality about the war, a trap laid by Israel that has changed the world forever. 21st century wire: https://www.youtube.com/@UCY_sGiAswJNo8HQBOKme01g Patrick's substack: <https://patrickhenningsen.substack.com/> LIKE the video and Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis! Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritho> #trump #iran #iranwar

#Danny

Israel is reportedly pushing for renewed strikes on Iran. They're claiming that Iran is planning a surprise attack at any moment. And that's why Donald Trump and his administration need to drop any pretenses of diplomacy. There was this very interesting report — The Times of Israel citing The Washington Post — that says the U.S. has used over half of its THAAD interceptors defending Israel during those 37 days or so of active hostilities. And I just want to read this very important quote from the U.S. officials who decided to disclose what was going on. They said Israel is not capable of fighting and winning wars on its own, but nobody actually knows this because they never see the back end. Amid these reports, you have Israel pushing for renewed war, and you have U.S. officials saying that they spent half of what they had left. What do you make of this? How critical is this to understanding what exactly is going on right now?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, just on this story, I think it's emblematic of the relationship between the United States and Israel, whereby they feel compelled to have the U.S. empty out its stocks of valuable interceptors, high-altitude THAAD interceptors. And Israel is obliged to hold back its stock. So for the U.S., it's Israel first, and for Israel, it's Israel first. And that's an incredible thing considering the U.S. is also trying to manage multiple theaters around the world. They're not just busy in West Asia. The U.S. is busy in half a dozen other theaters, and two in particular of note, which are the Ukraine theater as well as the East Asia and Taiwan theater, vis-à-vis the other allies in the region. So I think that should be a real clear signal to people who might be questioning what our relationship with Israel is.

That's the net result. And it just goes to show you that this war, this undeclared war of aggression, this sort of errant adventurism by the U.S. with Iran, just getting involved with this, this is just accelerating the demise of the United States as a viable imperial power globally. You can't manage all of these things. Right now, see, they're in a sort of production mode, capitalizing the defense industry. You see all these sort of big tech people that are now getting into defense, and they're like, no, no, we're not going to make this mistake again. We're going to double down on production, and this is what we're going to do. Palmer Luckey's got all this great tech. Palantir's going to do the back end. It's going to be fantastic. We're just going to churn out artillery and everything else, whatever we need.

We're going to have an endless stream of it, right? They think that they can just switch this on, and all the things that are killing the U.S. right now in the managerial, imperial sense, we're going to eliminate all those problems. We're on it now. We're on it now. And it's not going to work. It's not going to work. Because what's the premise of the imperial policy? What's the premise of the imperial mission? What's the imperial sales pitch to the world? What is that? That's the important bit. You can build up all this constant conflict and the military-industrial might behind that that keeps it going. But if you're not able to sell this to the world and to your own allies, you have to threaten and coerce all your allies, then there's no point.

There's no point. What this will do is bankrupt the United States. And this is, again, a classic symptom of late-stage empire — they'll then bankrupt themselves trying to maintain their previous position in the world when, in fact, their previous position in the world has been vacated, probably more because of their political orientation with the world and how they're treating everybody. And it's just too expensive to maintain and to micromanage all of these different theaters and all these different choke points and all of these different geopolitical flashpoints. That's how the British Empire collapsed.

The British Empire, at the height of the British Empire, when it kind of peaked before its ultimate demise, it was managing something like 40 different conflicts — 40, four-zero. And so it had to resource all of that, had to pay for all of that. Then there's the political capital, the diplomatic capital, then the economic considerations, the supply chains, and so forth. That's why they could not afford to maintain all of that. The interdependency, which was at one point the strength of the British Empire, became the biggest liability of the British Empire. And by the same token, the interdependency of the U.S. Empire, which is mainly a dollar-driven empire — that interdependency, which was its greatest asset, is now its greatest liability, and that's because of the behavior of the United States itself.

And also by prioritizing economic warfare in order to—let's be honest—the reason the U.S. has pursued such an aggressive sanctions agenda was to avoid having to use the military, because that wasn't seen as popular or had bad optics internationally. So, oh, that's okay, we're going to sanction them, we're going to coerce them through sanctions. Of course, sanctions don't work. They never

have. They've never been proven to show that they work. They only work really against your allies, if anything, hardly ever against your enemies. They don't change their behavior. So it was always seen as bloodless. Americans will sell it to themselves. Congress and the Senate love it because they can do something by passing sanctions without having to send troops. Post-Vietnam, this has always been a very popular policy.

