

Iran's Missiles Inflict MASSIVE Blow to US Airbase, Trump FURIOUS | Patrick Henningsen

Geopolitical analyst Patrick Henningsen joins to discuss Iran retaliating hard against US airstrikes, targeting major US military assets in Kuwait and threatening to close the Strait of Hormuz permanently as talks collapse. JOIN US! SUPPORT PATRICK'S WORK: https://www.youtube.com/@UCY_sGiAswJNo8HQBOKme01g <https://patrickhenningsen.substack.com/> PATREON.COM /DANNYHAIPHONG Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhai...> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> Follow me on Telegram: <https://t.me/dannyhaiphong> #iran #trump #iranwar

#Danny

Welcome, everyone. Welcome back to the show. It's your host, Danny Haiphong. Welcome to June. And to start June, we have Patrick Henningsen here. He is the editor and founder of 21st Century Wire and a geopolitical analyst and commentator. Patrick, good to see you again. Great to be with you, Danny. Great to be with you. Okay, well, how about we get started here, Patrick. Just when you thought that the Iran war was entering a period of tit for tat and almost a no peace, no war, it appears that things are escalating quite quickly. Just over the past few days, let's say the last 24 hours, there were major reports of U.S. strikes on Iran, and then Iran retaliating back. And so I'll just pull up what The Cradle said about this. The IRGC said today that they targeted a communications tower in Sirk early, that the U.S. forces targeted communication towers in Iran's Hormozgan province yesterday.

In response, they struck an airbase from which the attack was launched, claiming that its designated targets were destroyed. And they said that any repeat of this U.S. aggression would be met with a completely different kind of response, one that would be the responsibility of the aggressor in the child-killing U.S. regime. Now, of note, Patrick, with these strikes, we saw Kuwait activate their air defenses just hours ago. And this would be the second time that this occurred, because now we have more evidence that on May 27th, the so-called interception, and the U.S. CENTCOM is saying that everything has been intercepted today as well. But on May 27th, they said the missile, the single missile, was intercepted in that retaliation strike.

But it appears that that interception actually caused quite a lot of damage. Five Americans were injured. I'm hearing also several contractors at the U.S. Ali Al-Salem base in Qatar—I mean, in Kuwait—were also injured. And a \$30 million U.S. Reaper drone was destroyed. An MQ-1 drone was

also destroyed by Iran, and now we're in a situation where the war could very well restart. There's talk that this expansion of the war against Lebanon, this invasion that Israel is putting together, will and could cause Iran to strike back at Israel too. Patrick, what's your reaction to this? It does feel like Israel is right now heavily in the mix of helping to reignite the flame of this conflict. Trump is kind of sitting back and being very mum with his words, surprisingly so. What are your thoughts on what's going on?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, there are two parts to that. The first part you mentioned, the radar station at Sirik Island in the Strait of Hormuz. That looks like the United States is preparing to, you know, that could be a missile defense radar battery, air defense. So it looks like that would be the first steps in the United States preparing a major military mission. They could just be feeling out and poking to try to see how Iran will react, and maybe just gradually, one by one, degrading what they think are key military installations that Iran has to defend the strait. So that's one thing.

Whether the U.S. will go through with that or put boots on the ground or, you know, try to occupy an island, one of the islands in there—Garuk Island—or all these various key positions there that one could occupy in order to create a scene, a situation whereby it would create an international incident and the U.S. could claim that they're taking decisive action and use that to escalate, we don't know. We don't know what the end result or the end state would be in that. But the U.S. is definitely in the process of interventions, a series of interventions, tactical interventions. That's clear. So this could mean that's a prelude to a resumption in hostilities, possibly. So it's hard to tell. I think the United States clearly has to buy time.

They need more time to amass the type of munitions that are going to be required in any kind of serious exchange. But I think it's controlled escalation right now. And Iran's prepared, of course, as they have been from the beginning—they prepared for a massive onslaught by the United States and Israel. So what shape that's going to take, I don't know. But the Lebanese question, that's separate. And what I'll say about that, Danny, is that by anchoring negotiations to what's going on in Lebanon, that's something Iran's doing. They're insisting. They've been doing this now since almost the beginning of this phase of the conflict, for the last couple of months. And they're expanding their influence. That's what they're doing. And the U.S. and Israel have ignored that. They've ignored that.

But the longer Iran sticks to that strategy and the longer there's no settlement or agreement or deal or whatever you want to call it, that bodes in Iran's favor. Because that means, like they did with the GCC, Persian Gulf Arab states, where they pulled them into the conflict and thus pulled the global economy into the conflict, they expanded their influence that way and put pressure on international actors to try to do something to restrain the U.S. and Israel and take Iran seriously as an actor. That's what they're doing here with Lebanon. And so if they don't waver on that, eventually they're

going to pull in concerned European governments and other regional governments and say, wait a minute, Israel, why don't you stop bombing Lebanon? Because you've violated the ceasefire in Lebanon a few thousand times already.

