

Patrick Henningsen: Hezbollah Just Drew the Line: 'Israel Out of Lebanon Completely

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 Thursday, June 4th, 2026, and our dear friend Patrick Henningsen is here with us. Welcome, Patrick.

#Patrick

Good to be with you, Nima.

#Nima

Patrick, let's start with yesterday. What has happened with the case of Lebanon? The United States announced that there is an agreement between the government in Lebanon and the Israelis. What are the points? What are the terms or the clauses of this agreement? Hezbollah must reportedly halt all attacks and withdraw from south of the Litani River — that's the first point. And Lebanon stated that it has no hostile intentions toward Israel and reportedly designated Hezbollah as an enemy of the Lebanese state. The Lebanese Armed Forces would assume exclusive security control in designated areas, excluding non-state armed groups. Both sides reaffirmed they don't seek conflict with one another and agreed to continue direct talks toward broader security and peace arrangements.

And political and security negotiations are expected to resume during the week of June 22nd with continued US mediation. Looking at this, is that going to make sense for anybody, do you think, in Lebanon? I'm not talking about the government, the people, and Hezbollah. Because the problem with Israel is the fight between Hezbollah and Lebanon, and the problem of the occupation of the southern part of Lebanon is not related to the Lebanese government. And how do you see the thing? Because Donald Trump is somehow desperate. He knows Iran is putting pressure on him, because

they said they're going to attack the northern part of Israel. And you see, he came out with this sort of—I don't see any sort of future for this agreement. But what is happening, in your mind, with the case of Israel and Lebanon?

#Patrick

The draft proposal that you just read there, that was written either by Washington or a combination of Washington and Israel. They wrote it, and they would hand it to the Lebanese government and tell them that's the agreement that you're going to put forward. It's impossible that this would have come from Lebanon or from anyone in Lebanon, realistically speaking. And what you have in Beirut at the moment is what we call a trustee government — a trustee government. So, like when you have a prison and the prison warden nominates a few prisoners to be trustees to govern over the other prisoners — they have no power, they have no sovereignty.

They're just there, uh, symbolically to deal with, you know, the inmates, uh, as it were. Uh, that's what, uh, Joseph Aoun and Nawaf Salam are — the president, uh, and prime minister of Lebanon at the moment. These are effectively appointed by the United States and Israel. So this is total American and Zionist control over Lebanon. And their goal, the United States' goal — they've been very public about it. Tom Barrack is Trump's former fixer, business fixer in the region. And then he got promoted to special envoy or ambassador to Turkey, and then he's suddenly special envoy dealing with Lebanon. He's been very open that he wants to see a civil war in Lebanon.

He's not using those exact words, but he's talking about using the Lebanese military to disarm Hezbollah. That's effectively promoting the idea or forcing the idea of an armed civil war in Lebanon. And, you know, this is very easy for Americans to be talking like this because they're not Lebanese. They have no stake in Lebanon. Lebanon is just a space on a chessboard for the Americans. And for Israel, it's future territory that they want to annex. That's all. So when you hear Tom Barrack or Trump or anybody from the U.S. or from the Atlantic Council or the State Department — what passes for a State Department these days in America, which is basically an annex of the Israeli embassy, effectively.

But when you hear this type of rhetoric, this is just basically the U.S. working with Israel, pretending to be separate parties — the U.S. pretending to want to restrain Israel — when in fact they're an absolutely, completely perfect partnership. And they're reading from exactly the same page. Americans do not care about Lebanese civilians. As far as Americans are concerned, Arabs living in South Lebanon are a nuisance, and they would like to see them moved out. They would like to see that area depopulated like Gaza and the West Bank, and to make way for more settlements, more expansion of Israel. So that's an important part of the Greater Israel Project — the annexation of South Lebanon, not just to the Litani River, because Israel needs the freshwater source. They can't be dependent on desalination.

They need Lebanon's freshwater. So effectively, Israel has always coveted Lebanese freshwater. They want to steal it. They want to steal that river, that water, just like they've stolen the Golan Heights, just like they are planning to steal. And this is important, Nima. It's not just the Litani River. Israel would like a buffer zone above the Litani River. Why? Because it's not just about what's on land in Lebanon. It's what's offshore. We're talking about natural gas deposits off of Lebanon. The United States, through its various agents and financial institutions and by creating a lot of sectarian division and arguments among Lebanese billionaires, Lebanon has not been able to exploit its natural gas deposits off the coast of the Levant.

Hence, while the billionaires are arguing over who's going to get it, it's not being properly exploited. Lebanon continues to be a sort of defunct economy, a dysfunctional economy, with a currency in free fall — you know, a complete disaster. That's all by design because Israel has always wanted to maintain that as a non-performing energy asset of Lebanon to buy time, so they could get into position to take it. And now they're very close to getting it. And that's one of the main prizes in all of this, besides fresh water, and also to steal the very, very fertile agricultural land in the south, in much the same way the Israelis have already stolen and illegally occupied the Shebaa Farms. That's Lebanese territory as well.

And so that's very profitable, fertile agricultural land, which Israel is seeking to take and then to eventually export products from there. And if you look at what Israel does whenever it steals territory, it very quickly goes to develop the economic assets of the lands that it steals, and then it will want to make that a performing economic asset. And that just further, sort of in their mind, justifies the fact that they're there. They're going to occupy it illegally, and they're going to take it. And they say, well, you know, the people who were here before, the Palestinians or whoever, they weren't doing anything with this land. So we just took it, and now it's profitable. Now it's developed. And it's because of us, the Israelis.

So if they're allowed to, they will continue this pattern of behavior into Lebanon, onshore and offshore. That's the first thing. So they've cloaked this under the idea of security, okay? And then one of the big sort of frauds in all of this, unfortunately, and really this is at the core of a lot of the problems in the region, and the big enabler of Israel, is to label everybody a terrorist — anybody that is opposing their aggression, their occupation. And remember, Nima, Israel has, throughout all of this and years prior to October 7th, always maintained possession illegally of Lebanese territory. They never fully withdrew from South Lebanon. They still maintain illegally occupied pieces of land in South Lebanon.