But by doing so, they're slowly grinding down and killing the goose that laid the golden egg for Uncle Sam. And then the interdependency of the global petrodollar and the U.S. reserve currency, the real engine of the U.S. empire, all of a sudden is now becoming a liability. Right, for everybody else holding it and really only doing the U.S. a favor by not dumping all their treasuries on the market. And you know what? There will come a point where they'll have to dump them, because otherwise it's "I get something versus nothing." And that day may not be far off. Certainly Japan — these are the issues that the Japanese central banks are mulling over at the moment. And I'm sure the Chinese and others have been thinking the same for a very long time.

#Danny

The numbers are pretty staggering just in this report. The Washington Post report says 200 THAAD interceptors left China. And so if we do some simple math, half being depleted means 200 used during 37 days. That's a lot. \$12.7 million per interceptor missile is a lot of money. And this also goes in league with what you said — there's this huge liability being built here, being entangled in all of these conflicts. Well, that liability is actually showing real results. The Center for Responsible Statecraft cited the acting Navy Secretary Huang Chao, who said that the Iran war stockpile woes are behind the pause on U.S. munition aid to Taiwan. He said, Donald Trump, that this was a negotiating chip, which is why Trump has not made a decision on this arms package, the latest one to Taiwan. But it seems like actually what's happening is that the U.S. military might, which is so important to preserving this hegemony that you just described and outlined on all fronts, seems to be actually depleting and diminishing right before our eyes in real time.

#Patrick Henningsen

So here's the equation. The equation is — and if you take political science or history right from junior high through high school to college, history in America — I have an American education, so I'll speak — and half British, but I'll speak about my American education — focus is on war. Focus is on military, battles, dates, wars, generals, treaties. That's the focus. That's what we learn about. We're indoctrinated to believe that the American empire is led by the military. It's not. The U.S. dollar as a reserve currency leads the U.S. empire, and that financial power is backed up by the military.

But if you don't have the military to back up that financial preponderance, as I call it, then the whole equation starts to fall apart. And isn't it amazing that we're watching that equation fall apart in real time right now? And that's to say nothing about the economic disparity between the cost of producing an interceptor missile or a drone in the United States versus the cost of producing the

bogey in Iran, the Shahed drone or the Iranian missile. And the disparity in terms of the economy of these two things, it's unbelievable. And it really would — any sane person would look at this at scale and say, this is clearly not sustainable. This is not sustainable economically.

So then there must be another route that is more sustainable, like maybe negotiations, diplomacy, perhaps trade, maybe mutual benefit and partnership rather than coercion and punishment. I don't know. But at some point—hey, if you're in the industry, if you're in those industries right now, that's where the money in the U.S. is flowing. But I think you could also see a defense bubble. If you look at history, which is interesting, you have financial bubbles. Those can wipe out economies and countries. But what can wipe out governments and regimes is a defense bubble, because it's usually tied with some outrageous adventurism militarily.

And so, yeah, the U.S., whether it's this presidency, this administration, or the next administration, I think this is going to have devastating consequences for the government and also probably for the U.S. economy. So this could end up also being a bubble of sorts. Pete Hegseth, remember he gave this speech. He put out this happy, clappy video, this sort of like stupid little kind of—it's like one of those dumb NGO videos or Sesame Street or something. And he's basically saying, no more of these cost overruns, we're not going to do that, and we're giving the fake populist pitch: you're robbing the American taxpayer.

Come on. You just doubled the war budget to \$1.5 trillion and asked for another \$200 billion override—\$1.7 trillion. That's jacking up our money supply and our inflation. So what are you talking about, the working class? Who are you talking about? But that idea—if this is where the U.S. economy is going, if the war machine, the war budget becomes the central piece in the political economy of the United States—that's assuming they're going to be winning all these wars that they're waging.