It's not Hezbollah. You can't blame it on Hezbollah. You can't blame it on the Lebanese. You've killed thousands of them already—civilians. So Israel's just acting like a rogue terrorist entity. And meanwhile, Hezbollah is only hitting military targets, Israeli military targets. So who's the terrorist? That's a legit question. I'm just saying, hypothetically, you could make that argument. You know, not hypothetically—like, you can actually make that argument here. Who's going to restrain Israel? And Hezbollah is not hitting civilian targets. Pretty clear. It's pretty obvious.

So, by keeping it under the banner—Israel and the U.S. keeping it under the banner of, oh, this is Iran's proxy, the terrorist threat in South Lebanon—it gives them pretty much license to do whatever they want, including raze whole villages to the ground, threaten the ancient city of Tyre with total annihilation, tell whatever million residents and whatnot that you have to leave, otherwise we're going to annihilate you. That's a UNESCO-protected World Heritage Site, Tyre. It's in the Bible. For any MAGA that need a geography lesson, just put your hand through the Bible, that book that you guys read, or some people say they read.

The president claims it's his favorite book. I don't know if he's actually read it. If he did, he would find it in there. And Israel wants to basically flatten it. Because of what? Because terrorism. Please. How far is this going to go? How long are we going to have to endure this total BS? That seems to me, at least from a semantic point of view, to be the source of so many problems here—how this is being framed. And it's allowing Israel to get away with pretty much anything, which is impeding a negotiated settlement to everything in West Asia. Hello, do we need a map? Do we need a whiteboard to spell it out? It's kind of obvious at this point, and it's getting dangerous.

#Danny

Yeah. Yeah, that definitely is getting dangerous. And just before we get deeper into Lebanon, because Iran has made a major move in response to this, it seems like things are building up quite quickly regarding Iran now intervening in league with the resistance in Lebanon. But just this one single missile—now we have the second strike that I guess we'll have to find out the damage of that—but even the one single missile on May 27th, I think this is—we're seeing the U.S. is quite afraid of Iran's retaliation, because the way the U.S. is striking Iran right now is very much limited. And even U.S. officials close to these decisions are saying that this is limited and we're not actually trying to violate the ceasefire.

Of course, that's absolute hogwash. Because the U.S. doesn't abide by ceasefires. There is none. But they're trying to keep it limited because one single missile, just the so-called debris, did cause massive damage. I mean, five Americans were injured—contractors. What's the significance of Kuwait being this? It seems like the U.S. is really using Kuwait right now as the main battle station,

so to speak, to continue these limited operations. Doesn't seem like that can last very long if this so-called tit-for-tat gets harsher, as Iran has promised. So what's your reaction to this before we get more? Because there are some developments with the Lebanon situation, too.

#Patrick Henningsen

You know, I'm quite frankly surprised that they are using Kuwait as a staging ground for anything, considering what's happened to Kuwait, to the U.S. facilities in Kuwait, since this phase of the war began on February 28th. So I'm surprised. Why would they do that? Certainly it's not—I can't see it in the Kuwaitis' interest. You know, Kuwait, historically, it's an artificial emirate. It's just carved out of Iraq, basically. Not that Iraq is very well defined as a nation, thanks to the British. Thank you very much, British colonial mapmakers. But Kuwait is precarious, and it's always relied on U.S. protection to basically exist. It's very lucrative, and from an oil point of view, it's got a lot.

But it could very easily—the royal family there is serving really at the pleasure of the United States, period. And all their money is tied up in American banks, so they can't kick the Americans out. So it's a very difficult situation. Iraq's also in a difficult situation for the same reason. The United States has control over a lot of Iraq's liquid assets in New York, which means that Iraq could be taking a much more strident position in this, allying with Iran, closing their airspace, and also addressing the Kuwait situation. But that can't happen at the moment. So the U.S. still has a lot of leverage over both of those. So in a way, they could be sacrificing Kuwait if things were to escalate.

But Iran's been very circumspect and careful about that—the choice of its targets. That's been pretty consistent. So they're not going to be hitting Kuwaiti civilian targets. That's not going to happen. It's very strictly military and strictly key infrastructure relating to that. But that's a problem. Is it a case maybe that the U.S. just has very few options in terms of staging? Saudi Arabia, not exactly a great option. Qatar, not exactly a great option. What's left? You have sort of malleable—Bahrain is massively exposed and damaged. So what are you left with? Well, you've got Kuwait, and you've got the United Arab Emirates and Jordan. That's it. And Israel. So it's not the same as before February 28th. It's reduced options. Reduced options. And maybe it's just a case of that.

And, you know, the failed raid on Isfahan, the U.S. raid to try to snatch and grab the enriched uranium that they gave a cover story for—that it was to rescue Private Ryan, pilot, navigator, ordnance, whatever, colonel. A lot of that operation was deployed from Kuwait. So I think it's a problem. I think the U.S. is overly reliant on their naval assets, aircraft carriers, air-to-air refueling. It's not the same as having 13 bases that you can operate from to basically surround and pelt your opponent with. So it's a new reality now in the Persian Gulf. I don't know. It doesn't make a whole lot of sense. It seems a bit desperate. But maybe from a Kuwaiti point of view, they don't really have any choice, quite frankly. Maybe it's a case of that.