That is why Hezbollah exists. From the beginning, Hezbollah, as a political movement, as an indigenous organic militia, defense militia, armed liberation struggle, opposing an illegal occupation of their land. By definition, under international law and the UN Charter, that's the classification of Hezbollah. And that goes for Palestinian resistance as well. Okay, that is why they have a mandate to do what they're doing. And so it's about defending the border because the Lebanese army, what

they call the Lebanese army—bless them—but they're just a jumped-up security force, a domestic security force. The Americans, because of—and this is coming from Israel.

One of the important roles of the Israeli lobby in America is to make sure that pressure is placed on Washington to dictate terms for the Lebanese military — what they can and what they cannot purchase as a military. And Israel has insisted that Washington impose restrictions on the Lebanese military so they cannot have any air defense, forbidden by the Americans, so they cannot have an air force, forbidden by the Americans. That's kind of ridiculous if you think about it, but that is the actual state of play in Lebanon. Because Israel needed to have full occupational control over Lebanese airspace for the last few decades. One of the important reasons for that is Israel wanted to have access to Lebanese airspace in order to send its IDF jets into Lebanese airspace to fire missiles on Syria for 15 years and to do it with total impunity.

And if Lebanon had air defense or any ability to police their own airspace, Israel would not have been able to basically act as the moderate rebel or al-Qaeda — their air force of al-Qaeda and the moderate rebels in Syria from 2011 forward, until al-Qaeda took control of Damascus with Mohammed al-Jolani, al-Sharar, as he's called now, Ahmed al-Sharar. So Abu Mohammed al-Jolani, Ahmed al-Sharar — I think I got that right. Yeah, so the former deputy to Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi in ISIS and the founder of al-Qaeda in Syria, who Donald Trump has lauded and invited to the White House and sprays perfume on him and does selfies — that's a head-chopping al-Qaeda leader. He benefited from Israel's air support.

He and all the other terrorists backed by the United States, backed by Israel, trained and backed by Jordan, backed by Turkey, backed by France, backed by the Netherlands, backed by the UK, backed by Germany, backed by pretty much NATO full stop, backed by Saudi Arabia, backed by Qatar, backed by the UAE, backed by Kuwait. So Lebanon is very important because that allowed for constant and very safe deployment of air missiles and munitions and so forth, hitting targets constantly in Syria. That ultimately led to it being a failed state, hitting infrastructure, claiming that they were targeting Hezbollah. So that's very important. So it's very easy to create this civil war situation in Lebanon. It's very easy for the United States and Israel to try to engineer this, okay? But the fact remains, the Lebanese army, they're not equipped to fight Hezbollah.

They won't. I don't believe they can credibly do that. It would lead to a sectarian civil war in Lebanon, you know, after the country has recovered from, you know, decades of Western and Israeli-imposed civil war, which the first Lebanese civil war was characterized in such a way that even Lebanese were brainwashed to think that it was between factions within Lebanon. So they're constantly suspicious, taking sides, partisan, sectarian mentality that developed in that country, where it's very clear when you look at the history and you step back, that it wasn't a civil war, it was a foreign war. Lebanon was used as the battle space for it. That was really, in many ways, a war between Syria and Israel as much as anything. And Lebanon was the battlefield for that.

And it was the United States working either behind the scenes or in the front of house during the Reagan administration, and then later behind the scenes with USAID money, the CIA working behind the scenes, to maintain this level of instability and dysfunction in that country. And so here we are in 2026 — America, the neocons, the warmongering party led by Donald Trump and Netanyahu in Israel — they believe they're very close to achieving their ultimate goal, which is to wipe out any dissent, any resistance in the Levant. And the problem is that it's probably not going to be practical. It's not going to work. And the idea that you could get a Lebanese government to say that they wish no harm on Israel after Israel's been massacring Lebanese civilians, massacring people in Beirut, people in Tyre, people right across Nabatieh, right across the entirety of the south.

It's laughable, and it's such a betrayal of the Lebanese people by this puppet, this U.S., American and Israeli puppet government. It's shameless that any Lebanese official would read such a statement, but you can tell it was drafted in Washington. It's very clear. The arrogance in that statement — it's a foreign-drafted statement, probably more like drafted in Tel Aviv, rubber-stamped in Washington, and then handed to the Lebanese president and prime minister, and they'll stick it on their desk and say, "Read that, read that." And that's that. So realistically, it's almost impossible for them to implement this, besides the fact that, you know, Israel's just been bombing with impunity.

They're now bombing the UNESCO World Heritage protected site, the city of Tyre. There are so many different civilizations layered on top of each other entirely. It's a wonderful and amazing piece of history. And Israel has no qualms, nor does the United States, about leveling that city, turning it into a pile of rubble, and then getting Jared Kushner or whoever to build some new high-rise towers there and say there's going to be a resort there. They have no problem with that at all. Alexander the Great, Egyptian, Byzantine, Roman — further afield going back. There's so much history in Tyre. And then the excuse that Israel says is, well, there's Hezbollah hiding in the Christian area, so we're going to flatten that and kill, you know, an 80% civilian, 20% combatant kill ratio, casualty ratio.

So many civilians will die. But it's not just that. It's about destroying the dwellings. There's also a major Palestinian refugee camp still in Tyre. I don't know how many people are there. It's very densely packed. I've been to Tyre many times. I know it very well. Very densely packed — 200-plus thousand people in that very, very small Palestinian refugee camp. So Israel will use these as excuses, as they have done forever. This is constant. During the Lebanese Civil War in the 80s and 90s, the whole basis of Israeli involvement was that they were taking out Palestinian terrorists in Lebanon. And now it's Hezbollah — same exact excuse.

Hezbollah would not exist if not for Israel's illegal and brutal occupation of South Lebanon. Full stop. And Hezbollah is not a proxy of Iran. That is a fake talking point that keeps being pushed ad nauseam by the United States, okay? They're not. They're absolutely from South Lebanon. There's no question about that. And they don't have an expeditionary terrorist branch, okay? It's not al-

Qaeda or ISIS, okay? Whatever you believe those organizations actually are, but it's nothing like that. But that's how it's been classified legally and proscribed by the United States, Israel, Brussels, the UK, Germany, France, and a few other European countries, Canada, and the U.S., and that's it.

