

Iran TAKES OUT 200 US Troops, ARAMCO Burns as Trump LOSES IT | Patrick Henningsen

Geopolitical analyst Patrick Henningsen joins the show to discuss the massive US losses coming out in the Iran war as Trump loses it completely over them, and what comes next.

<https://patrickhenningsen.substack.com/> Patrick Henningsen Substack <https://www.youtube.com/@21stCenturyWireTV> Patrick's YouTube LIKE the video and Subscribe for more in-depth geopolitical analysis Leave your thoughts in the comments below! Support the Channel: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/dannyhaiphong> SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE: Rumble: <https://rumble.com/c/DannyHaiphong> Follow Me on Social Media: Twitter: <https://twitter.com/DannyHaiphong> Telegram: <https://t.me/DannyHaiphong> Support the channel in other ways: <https://www.buymeacoffee.com/dannyhaiphong> Substack: chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritho> #iran #trump #iranwar

#Danny

Welcome back to the show, everyone. We have Patrick Henningsen back on the show to cover the latest developments. Well, Patrick, since you've come back from Iran, we've had Trump so-called TACO out of the war. He did not escalate, and now we're finding out many reasons why. One of which is that now Iran is saying that over the course of the 13 days of strikes, at least 200 U.S. service members were killed by Iran's retaliation. CNN is saying, well, they're not verifying the number of dead that Iran is claiming. The United States CENTCOM is saying that 600 U.S. troop casualties have been meted out by Iran's retaliation over this period. Now, there's also big news about Aramco. So since you've come back, Patrick, I'm sure you've seen that Yemen has reentered the war because of Saudi aggression, U.S.-Saudi aggression, I should say.

And now it seems like Iraqi resistance has gotten into the mix. Aramco is already burning, and now it is burning even more. According to Saudi Arabia, Aramco was hit last night by Iraqi resistance drones. At least that's what they're saying. And then Yemen also hit a Jizan oil refinery site, again with drones, and it had been burning for two days straight after the initial strikes by missile and drone. So this was a drone attack yesterday, and that's the large plume of smoke billowing from the refinery being shown by the satellite imagery. Now Donald Trump has been losing it, Patrick. He's posting AI imagery, it seems, for the last 24 hours for some reason. But your thoughts on what's going on here, the current state of the war, and why do you believe that now the United States seems to be pulling back despite Trump's assertion that this won't last very long unless Iran gives them everything they want?

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, Danny, I mean, I've been watching this. We've been watching this tennis match back and forth. And then let's talk about the MOU phase, right? The MOU phase. And this, to me, is just part of that continuum. And what I believe, just by studying the United States' actions, I'll just firstly start off with—to me, it's very clear. Now, it might not be clear to everybody, and I know that a lot of podcasters and channels are kind of set up to follow day-to-day changes and then sort of say, "Is this a turn? Is this a pivot?" What I'm seeing, Danny—and we can discuss afterwards—but what I'm seeing is a continuum. And the United States is not pulling back. The United States has ongoing operations.

Okay, we have to be very, very cognizant of the fact that these operations are funded. U.S. operations are currently funded right through the rest of the year. So whatever they've got on the go, it's going to be continued until an order has been given by the president to stop operations. And I don't see that happening. So the U.S. operations are clearly to attack and to disable Iran's ability to physically manage the Straits of Hormuz. That means attacking infrastructure. That means attacking military facilities, radar, port facilities, naval resources, anything—infrastructure, anything along the south coast in and around the Strait of Hormuz.

And the U.S. has a window to do this that is not confined to this week, or last week, or during the MOU phase. It's going to extend right through the midterm elections, right till the end of the year, and then probably into the new year. So that's the way I'm looking at it, and other military analysts, some of whom we know, are also looking at it this way. And if we look at it this way, then we won't be distracted by all of the games and propaganda and disinformation that's being thrown out by this White House, that clearly, during this whole process, is also playing the markets. So these announcements, this latest announcement clearly that came out last night, was designed to hit before the opening of Monday's markets.