#Danny

Hmm. Yeah, those are good points. And, you know, Donald Trump is not happy about this situation, but has actually, Patrick, taken to more domestic targets for his ire—especially the media, especially the Democrats. He has been, over and over again. This is his latest social media posting: that Iran really, really, really wants a deal. It would make a good one. But the Democrats and various unpatriotic Republicans understand it's much tougher for me to properly do my job and negotiate when political hacks keep chirping negatively at me at levels never seen before, over and over and over again—that I should move faster, move slower, go to war, not go to war, whatever.

Just sit back and relax. It'll all work out in the end. It always does. So he's not happy with the situation either, but for maybe different reasons than, you know, actual people who care about humanity. But now the situation is not going at all like Donald Trump is saying, because there's been a series of developments here, Patrick. Let's look at this one. The reports are from Tasnim News, Iranian media, that Iran has actually suspended all indirect talks and messages with the United States through intermediaries. And they're citing the Lebanon and Gaza fronts as being the reason why, because Israel expanding Israeli operations there completely violates ceasefire-related understandings.

And they've reiterated that any resumption of dialogue depends on the cessation of military operations in these parts of the region, Gaza and Lebanon. This seems to indicate that there could be an attack on Israel if they carry out, for example, the expansion of strikes Israel does on Lebanon. This is what the headquarters of the Iranian military said. Netanyahu continues acts of aggression. The regime has threatened to bomb Dahiya in Beirut and has issued an evacuation warning to residents. Given the regime's repeated violations of this ceasefire, if the threat is carried out, we warn residents of the northern areas and military settlements in the occupied territories that if they do not wish to be harmed, they should leave the area.

And Donald Trump, in response to the end of the ceasefire and indirect talks, has said he's okay with it. They're very good negotiators. So Trump's tone has certainly changed. Just last week, he was talking about ending it if Iran doesn't agree. Now it seems like the developments have moved pretty fast. And supposedly he's on the phone with Netanyahu as we speak about this. What do you make of these developments regarding Israel? Because, again, Israel is at the center of this, and Lebanon and Gaza, and Iran is taking a very firm stance in this regard.

#Patrick Henningsen

The key there is Trump's on the phone with Netanyahu, but he's not on the phone with the Iranians, you see. That's the problem. He's not talking to the Iranians. So anytime Trump puts out a Truth or makes a statement like,

#Danny

We're very close to a deal. We're very close. They want to make a deal. We want to make a deal. It's going to happen. It's going to happen real soon.

#Patrick Henningsen

Real soon. When you hear that, it's basically they're fumbling around in Washington, playing games with the press, playing games with this stupid platform, ridiculous Truth Social. The name of it is just oxymoronic. But that's the point. They're working through intermediaries — Pakistan, or they were through Oman. But so it's Israel and the United States figuring out what their next move is going to be. And what Iran has done very cleverly here is basically they've now pivoted.

So up until this point, and here's an important slight change here, the United States was setting the pace, even though the United States is kind of waffling around with their blockade in the Strait of Hormuz. This is potentially a major shift. Whereas if Iran takes any action, then the United States has to respond to Iran at a time when the U.S. is probably not so comfortable getting into any kind of a protracted exchange with the Iranians, by virtue of the fact the United States is running low on munitions. They need time to restock, resupply, to fortify positions. And Israel is in the same dilemma as well.

So by doing this... The other thing is, it's smart what they're doing, and maybe also to create international pressure, as I said before, on Israel, on the U.S. So changing the blame from Iran, as their international stock rises, as their credibility as a rational state actor rises, and Israel and the U.S., especially the U.S., drops, it continues to crater, that means that more countries will be putting some kind of pressure or political pressure, or at least rhetoric or noise — who knows. Certainly, in public opinion, it's going to show out in polls that the real obstacle to peace and stability in West Asia is Israel and the United States, who's supporting it.

And something needs to change there. And if that means a cessation of hostilities against Lebanon, then so be it. And that really works against the United States and Israel's long-range hostilities. The goal with Lebanon is the United States and Israel are working together to try to foment a civil war. The U.S., the Trump administration, and the Netanyahu regime, okay, they want to foment a bloody civil war in Lebanon, and they're not making any secret about it. They want to turn the Lebanese armed forces against Hezbollah for no other reason than to create a maelstrom of chaos and division so that Israel can move forward unimpeded.

While the Lebanese fight each other, Israel will move forward to steal Lebanese territory more than ever before. That is the master plan. That's what Trump wants. That's what the U.S. wants. That's what Israel wants. Everything else you're seeing in terms of negotiations is play-acting. Israel wants to seize land. They have land. They've stolen a very important and strategic chunk of Syria. They'll

never give it back. It's permanently annexed. And they'll wait years to formalize it, but they're going to do that. They're attempting to do that in Gaza. Right now, they're very close to doing it, and they want to do that with South Lebanon, not just up to the Litani River.