So, and that gives you basically carte blanche to carpet bomb anywhere where you suspect that these so-called terrorists will be, including—look at Gaza. That's the whole basis of the genocide in Gaza. It was a war on terror. That was the banner that Israel perpetrated this genocide under. Simple. So it's the same. This is the source of so many problems in the region. It's the proscription and the labeling that gives the perpetrators, the state actors, the license to enact state terror policies of total annihilation in the war on terror, according to their legal justification. And that creates the instability. It creates the crisis. It creates the wars. It's the same reason that the U.S. and Israel have been attacking Iran. They're claiming that Iran is a terrorist state, that they're funding terrorism, and so forth.

But the bottom line is, if you strip back all of these labels, anybody who's resisting the U.S. or Israeli aggression or occupation will at some point be labeled a terrorist by the legal system in the West and by Israel, of course. And that's just a constant pattern that keeps repeating itself over the last 50 or 60 years. Well, let's say 50 years, and especially in the last 30 years. And I will argue from an academic, objective point of view that we cannot have any dialogue or any meaningful, objective analysis, dialogue, or any solutions, much less any political settlement, so long as the U.S. and its allies cling to this policy of extrajudicially proscribing, labeling, and then any resistance to war crimes or genocide or occupation or apartheid, labeling them terrorists.

And it's kind of a problem historically. I think we'll look back at this period in history, Nima, the last 40 years especially, and we'll realize what an absolute catastrophe it's been. And it's been a catastrophe because it's been given legal cover, pure and simple, to override international law, you see. So this idea—this is the basis of all Israeli action—is that they don't believe that they have to abide by or recognize any humanitarian, any UN, any international law, nothing, because they are waging a war on terror, pure and simple. And I think, stepping back in history, if we are lucky enough to live long enough as a society to be able to look back and analyze the last 40 years, I think that's exactly what the experts will conclude, despite what people say to me.

#Nima

I think the point that you raised about the fresh water and how Israel is dependent on fresh water because they're using desalination plants right now—and you mentioned the Litani River—the same case is applicable to what's going on in the southern part of Syria. The territory under Israeli occupation right now is producing 20% of the fresh water of Syria, 20% just under the Israeli occupation right now. They're using that land, and we understand what's going on in the minds of these people who want a bigger fight, who want to expand the war to Turkey, to Egypt, as they were talking about it—the next step is going to be Turkey and Egypt after Iran.

But putting all that together, Patrick, do you think with what's going on right now in Lebanon—even Axios reported that significant progress has been made—serious disagreements still exist, including the timing of Israel's full withdrawal from Lebanon and Hezbollah's disarmament and security guarantees. These are all related, I would say. And there is no way, I don't see anything of that sort happening—Israel withdrawing totally from the southern part of Lebanon. And the only reason that we have these sorts of discussions here is because Hezbollah is capable of fighting back.

Hezbollah is capable of hitting Israel, the Israeli army. So that's why they're asking for more negotiation, because there is no viable choice for them right now in the southern part of Lebanon fighting Hezbollah. That's why, you know, you can make the argument that Iran is putting pressure on Donald Trump to put an end to the war. Iran is doing that. But at the same time, Israel is desperate in the southern part of Lebanon. As the Israeli ambassador to the UN said, this FPV drone is turning into a disaster for Israel, and they have no solution for that.

#Patrick

Well, he has said that, and that is a problem for Israel. The FPV drone operations by Hezbollah are very effective. But, you know, Israel could withdraw militarily from lots of positions in South Lebanon, but then they would reserve the right to conduct airstrikes on targets at any time, on demand, indefinitely into the future. Because you have to understand, Israel views South Lebanon as future Israeli territory. That's how they view it. They view that as an important piece in the future of the Greater Israel Project. So if you understand that, you'll know that any rhetoric in terms of negotiations, withdrawal, peace agreements—they have no intention, long-term, of abiding by any type of agreements.

They have an objective, which is they want all of that land, they want all the resources in it, and they'll do that under the fake, completely fabricated excuse that it has to do with their security and them feeling safe. So again, it's Israel saying, we need to massacre thousands of Arabs. We need to take and steal all of their land. We need to destroy hundreds of thousands of homes that have been destroyed in South Lebanon. Hundreds of thousands of homes destroyed, hundreds of villages destroyed, so that Israel can feel safe. So they say, we reserve the right to commit genocide again.

Again, this is a textbook, textbook ongoing genocide in deed and in word and in intent, legally speaking. It is a textbook genocide in South Lebanon. And they reserve the right to do that so they feel safe. Try to wrap your head around that logic. It is just extraordinary. So I would say any statements, interim statements by any Israeli officials, are insincere. They're moving around, trying to tactically maneuver in order to get from A to B. And they're willing to withdraw, as they have in the past. Israel has withdrawn in the past, but they're back again.

#Nima

And they're back, much worse and much more deadly than they were before.

#Patrick

That's the thing. Take the long view of history here and look at it. Whereas before they would have been happy to employ a proxy force, to act as trustees in South Lebanon, and that was fine for Israel, but they don't need to do that anymore. They did that already in the 80s and 90s. They don't need to do that anymore because they established a new rule set. The new rule set is that they reserve the right to enact a scorched earth policy of total annihilation — total annihilation of cities, towns, villages, homes — expel populations, displace millions of people. They reserve the right to do that, and they've proven that they've done it already in Gaza. And the precedent here, the main precedent, is that no country in the West has been willing to restrain them. So they are free to commit genocide again, be it in the West Bank, South Lebanon, wherever.

#Nima

Patrick, what is the situation with Donald Trump and his ongoing war against Iran? We have the confrontation. I think the recent two just – we had two confrontations recently in the last week. And today, two days ago, we had a new confrontation, which is, if you look at the scale of what's going on, it's just going up and up. You know, it's increasing. They are scaling up the attacks. That's why you see the American attack on a tanker. You remember when the ceasefire started, they attacked many of these tankers in the Persian Gulf. But the reaction from Iran was not that aggressive, you know, not the way it was against Kuwait and Bahrain, as we saw two days ago. And this is the reality of how the escalation is happening in the Persian Gulf.

So you attack a tanker, we're going to hit all your bases in Kuwait and Bahrain. We're going to hit even the international bases, the airport in Kuwait. We don't know if it was an Iranian drone or missile. We still don't know that. But this is the outcome of what's going on, the escalation that is happening between Iran and the United States. And we had the case of Lebanon, Iran putting pressure, Iran saying to Donald Trump and Israel, if you attack Dahiyeh, which we know how populated Dahiyeh is — it's a very populated area in the city, we can call it a city — about 400,000 people live there or something like that. And you announce some sort of evacuation and you have to get out of your homes, getting out of the region.