And so the U.S. has to basically—they need time to rearm and reload, and that's a constant process that's going to take us right through. The opportune moment for a grandstand before the midterm elections to get a W, or at least a short-term media W, would probably be somewhere between the 1st of September and the 1st of October. So in terms of some kind of symbolic ground beachhead, storming the beaches of Kharg Island or whatever it is, it's going to be temporary, and it has to coincide in the run-up to the midterms so that Donald Trump can declare victory. That's the plan, and I'm not saying that any of these are good plans. I'm not saying that they make sense. They're sane, but they're funded, and they're in motion, and the U.S. is locked in.

Pete Hegseth, the Pentagon, they're locked in. This is their program. The United States fully understands, and so does Israel, that the strongest hand that Iran has to play, aside from their missile deterrence, is the control of the Strait of Hormuz. That is their strongest leverage. So, therefore, the United States' object militarily is to remove that card from Iran, to take away that leverage. And therefore, they can reverse the dynamic. And then what the U.S. typically will do at

that point is to come in with new terms and try to renegotiate the terms of this deal. So the MOU, for all intents and purposes—and by the way, this is what everybody in Iran believes that I spoke to—was just a ruse.

It was a ruse, and the U.S. never had any intention of abiding by any of the obligations within the MOU. Now, I know that's going to upset some people who are J.D. Vance fans or who are hoping to get a position in the Vance administration, who are all over the podcasting circuit, by the way. There's plenty of them. I know that's going to upset them, but Donald Trump, J.D. Vance, and Marco Rubio all actively sabotaged the MOU. Literally, each of them was assigned to break or sabotage one point of the MOU. Marco Rubio took out clause number one, and Pete Hegseth and Donald Trump took out clauses four and five, sabotaged those, and J.D. Vance sabotaged clause 10, which was reparations.

And he did that by announcing that Iranian frozen assets would be handed to U.S. soya farmers. And that was a Jared Kushner brainstorm. What a brilliant idea. He was boasting about it. So he's using the Islamabad or the Geneva forums on these negotiations to grandstand for himself, trying to kind of big his position up for the 2028 election. He's already started that process because campaigning begins next year, next April. But what he did was basically invalidate Clause 10. So each of them played a role. If the U.S. were serious about this MOU, they wouldn't have so systematically dismantled it and done so in a very short space of time, let's say three weeks. So to me, that's the way I'm looking at it, Danny Haiphong, just to begin with.

So if we look at it that way, then all these pauses are just laying in wait for the next cycle. And the other giveaway on this is Donald Trump's letter he wrote to Congress asking for a 60-day extension to the war. That's a legal way, via the executive branch, to avoid the War Powers Act oversight. And also it has to be funded as well. So it's a legal loophole, and they'll run this. So you'll see fake negotiations that will more or less coincide with a 60-day cycle. Okay, that's so they cover their you-know-what on the domestic legal side. And then politically they can say it's all above board and kind of keep the doves in the Democrat Party and the Republican masses at bay somewhat.

So when you establish that framework, you can kind of see this is designed to roll over and just to keep going. It's like a lung. It will inhale and exhale in terms of cycles of escalation. But the U.S. has got very, very clear guidelines, target bank lists that they're going to continue to hit, and they'll stage any provocation or use any excuse. In this case, they staged the provocations for tankers violating the Iranian Clause 4 and 5 of the MOU in order to create a pretext for military escalation, which they did. So that's pretty clear. So I think this is war by deception by Washington. So they've taken a page out of the Israeli playbook, which is use negotiations in order to provide cover for you to maximize your military objectives.

That is an Israeli policy, tried-and-true tactic. And the United States has now adopted Israeli tactics, which means they're not serious about any negotiations or deals. It's always—then they'll end up going to maximalist demands, then they'll walk away, then they'll blame the other side. This is what

Israel has been doing for 50 years. So this is what the U.S. is doing under the Trump administration. So that's established. Next, Yemen. So why on earth would Saudi Arabia want to oblige after a relatively successful armistice from 2023 till the present with Ansar Allah in Yemen? That doesn't make any sense. Why? What leverage does the United States have over Saudi?