No, no, no. They want a buffer zone after the Litani River. Hezbollah is putting up great resistance to this. Hezbollah is an indigenous South Lebanese armed resistance movement, but it's labeled as a terrorist organization by the U.S., Britain, most European countries, as well as Israel. So because it's designated as a terrorist organization, their political wing and their military wing, that means that gives Israel a free hand to do whatever it wants in terms of collateral damage. In the eyes of the West, that's just collateral damage in the war on terror. End of. End of argument. So that's one of the problems, is that while Hezbollah can put up a resistance against Israel, and it will continue to probably resist them even if they fully occupy all of South Lebanon, they won't give up resisting them for years.

But that's not going to also mean that Israel isn't going to be bombing and basically scorched earth, leveling, flattening more villages and cities and towns, including historic cities in South Lebanon. And unfortunately, those are the new rules of the game. The West has shown that the United States, the British government, the French, the EU, the Germans, and of course Israel, who's perpetrating this, are okay with genocide. That's the West. Canada, everybody, they support full-blown scorched earth genocide. They don't mind massive slaughter of civilians, women, children, young men, et cetera. Infrastructure, schools, universities, hundreds of thousands of homes have already been destroyed in South Lebanon. And the West, the democratic West, is 100% in support of this.

That shows you those are Western values in 2026. That's the problem. That means they've given Israel the green light to continue this policy. Nobody has stopped them. There are no sanctions coming from any of these countries. It's still Russia, Russia, Russia in Europe. Meanwhile, Israel is conducting a genocide on three fronts—four if you count what the Israeli defense minister said recently about Iran, threatening them with complete annihilation. But let's just say Gaza, West Bank, and South Lebanon. Or just Gaza and South Lebanon. Just that. At least two, you know, bona fide cases of an ongoing genocide. When you're threatening—the third biggest city in Lebanon is Tyre—and they're saying, evacuate, leave, you're dead, basically. You're seeing the forced displacement of millions of people within Lebanon. IDPs, internally displaced persons. What is that?

Ethnic cleansing under threat of death? I think that's attempted genocide. Personally, that's what international law and the legal argument say. That hasn't changed. That's in the Genocide Convention. And they're doing it again. So they're going to continue, unfortunately. And that's not great for Hezbollah. It's not great for the people who live in South Lebanon. But this is the new reality. And until that changes, we cannot rely on any rule books that we might have in the past. To me, that's the big problem. That's the difference between now and 2006, and also 2000, is that Israel was playing by a different set of rules back then, using proxies to govern the south under occupation.

The South Lebanese Army, or whatever that dodgy proxy force they were running was, was brutalizing the population when Israel occupied South Lebanon. They were playing by a softer set of rules. It was brutal. It was terrible. But the rules they're playing by now—it's just total annihilation. And they're daring the international community to do something about it. Well, there's one country that is going to potentially do something about it, which is Iran. And the thing Israel has to be worried about, which the U.S. is very worried about, is as soon as they do have any kind of permanent encampments in South Lebanon and bases, Iran will at some point target them with missiles and obliterate those Israeli military encampments. They'll destroy them—all their equipment and their soldiers and whatever.

So Iran hasn't pulled that card yet. But they can, and with a very high degree of accuracy, as we've seen with previous missile strikes. And that's to say nothing about what Hezbollah would do in coordination at that time if those attacks happened. That could be devastating for Israel. But even then, Danny, that's not going to stop Israel from its scorched-earth policy in South Lebanon, unless Iran puts such pressure on them militarily—Israel—that they have to somehow, and it becomes such a crisis, and Trump is pulling his fake orange hair weave out, that it's going to force some kind of pressure that, no, Israel, you're going to stop now. You're going to have to observe some kind of a ceasefire. But that moment has not happened yet. That's the thing. Maybe we'll get there. Maybe we'll get there.

#Danny

But not yet.

#Patrick Henningsen

Hmm.

#Danny

Yeah, well, it's interesting. As we've been talking, Patrick, the results of this call are in. And as you said, Iran is the only country, especially in the region, that will do anything about this. And it seems like Iran's threats have, what is being said by comm media, Israeli media, postponed the expanded Lebanon operation. But everyone should be reminded that Israel and the United States, of course, by its side, all they do is postpone. They don't stop the general trend and arc of warmongering, expansionism, and genocide, as you outlined, Patrick. But that's what's happened now.

And I find it very interesting that it took Iran's warning that it would hit the northern occupied territories of so-called Israel for that to occur. Nothing Trump did. Trump is saying that he doesn't even care if negotiations are over. But there's this other thing, Patrick, that's going on, which is

there are some economists who are saying a couple of weeks in June we could be looking at a total economic disaster, much worse than what people are already experiencing now, both in the United States and around the world. So your thoughts about this latest development here?