Then Iran announced they're going to hit the northern part of Israel. Everyone should evacuate. Then we've seen some sort of phone call between Benjamin Netanyahu and Donald Trump, and you know what happened during that phone call. But the outcome was disagreement. As you see, disagreement. I don't see Iran cares about what's going on with this agreement. Nobody would care. Hezbollah doesn't recognize it. Iran doesn't recognize it. It doesn't see it as a step toward some sort of deal with the United States. But the Trump administration, how do you see the way that Donald Trump is dealing with the case of Iran and what's going on in the Persian Gulf?

#Patrick

I think, you see, the problem here is, when you amass so much military hardware, power, and assets in the region, you've got a lot of things that are waiting to do jobs, waiting to get busy. And I think the U.S. has been poking and testing controlled escalation with Iran to see — maybe they're testing weaknesses in advance of a bigger operation. This is always possible, and I'm sure that's part of the program. Absolutely, that's to be expected. But, of course, they're also testing what Iran's response is going to be to some of these, you know, poking the Iranians in this way strategically. And as you can see, if it's a substantial response from the Iranians, like what we've seen, then that could go two ways. Either Iran's established some deterrence control, or it could escalate. The United States could re-escalate as a result of that. But that seems somehow unlikely at the moment.

It seems to me, politically speaking, I might be wrong, but it seems to me like the political window for a major follow-up attack by the United States has already passed. Because the problem with Trump and the U.S. government is, the longer they wait and the closer they veer towards the midterm elections, there's going to be no victory of any U.S. incursion or bombing run. I mean, they could do a symbolic airstrike, do another, quote, "Midnight Hammer" — you know, these titles of these operations are just childish. But anyway, it's just ridiculous even using these terms. But I'll just do it — "Midnight Hammer." They could do another "Midnight Hammer," and then Trump could declare victory, you know, at the end of June, the one-year anniversary. It's coming up, isn't it? So you could easily do that, and you could probably get away with it. In Trump world, in America world — okay, Washington world — you could probably get away with it.

And I believe that if you time this with an invasion of Cuba or some kind of attack on Cuba, that would work. Because Americans have very short memories. I mean, they could be all into Iran for a year, and then you show them another shiny object, and everybody will gravitate towards that. The media will go, "Cuba, Cuba," and it will all be about Cuba. Or it could be Taiwan. They could make it all about Taiwan. They could just shift the public. America is like—the political economy in America runs like a type of cult. And the media's involved, Washington's involved, and they're very adept at just taking the public's perception and shifting it very quickly.

And they could even shift it onto some missing person in Colorado or, you know, some serial killer or a disease, you know, a new virus or something like that. So if Trump did some kind of symbolic military action, got the media to wave the flag, put his bomber jacket on, said, "Mission accomplished, victory, fight, fight, fight, on to the midterms, and let's go hit Cuba and get a win. Let's get a win in Cuba." That would work. That would work as far as America is concerned. That'll work in the American political context. But that doesn't change the structural realities of West Asia, which have been changed forever. And the power dynamics, the distribution of power in the Middle East, West Asia, has been transformed, and it can't be changed. That includes the Strait of Hormuz.

That includes the balance of power in the Persian Gulf, the relationship, the relative hierarchy between the Iranians, the Gulf states, and also Israel, too. And Israel, too. Now, as you can see, Nima, Israel and the U.S. only understand the language of force. So Iran saying that they're going to target northern Israel or even threatening to get involved militarily, hitting military targets in the

north, and also that would include any military positions in south Lebanon—I'm talking about Israeli military positions—the Iranians could target those. When you combine that with Hezbollah operations, that is potentially a major defeat for Israel militarily. They would not be able to cope. Absolutely. And that's one weak point.

If Iran decides to push the button on that, there's little the U.S. could do. There's very little they could do, especially considering all the war crimes that Israel has committed in Lebanon, especially over the last 12 months. Nobody is going to shed a tear or have any sympathy for the Israelis, no matter how much Danny Danon is going to cry at the UN Security Council, decrying, "Too many drones, too many drones." It's just a comedy show. It's not going to happen. So that's one area, I think, where Iran has established some kind of a deterrence or dominance there. So it's because of the threat of force. And combined with Hezbollah and what they're doing, both hitting Israeli positions in South Lebanon or in northern Israel, devastating.

The other weak point is that because the United States has lost a lot of its operational capability to stage military operations in the Persian Gulf, they're left with very few options on land in the region. One of them is Ben Gurion Airport, which is being used as a staging ground for the Americans. We're talking about C-130s, we're talking about air-to-air refueling tankers, all that. So that's a weak point because all Iran has to do is just destroy Ben Gurion Airport, and, you know, what are the Americans going to do then? Saudi Arabia is off-limits. That's not going to happen. Al-Udeid in Qatar, that's not a viable option. Kuwait, well, you told us what happened in Kuwait and what will continue to happen.

Bahrain as well is severely damaged. The Fifth Fleet base in Bahrain, the U.S. base there. And, of course, the UAE is very much exposed and probably could not withstand many more barrages before their economy or any direct foreign investment just runs away forever from the UAE. So Israel is one of the last footholds for the U.S. military, believe it or not. This idea that they can be reliant on carrier groups to create enforcement in the region, it's not very practical for many reasons — militarily, economically, and just... it's just not. So this is a very much weakened — the United States in West Asia, very much weakened with fewer options.

And so if they can't provide that protection umbrella for the Israelis, then that's it. The game's over for Israel. It relies on U.S. protection and the U.S. doing the heavy lifting by either attacking their adversaries like Iran or creating an umbrella of deterrence to protect Israel in the region. That's what the entire U.S. footprint in West Asia is really about. It's not about protecting the petrodollar, as we can see, because the United States doesn't care about any of these Arab countries, not really. It's about protecting Israel. And it's expensive. It costs a lot more than \$3.8 billion in military aid to Israel. That's just on paper. That's just the shopping list that Israel will shop at Uncle Sam's military hardware store and gets that free check every year. That's a fraction of the real cost that the U.S. spends to defend Israel.