That's a big assumption, because if it goes the other way, it's not going to be a happy ending for America. I'm just going by other historical examples—not to mention the obvious one—but you know, it's like, um, and also, yeah, they're depending on a lot of foreign money too, you know, like a lot of international capital to help bolster this defense, war department, war revolution in America. Listen, why would Boeing or Lockheed or Raytheon or whatever, why would they put up the cost of a factory unless they have some guarantees?

They're not going to be hiring the best engineers. And then what's Pete Hegseth going to do? Go ahead and cancel their contract after two years because they're over budget and start over again, and then wait two more years to wait for those interceptor missiles. Okay. So you got the system you got in America. It's bloated. It's corrupt. It's slow. It's overpriced. It's not good value for the money. And a lot of the stuff in the field is redundant by the time it comes off the assembly line. But that's the system we got. It's absolutely concomitant with our empire. So there's no way you can operate any other way.

Otherwise, you got to get rid of the empire, and that ain't going to happen, or they don't want it to happen. So they're stuck. It's just, to me, amazing—the delusional mindset of these people that cope. We'll call it the post-imperial cope. It's just incredible that they would push some of these ideas out, and clearly it was like real economists and business people, even in the defense industry, are looking at that happy-clappy video by Hegseth and going, I don't think so. Like, I just had lunch with you last week in New York, and we weren't talking about this, you know, kind of thing. But anyway.

#Danny

No, I mean, you know, this fantasy of the Golden Dome and all of these new weapons, new jets, the B-21, you know, on and on and on—fantasies in many respects, especially when the old stuff just goes to Israel anyway.

#Patrick Henningsen

I mean, half of it is just going to go to them because... and the really old stuff goes to Ukraine. Yeah.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah. So it is quite the mess. And speaking of this, then how much of this factors into all of these reports about—it feels like it's déjà vu. We are back to the start, where despite the massive military expenditure diminishment from the United States and, of course, all the damage done to the Gulf, to Israel, we're in this point again where we have a mediator, this time Pakistan. Now we're here in Qatar. There's a lot of players trying to get into the midst of Russia, a limited framework to allow for talks and to extend the period where there's no fighting. It feels like back before February 28th, when Oman, with Omani—the prime minister who was brokering the talks—went on to NBC. Foreign minister.

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, the foreign minister.

#Danny

The foreign minister of Oman went on NBC and said, we are so close to a deal that will avoid a war. And not 12 hours later, the U.S. and Israel were bombing Iran. It seems like Israel is pushing for that. But what do you make of this deal? A flurry of news. Nobody, especially on the U.S. side, is giving any indication that there's anything genuine going on on the U.S. side. Iran is very firm. It's about their rights. They don't have any interest in settling for limited frameworks. They're demanding what they want out of the destruction that was imposed upon them, plus the fact that they believe they won. So what's your thought on this?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, when I saw the announcement going viral, the usual Twitter accounts putting out fake news—I won't mention any names, but everybody knows who they are—saying that there's a draft of this deal and so forth. And immediately it gets leveraged, because that's what good propaganda does. It gets leverage, it gets traction, because it's what people desire to hear. Everybody is desperate for some kind of peace solution or some kind of ceasefire and some kind of treaty or whatever. So everyone's desperate. So you put that out, immediately it's going to get lapped up. And what the net of that, from a propaganda point of view, would be like people think, well, okay, Trump's finally—you know, he's finally read the writing on the wall.

At last, Donald, he's come to his senses. And it was those Gulf states that really brought him to heel and brought him down to reality—Qatar and the Saudis and the Kuwaitis. They really tamed the beast of Donald Trump. Okay. But none of that was true. None of that was true. And when I saw that, I'm like, okay. And, you know, little media lesson: if you see something like that and you think, well, is that happening or not? Just go to the Iranian media. Go to the Iranian websites. Go to Iran's X and Twitter accounts. Nothing there. So where does this exist? It's fake news. It exists in Donald Trump's head. It exists with influencer accounts on X that are all basically coining money off Elon Musk's monetization by putting out fake news.

There's just too many of these so-called political analysis accounts or whatever. But the bottom line is this, Danny. As far as the peace process goes, in my humble opinion, I'd be happy if, you know, things calm down, but there ain't going to be any deals, right? There's not going to be any deals. There are going to be no major agreements. There might be announcements. There might be temporary impasses. But until this U.S. administration demonstrates that it has the ADHD-proof ability to sit down and actually get involved in some serious diplomacy, then I see no hope whatsoever. During this presidency, they literally do not have the ability to do a major deal, any kind of multilateral deal.