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, the economic clouds are definitely forming, and that's going to happen. I mean, you're already seeing moves by the Europeans to try to head off some of the potential shockwaves from this by trying to raise the price. They have this crazy cap on Russian oil that Russian oil can't be sold. They're trying to enforce this crazy \$45 a barrel or something like that. So they're now ruminating about that issue, and they're probably going to raise it to \$65 a barrel, even though Siberian crude is trading at \$85 plus. So that's a signal by the Europeans that they're anticipating severe market shortages and trying to head off and release some of the pressure on that. And they're very staunchly anti-Russian. You know how anti-Russian the Europeans are.

That's their whole reason for living, to be anti-Russian and to show they're tough on Russia, and just the economic suicide pact that Europe has with itself. It's a bizarre thing. But to see them having to preemptively prepare and give way on that is incredible. That means that this is serious. So there will be—that's going to be very, very bad for the American economy, which is already in a kind of inflationary cycle. But you wouldn't know that if you're reading Breitbart News or Breitbart News Alerts or watching Fox. So that's perhaps some pressure that the United States is looking at, and that's why Trump maybe wanted to sort of declare that there's some deal happening. They're really problematic, though, because one of the lead Iranian envoys, Ghalibaf, he's basically made statements like, we don't trust the United States, that they'll make good on any promises at all, on anything.

And it's true. That's a logical position. Even if there was a memorandum of understanding, yeah, you'll see the stock market go up, you'll see oil go down, and, you know, there'll be sort of temporary celebration there. The Trump family can lock in its profits from its put options and its various margin calls and whatnot on the stock and stuff like that. Everyone will make their money. But the situation hasn't fundamentally changed that much on the ground with this. So, yeah, that's on the economic front. There'd be pressure on Trump. A deal would have to entail some kind of financial arrangement with Iran. This is hugely problematic in terms of unfreezing assets, lifting sanctions—almost impossible, almost impossible in the United States.

The only thing that Trump could do is unilaterally create some kind of, uh, you know, reparations fund, which it looks like they're disguising as a, uh, reconstruction investment fund or something like that. And, uh, what Trump tends to do is make big announcements, like, we're starting a new fund, there's going to be, you know, \$300 billion in it, it's going to be big, we're going to rebuild that country, and they're going to bring in some U.S. firms to help rebuild Iran. So he can paint that as a win. But where's that money going to come from? Where's it going to come from? The Gulf states? Are they going to pay for that?

I don't think so. It's going to have to come from some of it, at least half of it, from America. And that's like basically, you know, the Laura Loomers of the world and the Mark Levins of the world are going to be like, they're giving money to terrorists. It's going to go straight into the hands of Iranian proxies—Hezbollah, Hamas—there are going to be more beheaded babies, you know, kind of thing. That's where it ends up. So if Trump can weather that storm from the Israeli mouthpieces and all these kind of people in his orbit, the Israeli lobby crowd and all of this stuff, if he can do that, great. I don't see him doing that.

So I don't see any real progress on some of those really key points that the U.S. just—it's kind of depressing to think that they're not even bringing the ball over the goal line on the key points. That's the scary part about this. So he's going to waffle in this kind of purgatory between war and war breaking out again and negotiations, and just kind of waffle in the middle, I guess. And then they can try to justify themselves—Pete Hegseth, the White House—to say, well, privately, we're buying time to rearm and reload, and Israel's also buying time for the exact same reason, and that they could reserve the right to resume hostilities at any point in the future. Maybe that's the— is that the de facto position? I don't know. Yeah.

#Danny

Well, Donald Trump has just, Patrick, again, on Truth Social, the foreign policy information arm of Washington. Donald Trump posted this just as you were talking, just seven minutes ago: “I had a very productive call with Prime Minister Bibi Netanyahu of Israel. There will be no troops going to Beirut. Any troops that are on their way have already been turned back. Likewise, through highly placed representatives, I had a very good call with Hezbollah, and they agreed that all shooting will stop, that Israel will not attack them, and they will not attack Israel. Donald J. Trump.” So there's obviously some narrative management going on and definitely some desperation here, because if Donald Trump didn't care, he would not be intervening to try to manage the narrative again. But we've seen this before at the beginning of the so-called ceasefire. What's your thoughts about this? I don't think Iran is going to be fooled by any of this, but what say you?

#Patrick Henningsen

That's the point. That's the point, Danny. Let's establish some ground rules, okay? He can say and tweet out what he wants. Donald Trump says he's talking to high-level Hezbollah representatives. Really? Are you, really? You know, so let's establish some ground rules. Okay, Hezbollah, whether they're talking directly or through intermediaries, there's no way they're going to trust the U.S. or Israel to abide by their word on anything, period. Never again. It's just not going to happen unless there are credible international powers that act as guarantors to an agreement. That's different, okay? But that can't happen because Trump doesn't operate that way, doesn't do multilateralism.

Iran is never going to trust the United States, any promises. They can write down memorandums of understanding. They can put draft proposals together. Iran is never going to ever trust the word of this administration, period, ever. Ditto for Hamas and the Palestinian delegation. That's it. And Yemen too, if you want to throw them in there. Where does that leave us? That's the reality of it. Take away the truths, the U.S. media, the talking points, the fake stories planted in Axios, the latest fake one—I can't remember what it was—it was that president of ours, yeah, Pezeshkian, the Iranian president.