Add up all of those bases, all of the naval deployments, a good percentage of the operations in Germany at Ramstein and Stuttgart — a lot of that is allocated towards operations in West Asia. And

we have Greece, and we have multiple bases in Italy and across Europe and the UK. In one way or another, a large percentage of those military operations, their main concern is protecting Israel or, in the case of hostilities, attacking Iran. That's been demonstrated very, very clearly since February 28th. What is the cost of all that? What does that actually cost per year? We're getting up into, you know, 50 billion U.S. per year, plus, plus, plus — maybe 100 plus, 150 plus. I don't know. How can you calculate it? But it's a lot more than \$3.8 billion. So that's the shadow cost of the U.S. defending and protecting Israel.

So Israel — why does the U.S. need to defend and protect Israel? Why? So that Israel can attack its neighbors and it can parlay land and resources in the region for its own use. And the long-term name of that is the Greater Israel Project, which Benjamin Netanyahu publicly unveiled in September. So it's not a secret anymore. It's not a conspiracy theory. That is the basis of the U.S. support for Israel. So that's the real conversation, but the conversation in the media and politically will be slightly different — ceasefires, peace agreements, security concerns, terrorism threats. That's the sort of fake conversation that we have to endure on a daily basis if we live in the West, listening to our governments, listening to this clown, Netanyahu, unfortunately. But the real story is what I just laid out there.

#Nima

I think what you mentioned about Ben-Gurion Airport is so important. If there were something going on between Israel and Iran, they could hit Ben-Gurion Airport. And you see what is happening — there are a lot of these aircraft at Ben-Gurion Airport, and they're in the open, and they could hit Israel. That could be a disaster for Donald Trump if something of that sort happened.

#Patrick

So, I mean, think of how long it would take to deploy 60 air refueling tankers, U.S., that are on the tarmac now, by the way, taking up space that would normally be used by commercial airlines. That means hundreds, thousands of flights have been canceled. Normal commercial routes have been canceled in order to make space for the U.S. military in Ben Gurion. This is what we've seen this week, okay? How long would it take to deploy them in the event of an Iranian missile attack? To get the crew ready, unless they're ready to deploy at a moment's notice — they may not be, but let's say they are — about 20 minutes. Well, what's the flight time from Iran for a missile attack? What are we talking about? 20 minutes? 20, 25 minutes? I mean, it's very similar time frames. So if the Iranians decided that Ben Gurion Airport is the source of a lot of problems...

#Nima

And they don't have—sorry for interrupting—they don't have the early warning systems they had in the Persian Gulf. They don't know if a missile is coming.

#Patrick

That's right. And a lot of those capabilities have been taken out previously. So that's a huge weakness. Very much exposed. It's just not good to have all of your eggs in one basket anyway. But unfortunately, the U.S. doesn't have a lot of options. In the Persian Gulf, there is no U.S. deterrence. They're not able to flex in the Middle East the way they have been before. And it's because Iran has shown the world and the region that it is prepared to defend itself and use force against the United States. And they've taken absolutely the best conventional blows the U.S. has to offer, 100%. And quite frankly, the best conventional blows that Israel has to offer. Iran's taken from both of them.

No other country in the world has taken direct action — full-blown conventional military force — from the U.S. and Israel, but just from the U.S. alone. Russia hasn't had to face that. China's never faced that. There's no country that's faced that and been able to maintain their footing and hit back and inflict severe damage on the U.S. Show me any country in the world that has ever done that. Since, I don't know, World War II? I suppose Japan could. And on continental Europe, maybe Germany. But that's a long time ago. That's like 80 years ago, right? How about in the last 60 years? Vietnam, it's a different story. But in terms of the latest modern iteration of high-tech weaponry and satellite-driven warfare, nobody has.

Yeah, we'll put Vietnam in that category, sure. Put Korea in that category. But recently, in the last 40 years, 50 years, nobody. Nobody. Only Iran. Only Iran. On their feet, hitting back and inflicting damage. So the U.S. is in a very weak position. And here's the main thing that you need to remember, Nima, that everybody needs to remember, is that—ask the simple question. Simple question to any American official: are you in a better position now in June 2026 than you were on February 27th, 2026? And the answer is, on the political front, on the military front, on the economic front, geopolitically in the region, the answer is no, you're not. So who's winning? I rest my case.

#Nima

And Patrick, do you think that Donald Trump has got to the point where the continuation of the war can deepen his problems, or he's not there yet? He's not there yet. He's getting there, but he's not there yet. What is your assessment of the current situation with the Trump administration, which we know is fully influenced by the Zionists in the United States and outside the United States?

#Patrick

I think Trump, among his many faults and among his many problematic characteristics and narcissistic personality disorders, is a very keen poll watcher. So he does pay attention to the polls, and the polls are very clear. They're very clear on this war, how it's affected the administration, that he is being blamed for the economic deprivation that is happening and will probably really spiral out

of control in the next couple of weeks as the U.S. goes into full-blown, and the world goes into full-blown, economic down-spiraling due to massive shortages in terms of fuel, energy, jet fuel, petroleum, gas, fertilizer, food crises, food inflation. It's all baked in now.

It's inescapable. And he will get blamed for it. He should get blamed for it. He and Israel should be blamed for all of it. And they will be. And he knows that. So now Trump is in that kind of very unique position where reality has finally come to bear. And now, rather than believing he's going to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat, he's probably now, I think, more pragmatically looking for ways to cut his losses and go into full-blown spin PR mode to try to manufacture some kind of a victory — symbolic victory, public relations, virtual victory, if you will — and then focus on the domestic political disaster that's coming in the midterms. The polling is devastating for Republicans.

They will lose the House and the Senate massively. It's going to be a blowout. If you go by today's polling, OK, it's going to be a blowout, and that's going to be devastating. Already, Trump-endorsed candidates, be they gubernatorial or other candidates, they're not doing well. Some of them have already lost in their primary or their election bids. AIPAC-backed candidates, Israeli-backed candidates, are losing. So it's not looking good. I think the public has wised up. The War Powers Resolution passed in the House this week. So while Thomas Massie was defeated by the Israeli lobby and they plowed \$35 million into pushing him out of the House of Representatives, Thomas Massie's War Powers Resolution in the House passed this week.