You're going to need people on the U.S. side as guarantors. Otherwise, it ain't going to work. And who is that? It's not going to be a couple of Gulf states. No, you need major powers. You need China in there. You need Russia in there to glue it. You know, you need Turkey in there to glue it down. You need others, not just Gulf states, and the Israelis have to give some commitment. There's no use for the U.S. to do anything, put anything down on paper, because Israel can come and undo it in a minute just by attacking—that forces the U.S. in. So I think, Danny, that where Iran and the U.S. are now is where the U.S. and Russia were a year ago, which is Wyckoff and Kushner off to Moscow for caviar.

That's where they are, pre-Alaska, pre-Alaska. And guess what's happened with Russia and Ukraine? Nothing, nothing. Things just grind on as they are on the ground. It's very sad to say, but I think if that's the result of a U.S. administration in what probably would have been the most high-stakes geopolitical risk point, which is tension between Europe and Russia, with Ukraine in the middle there,

and if you can't even make any headway on this, any real headway, after a year and a half, I have zero confidence that they can do anything with Iran. Zero confidence. The best thing the U.S. can do is just back off and go to the U.S. media pretending until the midterms that nothing ever happened.

And just focus on something else. That's the best the U.S. can do. They cannot architect any meaningful framework. They have a problem. It's called Israel. And you're dealing—Iran is not stupid. They know they're dealing with a two-headed beast. And Israel is not coming to the table. I mean, so if Israel is not coming to the table, then forget it. Forget it. It's going to be unstable, status quo, slightly chaotic. Iran's going to rebuild and bolster its defenses, and it's going to do what it needs to do in its near abroad to secure its national security interests, exactly like Russia is doing in Ukraine. No different. So that's my prognosis.

#Danny

Patrick, I didn't take you as a neocon, but Robert Kagan has said something similar. Not exactly, but he said that Trump is hoping for the best-case scenario for him, or at least this is what Robert Kagan is arguing. Even though it's likely the best-case scenario, Robert Kagan is saying that Trump's actions seem to be attempting to slip away without Americans noticing the magnitude of the defeat in Iran. This is the second piece in as many weeks that Robert Kagan has written—very scathing, deceptive, and scathing—that it's promoting a more effective kind of war on Iran while attempting to argue that everything Trump has done is ineffective and totally on him. But also, there are reports too, Patrick, about this. Donald Trump said something very strange, where he said he has something called Iran to deal with when it comes to his son's wedding. So his son is getting married over the Memorial Day weekend. Which son? I don't even know—Eric? I don't know.

#Patrick Henningsen

Oh, Donald Jr.

#Danny

Donald Jr., yes. So the one that the Indonesian president supposedly called a good boy or something, and he wanted to meet with him further. Very strange family, of course. We know the activities that they are involved with, both financially and, let's say, otherwise. And he just announced that he will not be going to the wedding after all. And this has made people concerned that this is because the United States is kind of dropping everything to hold on to the possibility of renewed war on Iran, given that Israel is pushing the surprise attack narrative. Trump himself has said, oh, we'll give it a few days and see if we get the answer that we like.

They're not going to get the answer that they like, Patrick. So what do you make of all this? This appears—I mean, it's unprecedented how clownish this is, but also—it is, as Reuters has reported, an indicator. This is where we're at, looking at what Trump is saying on Truth Social, because that's

how he is governing foreign policy. This is literally what European diplomats are saying. This is what many people are saying in the administration, that they just hold a screen of Truth Social and wait to see what Trump says to get an indication of what they should be doing.

#Patrick Henningsen

One of the tells was last week when Donald Trump said, I was about to attack. We'd have been doing it by now. But the Qataris, and I think it was the Saudis—I can't remember—two Gulf states said, no, wait, wait, wait, we're making progress on the negotiations. What on earth is he talking about? Anyway, that was his story. And what that was, was this: that the U.S. wasn't ready. And they've had some issues between themselves and Israel that are probably more like logistical issues than anything. You know, Axios reported that there was a scathing phone call between Trump and Netanyahu. But quite frankly, I don't believe anything in Axios that's foreign policy related, especially when it pertains to Israel.