#Danny

He resigned.

#Patrick Henningsen

He was going to resign because he was worried about IRGC influence in Iranian affairs. Are you kidding me? Like, who made that one up? And the Jerusalem Post are running with it. So they have their own little ecosystem of information and propaganda, and these are sort of like sunbursts. They're like a wounded jet fighter that's unloading all of its sunbursts to avoid getting a direct hit from Iran. That's what all of these media little PR games are. I can't imagine what exactly was the purpose of putting out this story that Pezeshkian was going to resign. I don't get it. Where's the benefit there?

How do you leverage that into some kind of a benefit? Because it can't affect the Iranians, really, other than they can laugh about it. Then it must be for domestic consumption, right? That's the only explanation. But it's just utterly ridiculous. God, even Marco Rubio wouldn't fall for that. I mean, it's so obviously ridiculous. The IRGC runs it. Again, Iran's at war. The IRGC has a mandate to protect the country. End of discussion. That's how it goes. Supreme Leader, IRGC. The president is the political leader representing the legislature and the domestic politics. They're at war. Iran's at war. So it's IRGC. That's it. So it's a ridiculous story anyway.

#Danny

Yeah, especially when Pezeshkian, especially the president of Iran, has the military, has the IRGC to thank for his life. I mean, he was almost killed in the June war. They targeted him — Israel did. So it would be ridiculous. And there have been no statements to the contrary, that somehow this so-called, mostly made-up story about an internal struggle within the military and the less hardliners versus the hardliners — all of this — it seems all made up. But at the end of the day, there's also a lot of what seems to be just market manipulation. It seems like it all comes down to every single report. This is what is actually stunning about this and why I believe there's so much misinformation.

They've consolidated Israel and the U.S. They're reporting on the war right now, almost to a singular person in Axios, Barak Ravid, who was a former operative of Unit 8200, the Israeli intelligence Mossad. Now he works for Axios. He's been around the block, Western mainstream media — unsurprising, given the close links between U.S. and Israeli intel and Western corporate media. But this is what it's come to. Almost every single report about these negotiations has been from him, and he has literally released stories that now just ordinary people using X are saying, "This looks like you're just making up things at this point and putting it out there to manipulate markets and maybe shift the narrative away from the reality." But what do you make of this, especially this singular outlet with this singular so-called reporter who just happens to be a former Israeli operative?

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, I mean, we were calling that out a while ago. It was getting suspicious — Axios. They do cover some U.S. domestic politics, ineffectual sort of inside baseball, Democrats and Republicans, legislative stuff. They cover all that. And it's accurate if you're interested in that. It's just grist for the mill for the political conversation, just like Politico or something like that. But on foreign policy stuff, Axios is a dumpster fire, basically. It's terrible. And they're involved in disinformation, active disinformation. And I think Israel has their plant in that organization, and they can just stovepipe and feed all sorts of garbage through there. And it helps to sort of reinforce the same sort of information ops that they're running through other outlets. You know, the Pezeshkian story was interesting.

It was an anonymous source reported to Iran International, which isn't — that one's not even a real media outlet. That's basically a clearinghouse for Israeli anti-Iranian propaganda and Pahlavi pro-royalist propaganda. I think it was based in the U.S. previously, and it's moved to the U.K. It's changed hands, but it seems to me like a spook shop, because they just put out so much fake news. They led the charge on all that, you know, 50,000 protesters slaughtered by the Ayatollah in the street. They were running point on a lot of that, along with a whole host of fake protests — Iranian, quote, human rights organizations based around the corner from Langley, Virginia, and various and sundry other places like New York and Toronto, funded by the National Endowment for Democracy. I mean, seriously. You know, but so, yeah, Axios, unfortunately, is in that category.

So, you know, they don't have a lot left, but, you know, this idea of shorting the markets and then also making money on the rebound after the dip, whatever the case is on any of these announcements for the S&P 500 or on the oil markets, oil futures, you know, I think in Polymarket, so much money has been made. These are not trivial sums of money, and a lot of people have made money. And we don't even know. They picked out some of these Polymarket cases where it was clearly insiders, actually people within the U.S. military or attached to or around the Trump cabinet. So that's been proven. It's been shown. We have no idea what's happening at the institutional level, at the Goldman Sachs level, all these other Wall Street firms that have all of their trades shielded and hidden through various other shells, or it goes into a volume of activity.

And maybe they're doing multiple smaller trades to sort of dilute the focus and attention on that sort of insider trading on these very same transactions. We have really no idea. It would take a massive congressional panel, an investigation, a major, major project for the SEC, which Trump, as far as we've heard, has gutted of any serious people in there that would be able to look into this or stop this sort of thing. It would take a massive effort, and that would have to be spearheaded by the government. Well, if the government's involved in the corruption, the likelihood of that happening—it's not going to happen.