That's a huge victory. That's a first, actually. This has never happened before. Now, the president is not going to be able to veto that because technically it's what they call a concurrent resolution. So I don't think he'll be — no, he won't be able to do that. The Senate, however, passed a similar resolution. So that — they want to limit Trump's power regarding the — yes, a joint resolution could be vetoed, technicality. But the main point is this, that there were enough Republican rebels to make those majorities happen, and that wasn't even the case two months ago. OK, that's the difference.

And if he vetoes the Senate resolution or anything like this, or attempts to, that's going to be a noose around his neck, politically speaking, because it's going to further reinforce the idea that he is a warmongering president and he's brought all of this economic hardship forward on America and the world because of his warmongering, basically, and by being a stooge of Netanyahu and the Israeli lobby. And, you know, there's no secret now that Trump is an absolute marionette of the Israel lobby and the Israeli billionaire class led by Miriam Adelson and Ronald Lauder and all the rest of it, and Jeffrey Epstein's still-existing puppet strings that still have connections right through to Trump himself and the entire White House and half his cabinet, and a whole bunch of other people that matter.

So that's just a reality. Him pushing back against the democratic process in the House or the Senate in terms of restraining the president from carrying on with this open-ended war and all these airstrikes against Iran, that's just further going to tighten the political noose around his own neck, especially coming into the midterms. And his legacy is written in stone. He cannot avoid it. Donald

Trump, it's unavoidable. He will go down as the worst president in the history of the United States of America of all time. It's unavoidable. He's already got his — they can make the plaque already. Put it up there, wherever that plaque goes. It's been written. He can't avoid it now. He thinks he's going to get his face on Mount Rushmore next to Abe Lincoln.

#Nima

He really thought that. He really thought that this war against Iran was going to bring that for him.

#Patrick

Yeah, a golden statue. So that's the reality. So it's cut your losses. That's the political reality. And that's not a mode that Trump has been used to. In the last year and a half, he's been able to get his way, and now the blowback has happened. And not only that, if the blowback is severe, then other Trump allies will fall by the wayside, and he'll become more and more isolated. And that's a very, very ugly and uncomfortable position to be in as a U.S. president. And that's kind of what he's looking at after the midterms — very isolated — and he will be impeached. He may not be convicted in the Senate, although it might be close after the midterms. But he will go through the rigmarole of the impeachment hearings.

And they have actual — unlike the first term where the two impeachments were basically fabricated, very weak cases mainly to do with Ukraine — one of them — and the other to do, I believe, with January 6th. Now you have actual hard evidence for corruption, insider trading, graft, nepotism regarding his family, plus the Polymarket trades and all this manipulation. I mean, so there's no shortage of, you know, attack vectors that his opposition have to really make life uncomfortable for him during the impeachment process. And I know also all of his allies and family, too. So many of them are going down. And that's a fact. And I think for him, you know, he said something. Last thing I'll say is it's worth pointing out.

While he was gloating about his ballroom project the other day to the media, he made a statement that nobody had heard before. He said, I won't be able to enjoy all of this ballroom and the bunker underneath and all that. I'm not going to, because I'll be gone by the time it's finished. I'll be out of office. He never openly said he would be out of office before. There was always this lingering idea that Steve Bannon and others were putting out that Trump is going to get his third term by changing the rules or the law or a new amendment or whatever. So this is the first time Trump has admitted last week that he has no designs on a third term. So that's interesting. I had not heard that before. I will mark that as significant, politically speaking.

But it also means I think he probably feels he has enough money, socked away enough billions that he's protected, and he'll be able to sort of live a self-contained and self-sufficient, have a self-sufficient power base when he's out of office. Because he's going to be attacked legally, politically, he's going to be a very unpopular figure. He's not going to be able to travel anywhere. He will be

treated a lot worse than George Bush was after Bush finished his second term. People are going to be much more hostile to Trump, not just in America. He will not be welcome anywhere in the world. The only place he'd probably be welcome is in Israel, if it exists in five years or whenever he's out of office. He's going to have a very hard time. He'll be treated a lot like Tony Blair was in the UK after the Iraq war. Tony Blair spent most of his time outside of the UK after the war because people were doing citizens' arrests.

He couldn't go anywhere without being confronted. He was just so reviled by the British public because of the fact he lied the country into the Iraq war and then lied about it afterwards. He became the most unpopular, hated political figure in British history, pretty much. So, Trump's going to probably be regarded in the same way when he gets out of office, you know, unless he has some major Damascene conversion, converts to—I don't even know what religion he is. Nobody knows. But maybe he converts to something and, you know, becomes a pious individual and tries to make up for all of his sins. Somehow I don't see it happening. The narcissistic shell on this guy is just too thick and hardened. I think at this point in his life, if he doesn't get it, he'll never get it.

You know, so I don't think there's any chance for reform, much to the chagrin of those who are believing in the QAnon world that Trump's going to make it all right somehow. Trust the plan. That's what Pete Hegseth tweeted out the other day: "Trust the plan." I don't think so. I don't think so. It would be very unpopular. All of his statues—he's rushing to erect statues, if you noticed—he's putting these things up everywhere because he knows he's not going to be able to do anything when he gets out of office. And anything he does put up is going to need 24/7 security protection because activists and protesters are going to either deface it with graffiti or put a rope around it and pull it down. And that's just a reality. He will not be able to guard all of his monuments and statues.

It will cost millions per year just to guard all of his monuments that he's put up in honor of himself while he's president, which is a weird thing. Normally they don't do that until after you finish. You don't put your name on things like the Kennedy Center while you're president. This is not the normal tradition in America. But he's in a rush because he knows he will not have access to any of these sort of embellishments after he leaves office. So he's trying to get as much as he can done, put his name on as much as he can prior. The only thing he'll get—he's not going to get an airport. He'll get the West Palm Beach Airport. It's a tiny little airport next to Jeffrey Epstein's house. That's all he's going to get, unfortunately. So, yeah, politically, it's quite a story. It's quite a story.

#Nima

Patrick, before wrapping up, who's the most—you know, who's the strongest figure within the Trump administration? Putting Donald Trump himself aside, we were talking about various people since this administration started its duty in the United States. We were talking about J.D. Vance. He disappeared from the scene. Tulsi Gabbard is gone. And many people were part of this administration. They're not there anymore. Marco Rubio, nobody. I don't think this guy has anything to do with the foreign policy of the NSC. He's just following the rules of the establishment.