#Danny

And how many times have we heard of the scathing phone call from Trump, and then they work in coordination to escalate war right after this? That's called WrestleMania, Danny.

#Patrick Henningsen

It's called WrestleMania. So there is an element of that. OK, but what more likely what Trump is referring to—and you have to be able to translate Trump because he just makes things up on the fly—but there's always an element of truth. There's like a thread, or there's some heat. There are real things in the thread of what he's talking about. You just have to rearrange them. And I think the truth in what Trump was saying was that they actually have problems regarding Saudi Arabia, the usage of airspace for attacks on Iran, and the use of Saudi bases for direct attacks. And Qatar, as well as all of the GCC countries, Kuwait included, more than anybody because they're in the closest proximity to Iran. But that's been a real, I think, sticking point and a real obstacle for the United States in trying to mount an attack, because it means all of a sudden you've got more narrow attack vectors against Iran.

You don't have full control, and you don't have run of the table, as it were. Iraq is also a massive problem now for the United States. And so Iran has made some changes, and they have no doubt made some major contingencies, and probably... I would say I wouldn't put it out of the realm of possibility that Iran could have slightly more westerly forward operating positions, let's just put it that way, than they might have had before. And that changes things as well. So it just puts a little additional pressure on the United States in mounting such an attack on Israel as well. So I think that's what Trump was kind of referring to when he was talking about the Gulf states, because they weren't negotiating with the Iranians.

I mean, it might have been conversations happening between the U.S., its middlemen, people in Pakistan, Saudi, and the Pakistanis were very, very close, those two governments, in terms of defense and foreign policy. But that's what I think. That's how I would translate that. So, yes, it is very—it's very tense right now. So I don't discount any of these reports that you're saying. I think the Iranians are very realistic about their preparing for an attack. The U.S. is playing this sort of political game. The Iranians are like, we're just preparing for an imminent attack. But still, there's a chance that this could run into problems because the United States, at the end of the day, is a slave to all sorts of political to-ing and fro-ing that drives our political system.

And you're talking about the existential survival of this administration, the Republican Party in the midterms, plus a lot of other big business and energy and industrial concerns, economic concerns. All these things are just additional spanners in the works of this story. And there's too many of them, actually. And you know what? The longer you wait, the tougher it is to restart this war because there's nothing popular about this war. No one supports it. There are no benefits from it. It's only been drawbacks. And the longer you wait, every day you wait, you make it more difficult to prosecute, and it gives more time for other people to intervene, including Gulf powers and other international actors, including the Chinese, including the Russians.

More phone calls. Don't do it, Donald. If you do, that's going to happen. And you start adding these things up, and the calculus changes. If he was able to, he would have done it a month ago. But the U.S. probably doesn't have the equipment or the ammunition to actually do that. So somehow they think that they've got an opportunity here. It can only be a short run. It can only be—we're talking about, max, maybe three. But what's week three look like? U.S. jets going into Iranian airspace and getting shot down. Yes. Because that's how the last one ended. So, you know, it's just—there are so many drawbacks to this. It's really hard. I can't—unless they're planning to do something really stupid—

#Danny

I mean, the really stupid thing, too, is that curious report in Reuters talking about the curious way in which the Trump administration administers foreign policy at this time. It's my understanding. And in our last few minutes, you can react to this. It seems like the Trump administration really wanted to, and Donald Trump himself maybe wanted to go for this strike the moment he posted on Truth Social that he wanted to end Iran's civilization, that it was going to all end. And there were concerns from Europeans that—are you talking about a nuclear weapon? Because when you say you're going to wipe out everybody, you need a weapon strong enough to do that. You don't have weapons conventionally strong enough to do that. So are you talking about nukes? And nobody knew. Nobody knew.