It might happen under a Democrat administration if they came into power in 2020, or maybe perhaps after the midterms. There's a chance that that could happen, but still, you know, Trump has done a very, very good job strategically of getting rid of certain people and reshaping the DOJ and the SEC to the point where Sam Bankman-Fried went down with that massive crypto Ponzi operation, FTX, where he was using his fake tokens as collateral to get real finance loans. I mean, it's just fraud. And that exact same business structure Donald Jr. and Eric Trump and World Liberty Financial effectively have done. The difference is the SEC has been gutted. That's the difference.

So, you know, otherwise they'd be cooling it with Sam Bankman at the country club, you know, playing video games, serving out their time. But that's not going to happen, unfortunately. It's crazy, you know, there's so much of that going on. It's like, why would you want to stop? You could just keep drip-feeding this cycle and just, you know, another six months, another 20 billion, another few months, another 30 billion—billion here, billion there. You notice Trump's rhetoric, too. I'm sorry to get off on this tangent, but he was standing in front of the ballroom construction site this week talking to the press, and he's really in his element because Trump loves building. He loves building more than politics, trust me. And he's all, "Look, Eric's done a great job." I think he's put Eric in charge as head foreman on the bunker. It's not a ballroom.

It's a bunker, actually. He's got it in his genes. My son, he's got the building gene like me, like me, like his old man, like me. And he's sitting there, he's so confident. And he said something I have not heard before. This week he said, well, you know, by the time this is done, I'm not really going to be able to use it because I'll be out of office by then. I was like, whoa. Trump said publicly that he's not going to stay in office. What does that mean? That means that he's either happily padded his nest already, or he's planning to pad his nest by the time he gets out to such a degree that he really doesn't care because he'll be so rich from that. So I'm just putting that out there because we are seeing unprecedented levels of open corruption, where they're so blasé about it, they really don't care, which would shock people in normal times.

#Danny

Yeah, I mean, I remember during Trump's first go-round, during the campaign, I remember there were rumblings about those who were really studying and trying to figure out, how did this happen? How did someone like Donald Trump start running for president? Then there were some who were

wondering, you know, given his background, who he is, is he really just running for president for his own self-interest, his own gain? And if that's true, given his, you know, business background and the way he and the people close to him have conducted business, could this simply be a kind of quid pro quo?

Like, yeah, help me get rich and I'll help you — you being the ruling class — have a certain kind of political management happening under his administration. Like, he would run it in a certain way. It would work out very well for them. But it might look a little different than how it usually does under Democrats, of course, but even, you know, standard so-called mainstream Republicans, who Trump said he was an outsider from. So, you know, it seems like a lot of the evidence suggests that, you know, Trump has indeed been a big, big friend to the oligarchs and the warmongers and the bankers and the richest of the world. And he has governed in a particular kind of way, which makes it quite chaotic.

And speaking of chaos, part of the so-called indirect talks, negotiations falling apart with Iran, what comes with that is the potential tightening. Iran has said they could completely close the Strait of Hormuz. And then there's been talk about the Bab al-Mandab Strait too. So the chaos part of this is a big element of how Trump supposedly governs, or at least how he governs in service of the diktats of these forces who are really in control. So, Patrick, what do you make of this? Because this seems like where it's going. The United States, for now, Trump is saying, "Oh, Israel won't bomb Lebanon, so everything is okay." But we know where this war really is. So, what do you make of all this? Yeah.

#Patrick Henningsen

I think an important distinction is Iran's done very, very, very well to attach Lebanon to negotiations. That's fantastic. That shows you only a country that has some strength, that has firm footing politically, diplomatically, that has a strategy can do that. And Iran's done that. But the U.S. and Israel also, they're working overtime to try to compartmentalize and separate those two issues. But ultimately, Israel's number one concern is not that Iran has a nuclear weapon. I think even Israeli intelligence knows they probably don't. They don't have one, they're not developing one. And they know that Iran isn't going to necessarily attack them unless they're attacked first, because Iran's demonstrated that this is their doctrine — how they behave in warfare.

So Iran is not the number one concern of Israel. Israel's number one concern is its neighborhood and eliminating any potential challengers in occupied Palestine and South Lebanon, first and foremost. That's the number one priority. And also the Greater Israel project, the expansion of Israel's borders — it's a reality. And that's part of the political mission now. For any Israeli administration, they're going to have to take that on board. They have increased their land holdings significantly in the last couple of years, and even in the last two years specifically with regards to Syria, that's a massive real estate acquisition, a seizure by Israel.

And it just happens to be the most strategic piece of real estate in the entire Middle East, which is the Golan Heights and Mount Hermon. So they just feel that they're in the ascendancy, and if they can somehow maneuver and take South Lebanon under permanent occupation, depopulate it, and continue to put pressure with the United States on any dissenting elements within Lebanon, then they're on to a winner long term. And certainly Netanyahu, that's his legacy. He wants to be seen as the Ben-Gurion of this generation. That's what he wants. He wants the airport named after him. Maybe they'll have to rebuild an airport after this next round of hostilities.