And we have Pete Hegseth, who's somehow, you know, being the head of the Pentagon and being nothing, you know, he's nobody in Washington, in my opinion. And he just follows the same way that Rubio is. And when it comes to some other people who are mostly behind the scenes, like Stephen Miller, together with Jared Kushner. Jared Kushner is not part of the administration, but when you combine Jared Kushner and Stephen Miller, they have everything, in my opinion. What is your understanding of that?

#Patrick

Well, in terms of who's the strongest, most powerful person in the administration, I think you hit the nail on the head. Long term, in terms of power, and by being behind the scenes to the eminent degree, it's probably Jared Kushner. He's managed to pry away enough money through the administration, using his clout to pry money off the Saudis, off the Emiratis, to pad his Affinity Investment Fund. And Kushner's parlaying that into real assets and real power internationally. He will be damaged by his Israeli associations, his closeness to Netanyahu, and also Trump. But he still remains the person with quite a lot of leverage after Trump gets out. I don't think he'll ever translate that into political power, though, although he can be a kingmaker.

J.D. Vance had probably been the most promising person in the administration, but by being loyal to Trump. So the real power with Trump after Trump would be to oppose Trump in the administration. And J.D. Vance blew it, probably because he's just too young. He's a child. He's 41 years old. In political terms, he's a child. He's a teenager, and he dresses like a teenager, and he kind of acts and talks like a teenager. So he doesn't really have any real gravitas. It's fake. Peter Thiel and his backers probably thought they could make J.D. Vance into a type of white Obama, a white Obama character. That's the best way to describe Vance — as a kind of white Obama. He's a perfect tool of the establishment because he doesn't have any actual beliefs or principles.

He's just a good talker. And Obama was like that. Obama was a great talker. Nobody could talk like Obama. I mean, he was just so talented. But you could project onto Obama any type of idea or principle, and Obama could quickly shapeshift to become that. And that's what made him successful as a tool of the establishment, Obama. He would speak to the working class and relate with them because he would put on a ghetto kind of African-American accent. Then he would shift into something more sophisticated, like a minute later, if he's talking to a different crowd, he's talking to Wall Street. So he's very versatile. Vance does the same thing. He tries to talk to the white, dejected, Rust Belt working class, pretends he's one of them.

And then he can also talk to the tech oligarchy to show his fealty to the technocracy, and also Wall Street as well. But because he tethered himself so closely to Trump and was afraid to criticize Trump for fear of Trump dragging him and lambasting him publicly — because that's what Trump does to anybody that doesn't agree with Trump — and Trump says, you need to be loyal to me, even if, like, Trump could be out there with, you know, an automatic machine gun in the middle of Times Square

and just kill, you know, 200 people, and all of his cabinet would be there saying, well, Trump did not actually kill anybody. We're loyal to the president. We're sure that he was confident that he was doing the right thing, even though he could commit mass murder in front of everybody.

That's how completely blinkered you have to be if you're in the Trump camp. You have to show total loyalty, even if your president is a bloodthirsty war criminal and has also lost his mind in the process. So that's the problem with Trump — he only selects people that he can manipulate to be that loyal to him. So Trump sacrifices talent, skills, and capabilities in favor of what he calls loyalty. It's like an autocratic corporate structure. Donald Trump's the CEO. Everybody is, "Yes, sir, yes, sir, three bags full, sir." And if you can't play that game, you can't be on the team. So that means it's not good for your political future to be in the Trump administration.

So anybody that's in the Trump administration will be damaged goods in the exact, exact same way that anybody involved with Richard Nixon in the early 70s was labeled damaged goods before, and had very little... Those who did survive the Nixon administration or Watergate had to wait 20 or 30 years, 30 or 40 years before they could reemerge back into politics and have finally shed the damaged brand of Watergate and Richard Nixon. The same will be the case with Trump. They'll have to reinvent themselves. Rubio could... Rubio could mount a presidential run in 2028, and I'm sure he would like to.

And I'm sure Paul Singer and the Israeli lobby have promised they will back him in that. But he did run already in 2016, and he came off as very sophomoric and a little bit petty and not very likable, and a bit sort of a squeaky operative. And he doesn't have the alpha male personality characteristics that I think generally America wants to see, or the sort of stable person. And Rubio is very short physically as well. He has to wear lifts. You know, he's not a big guy, much like Ron DeSantis, kind of very short. So on stage, they look short on debate stages and stuff like that. It's always problematic. It's been problematic for Mike Dukakis.

Uh, I can name a whole bunch of other people that's been a problem for, and unfortunately, Americans are very superficial when it comes to image and what they want in terms of a leader. So Tulsi Gabbard, she could have, if she would have resigned last year when Trump threw her under the bus. She gave an intelligence assessment, said Iran was not pursuing a nuclear weapon. Trump basically said, I don't care what Tulsi Gabbard or the CIA said, or the National Director of Intelligence said. I don't care. I've got my Israeli intelligence, and they're two weeks away from a bomb, and we're going to attack them. So if Tulsi had resigned then, she would have set herself up for a very, very strong 2028 run.

But instead, she did the J.D. Vance thing and decided to show her loyalty to the president, even though she herself is complicit in war crimes, by not going against what was clearly fake Israeli intelligence that was intentionally used to bypass her own office right to the desk of the president in the Oval Office. We know that from Joe Kent, okay? Now, the person who has emerged from his cabinet with the most amount of credibility and popular support has been Joe Kent, because he left,

because he didn't agree with Trump, because he didn't play the loyalty game. So he's come out, his stock has risen, Tulsi's stock has dropped, J.D. Vance's stock has dropped.

Rubio continues to drop, although Rubio tries to keep a distance from Trump, tried to stay away from the Iran president issue for the longest time and concentrate on being viceroy of Latin America because he thought that's better for his image. But he can't, you know, he's secretary of state. You can't avoid the most important geopolitical flashpoint on the planet forever. And so now Rubio is being pulled back into the Iran conversation, and he's looking really bad. He's looking like he doesn't know what he's talking about. He's lying on behalf of the president. He comes off as a total hypocrite. So this is all bad for Rubio. And the other thing, Nima, is traditionally in America, Pete Hegseth is a sideshow.