But ultimately, I think it seems like the delay had a lot to do with these limitations and all these variables, which the U.S. empire, as you said, cannot handle. There are too many. There are too many—the economic fallout, the military fallout, the political fallout. And there are intricacies and

various variables within each of these fallout fronts that it does feel like a gamble, kind of dipping your hand in one of them and saying, OK, we'll go with that one. And that is concerning, not to mention the fact that it seems like the Trump administration has this idea that if it can get a victory in that, it might be more worthwhile now. And they're talking about Cuba. They moved Nimitz over to Cuba, which I don't think will actually be a victory. I don't think it will end up like Venezuela, but there are those who are looking at this. So your final comments, Patrick, before we wrap up here.

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, I mean, I can see Cuba has a lot of appeal to Trump. It's a country that's more or less defenseless, you know, from a heavy military point of view. So you could beat them up, wail on them, bully them around. I mean, that's more Trump's flavor, I think. Very close to home, so probably not going to spend a whole lot of money. I mean, it looks good on the surface, doesn't it? Like, you know, look at what we did in Venezuela. We're going to do the same here. Somehow I don't think it's going to end the same as Venezuela. Cuba's a whole different story. I think an invasion or a military incursion or attack on Cuba, I think that will well and truly be the end. I think that will be the final tipping point.

And if they do go for that, it would be to parlay the disappointment of not doing what they hoped they could do to Iran, which we're not really clear exactly what that is. There are so many different mission statements and ideas that have been floated out. They can't quite seem to figure out what the objectives are militarily or politically or whatever in Iran. And so I don't think they're going to be able to achieve it. It's easy not to achieve something that you haven't actually specified. I guess this is in the Don Zhu art of war, art of the deal of war, whatever.

Don, Don Trump's new guidebook on how to prosecute wars when he retires will be a great handbook for future failed leaders. But, so it'll be interesting to see how that progresses. I think for this administration, I could see them having a lot of appeal. We can get a win in Cuba. Mr. President, I know we can get a win. I can see Hegseth and these guys just getting off right now, Rubio and everybody else. Viceroy Marco Rubio, I like the sound of it. It really has a ring to it, doesn't it? Viceroy Rubio, another job title for Marco, as if he doesn't have enough already. So maybe Cuba could be the saving grace for Iran.

If that becomes more politically expedient, it's still going to end in disaster for the Trump administration. Really, that's going to be one hand too many at the table. I just have a feeling. I just think they underestimated the Iranians. Clearly, you could say from a military and political perspective, that was the big mistake. They underestimated the Iranians on all levels of capability, including the ability for Iran to troll them on social media, bringing the U.S. propaganda machine down with Lego videos. Nobody saw that coming. So I think Cuba as well has so much global support, and you'll see that support come to bear if the U.S. attacks.

And I think Cuba has deep, deep, deep political support globally, which is incredible for a country that small. But it shows you how symbolic they are and how important they are for, like, the global working class, for the global south. And I think you're going to see diplomatic—the U.S. has no basis for doing anything to Cuba. Cuba hasn't done anything to the United States. They're still grinding an axe over Castro's revolution 70-odd years ago, if that's what this is about. I mean, the perfect example: the indictment of Raul Castro this week. What a clown show. They're indicting him for intervening in what was clearly a CIA operation, for intervening in a CIA terrorist operation against Cuba.

I mean, is that the best they could come up with? So you're wanting to indict this person for trying to thwart one of your clandestine terrorist attacks on Cuba? Seriously? Do you think the public's that stupid? You guys must be that stupid to think that you could sell this. I mean, this is just a level of clownery that I didn't think this administration had in them. But, I mean, no limits, I guess. It's just unbelievable. So this shows us, Danny, that either they're incompetent, or they're not serious, or this is truly a clown show with Washington. Because there are a hundred other things you could have spun up. Fake indictments.

I mean, just put some smart people in a room and they'll come up with something plausible after a few hours. Some fake drug charges or something. I don't know. But to actually go for this one—the Brothers to the Rescue shoot-down in 1996—yeah, you want to do that one? That sort of failed CIA operation and hang Cuba, hang the Cuban leadership for that? Seriously? You're dealing with a low-IQ cabal that have superglued themselves to this Trump administration. I can't imagine whose brainchild this is. Is this from Marco Rubio's office? Is this Sebastian Gorka? Have we got Stephen Miller involved in spinning this one up? I mean, are these MAGA supporters from Miami? People that golf with Trump? Who spun this up? This one's amazing.