But he wants to go down in history as the godfather of Greater Israel. That's pure and simple. And even if he goes, for whatever reason, and he's replaced by another bloodthirsty Zionist former terrorist like Naftali Bennett, it's going to be the same. The hard line in Israel will not accept any kind of withdrawal at this point. They feel that they're in complete ascendancy, that they're realizing their long-term dreams — the expansion of Israel and eliminating what they call the Palestinian problem or the Arab problem. And they have their own final solution to that, and they're in the process of enacting it. And nobody's going to stop them. No one's going to stop them. Look at what they're doing to the city of Tyre.

It's unbelievable. Just saying, leave, leave. Third biggest city in Lebanon, and protected by UNESCO as a World Heritage Site. Israel doesn't care. They're like, yeah, so what? You got Egyptian history, Alexander the Great, ancient Greece, Byzantine history, Roman history, New Testament — we don't care. That's, you know, get out. And we're going to, you know, vaporize all that, and it's going to become a military base. Fine. Who's stopping them? Who's going to stop them besides Hezbollah? Who's going to put up a fight? Maybe Iran. So that's, to me, an inescapable reality politically in Israel. And so eliminating the threat of Hezbollah is going to be pushing them all the way to Beirut.

And permanently. And that looks like the plan right now. So, yeah, the only thing that could stop that is an internal political crisis in Israel and maybe a fracturing or a collapse of the Israeli military. And Iran could actually play a role in that if things were to escalate. So that does bring us back to your original point about whether Iran is going to initiate the next round of interactions. Because if they do, then they're setting the pace. And the U.S. and Israel are going to react. And how long could the U.S. and Israel withhold that pace? A couple of weeks? Right. Certainly, they would prefer to do that in a year's time.

#Danny

Yeah.

#Patrick Henningsen

I think not now. So that could be an interesting — that would be a major, major surprise. I believe that would change the pace of everything. It also might force a desperate hand by the U.S. and the

Israelis. There will be talk of nuclear weapons. But if they were to set the pace, that would also mean it would be a better bet for China and Russia to take more of an active role in assisting them. That's what that would mean. So, yeah.

#Danny

Yeah. Yeah, there's certainly a lot to chew on here. And even just the actions of — and you said it earlier — you said it's a big problem that Trump is not talking to Iran. And not, you know, of course, Hezbollah — what a joke, given how the U.S. and Israel have treated Hezbollah as a non-political entity when it's the most important one in Lebanon by far. But nonetheless, by Iran having made these threats and then Trump having to kind of scramble to manage the narrative. And now there's talk of a postponement of at least the expanded strikes, however truthful or meaningless it may be or not be.

This kind of shows the new reality here, that Iran is really—patience is running thin. They're saying that patience has its limits, and they've just stuck their neck out for a suburb in Lebanon, which is very, very, very, I think, significant in the sense that they are not banking their political futures, and their future in any respect, on the United States. And I think this shows the diminishment of the United States big time, because it really is. Israel's in the region. They've been empowered in large part by the United States to behave the way they do.

And, you know, the U.S. is quickly becoming irrelevant, other than how it boosts Israel in many ways. And here's just one image that came out of Iranian media right before they started hitting Kuwait. This was the sticker they put on the missile: "Until the last American soldier leaves the region." I mean, this is not a short war for any of these forces — not for Iran, not for Hezbollah. It seems like they're pretty clear on this. Any final thoughts as we begin to close this? And we have one question: Do you think Iran will reassess its stance on striking now to save Lebanon? So any thoughts on this question too, if you have any?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, if hostilities do resume, then I would say any Israeli targets within South Lebanon are fair game for Iran, and also northern Israel as well. That wasn't necessarily a focus previously, I think, for Iran. But if you combine that with Hezbollah's operations, if there's any, let's say, coordination there, or at least they're hitting targets in the same area, that's going to be devastating for the Israelis, at least. So that's going to really hamper their operations. So, yeah, this could be interesting. We'll see.

I think Iran has a lot more leverage over the U.S. and Israel than vice versa at the moment. That's ultimately the big change in things. That's how you have to view it, through that lens. Where were they in February 2020? And where are they now on June 1st? That's the big lens. In fact, that's the only one that really matters in a war of attrition — who has gained and who has lost, relatively

speaking, in their position in that power dynamic. And it's pretty clear Iran has gained on pretty much every front, and the U.S. has lost ground on every front. So, you know, that's the main thing to remember.

#Danny

Yeah. Well, I want to make sure everybody knows, Patrick, that they can support you and your work both on your YouTube channel, 21st Century Wire, and your Substack, both of which are in the video description. Patrick, any last words to the audience as we close out here?

#Patrick Henningsen

No, that's about it. Appreciate it, Danny. Yeah, it could all go. Fireworks could begin at any moment. We don't know. We don't know. We hope they won't, but it is looking very interesting and worrying at the moment, so we'll see.

#Danny

Indeed. All right, everybody, hit that like button before you go. That helps boost the show. After we end here, Patrick's links are in the video description below, as well as all the places to support this channel. I'll be back tomorrow at 4 p.m. Eastern Time, a bit later, but I will let you know what is going on a bit sooner before the program. So see you tomorrow and take care. Bye-bye.