He will go down as a bad joke in U.S. history. That's where he's going. He'll be lucky to escape war crimes tribunals or something else because he is a disaster. He's a failure as a defense secretary or a, quote, war secretary. Pete Hegseth has presided over the most amount of lost U.S. aircraft and U.S. military assets, and the absolute dumb, just complete depletion of U.S. armaments and military stock over these last three months, putting the U.S. in such a compromising position globally under his Defense Department, or War Department as he calls it. That's a total failure as head of the Pentagon. So he's the worst defense secretary or war secretary in American history — the worst.

And he's not qualified for the job anyway. And what did you expect when you send a boy to do a man's job? But again, Pete Hegseth playing the loyalty game. If he had gone against the president, he'd be a hero, you see. So it just shows you the corruption of this Trump-style hierarchy, how it doesn't serve the interests of any of these people. Stephen Miller can just jump ship at any time, by the way. He's an Israeli lobby selection in the cabinet. So he's a free agent. He can just sidestep and walk off and continue doing something else if he wants to. Maybe he'll go back and actually get a law degree, which he actually doesn't have, as far as I can tell. He was the head of America First Legal, doesn't have a law degree, but that's typical for Trump.

He has very unqualified people doing jobs that are way above normal, their pay grade, and they're promoted way above their level of incompetence. But that's just typical of the Trump world. So, yeah, I think if there's one other person that might fare well out of this, I'm not sure. Not RFK. He's gone as well. Look, RFK, Robert F. Kennedy Jr., who is a diehard Zionist, by the way, it's embarrassing, but anyway, he's handled by Rabbi Shmuley Boteach as his sort of Israeli handler. But he made a good run for president as a Democrat, then had to go independent, and could have challenged for a good percentage of the vote just on his Kennedy name. But then Trump took him and co-opted him like he did with Tulsi Gabbard and stuck them into a cabinet position, HHS, Health and Human Services Secretary.

So Trump took a potential political challenger to MAGA, co-opted him, stuck him into a government agency. And you can't jump from a government agency to run for president. You can't go from DNI to run for president. It's even hard enough to go from secretary of state and run for president. And

Americans will want normal politicians after Trump. So they're going to be looking for people who are governors and who are from the Senate, maybe even from Congress. Maybe they'll want to see somebody who's more representative of the people, like a Thomas Massie or Marjorie Taylor Greene. Maybe they'll want to see more democratic accountability and look at that in their career. Gavin Newsom as well. These are people who might have more broad appeal after this experiment of having a reality TV actor, which is kind of—Trump's like Zelensky in that sense.

You know, he comes from television. America's probably going to be—they may be wanting something more stable, something they can bank on: a governor, a senator, somebody who's not attached to Trump. I think that will offer the most amount of appeal to the broadest amount of the electorate. By the time Trump gets done, you'll be hard-pressed to find anybody that will admit ever supporting him in a serious way. I mean, that's how bad he's going to be in terms of a tarnished political brand after three years. So by the time we get to 2028, people are just going to be like, God, I can't wait. It'll be like Biden—just everyone's going to be watching, looking at their watch, thinking.

Yeah, another week he'll be gone, you know. That's how things are going to go. So yeah, he again had a chance to anoint an heir apparent, but the irony is, the paradox of Trump world is because you're loyal to Trump, that's going to be your undoing politically, simple. If Rubio went against him and had a major fallout, challenged him—but Rubio can't, because Rubio has already played his hand as a warmonger. And so he can't—Rubio can't reposition himself as somebody who believes in international law credibly, or somebody who cares about people, because he clearly has demonstrated that he's none of those things in the first 18 months of this administration. So I think he's toast. But what the Israeli lobby are very clever at, what they do is they will go to—before any election, by the way.

This could be a Senate, could be a Congress election. They'll go to the Democrat—both Democrat primary candidates, both Republican. They'll back them all. They'll promise them the world, all of them, and they know that whoever wins, they're going to have their person in place. And so they promised Rubio support in 2028. They promised Tulsi Gabbard support in 2028, and they also promised J.D. Vance support in 2028, and a few others as well, probably Ted Cruz as well. So they've already sort of backed all their horses. And whoever else comes up, they'll do the same—AOC on the Democratic side. So that's how they operate.

And so each person believes they're going to have the backing of this powerful force. And that keeps them on message. It keeps them behaving. It keeps them staying within the acceptable lines of political discourse because they know, as long as they think they still have a chance for the next election, the Adelsons or the lobby, as it were, are going to give them a shot, going to back them, going to write the big checks, give them the clout they need to get into power. But the problem is, Israel has made that promise to so many different people, and they're not loyal to any Republican or Democrat. The Israeli lobby, their job is to cover all bases.

That's their job, to make sure that no matter who wins, it's going to be good for Israel. That's it. So they don't care if they're Green, Independent, Republican, Democrat—it doesn't matter. MAGA, not MAGA, RINO, whatever. Doesn't matter. So just bear that in mind when you look at the playing field. Once in a while, a dark horse comes in—Ron Paul, for instance, someone like that. Thomas Massie could be that dark horse. He won't be that dark, though; he's already made a huge name for himself. I give him... pretty good, you know, I give Thomas Massie as good a chance as anyone to get that 30%, 35% that you need to be viable.

I think he has it. I think he's got the ability to do that. I can't see anybody else that can credibly do that, especially with the young people, the Gen Zs. Thomas Massie appeals to a lot of Gen Zs, and J. D. Vance doesn't. So it'll be interesting. But American politics is just a train wreck right now. I'm talking about it like it's real politics. It's not. It's a disaster. So we'll see how things develop. It'll be interesting to see who emerges as the big voices after the midterm elections, and that will say a lot. But in terms of Trump, his legacy, and anybody attached to him, I think that's a fait accompli at this point.

#Nima

Thank you so much, Patrick, for being with us today. Great pleasure. Before wrapping up, please go to 21st Century Wire, and you can follow Patrick on 21st Century Wire or by going to patrickhenningsen.substack.com, and you can follow him there. I'm gonna put the links to the YouTube video of Patrick and all the links to Substack and 21st Century Wire in the description of this video. You can follow Patrick using those links. Thank you so much, Patrick.

#Patrick

My pleasure. Thanks, Nima.