Because clearly they were pushed to interdict, or attempt to create a—an Iranian passenger airliner coming into Sana'a airport. Okay, that's what started this round of escalation with Saudi Arabia. Well, what was Trump doing at the same time? They were dangling a carrot of a nuclear deal with Saudi Arabia. And you notice how they dangled it, then got Saudi to hit Yemen, and then pulled it back and said, "No, no, no, Saudi needs to sign the Abraham Accords." Did you see that? So they just got played. That was a bait and switch by the Trump administration. And the White House and Scott Bessent did the same thing to Pakistan at the very same time. They dangled a carrot of an \$18 billion bailout of the Pakistani rupee. And they're dangling that in front of Pakistan as a rescue package.

And Pakistan obliged by making a public statement about their military alliance with Saudi Arabia, that they would, if necessary, defend Saudi in any kind of skirmish with Yemen. Okay, that was part of this triangular, transactional, tactical move by Washington. Danny, I'm not saying any of this is going to be productive in the long term, or even the short term, for Saudi or Pakistan or even the U. S., but this is how the Trump administration rolled. This is exactly how they roll. It's all short-term scams and cons and Kansas City shuffle maneuvers is what they do. And now you can see the result of this. Tell me how this isn't a total disaster for Saudi Arabia. I mean, look at the news you just read. That, to me, is just devastating news.

#Danny

It is.

#Patrick Henningsen

It is. Yanbu and Jizan, you know, these are state-of-the-art oil terminals, you know, very advanced, expensive, economically very crucial to the economy of Saudi Arabia that's already lost a substantial amount of oil coming out of Hormuz. They're totally relying on the Red Sea. Why on earth would you want to jeopardize any of that? For what? Why? Who is pushing them? Who threatened them? Who is blackmailing them? You know this is coming from Washington. And, Danny, if it's coming from Washington, where is it really coming from? It's not really coming from Washington. It's the boomerang that is tossed from Tel Aviv and all the way to Washington, that boomerangs back to West Asia. And that's how—so this isn't good for the U.S. It's not good for Saudi. It's not good for the region. Is it good for Israel? One could say.

#Danny

And they've got their hands supposedly free from this. They're not actively engaging in, you know, strikes at the moment. They weren't against Iran during those 13 days. And some Israeli officials think that was preferable. For the first time I've ever heard that, at least during this war, right? They're like, yeah, we got other things we want to take care of: Lebanon, we want to take, you know, Gaza, all of that. But anyway, it's back to you.

#Patrick Henningsen

This is good. Israel, they're out of the crosshairs for the moment. And that suits them down to the ground because they're busy. They're busy with Lebanon. So they're quite happy to let the rest of the region go up in flames so long as they can take care of their near abroad, their neighbourly projects, like expanding their borders and occupying Lebanon and running programs in the West Bank. And by the way, there's no international outrage about that. What's going on in the West Bank would have previously hit the headlines and caused such outrage, and Washington would have been paralysed as well about it. But not now. So this is a new kind of, you know, reality that we're in. Unfortunately, the hierarchy of crisis means that what used to be absolutely devastating, reprehensible acts are now pushed to the bottom of the outrage pyramid. And who does that suit? Israel.

So they're able to manage all of these different disasters, like Gaza, genocide in Gaza, an active attempt to do a genocide in the West Bank, and an ongoing genocide in South Lebanon. So, yeah, I mean, that's one way we could look at it. I mean, I'm sure that many can debate. But, you know, I think there's also this delusion, Danny, that the Abraham Accords in Washington anyway, and I think this is a Kushner-led and a Witkoff-led initiative, that somehow there's life in the Abraham Accords, and we just need to give it the right amount of mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, albeit kosher resuscitation, that somehow it's going to animate itself again. That's not going to happen. They've got Bahrain locked in. Well, congratulations. That's a successful project, as we can see. They've got the UAE locked in. Well, congratulations. Most people have already written the UAE off as East Israel.

#Danny

Yeah.

#Patrick Henningsen

And is that going to do them any favors in the long term? I'm not sure. The jury's out on that. So forget about Saudi Arabia. Forget about Qatar. You can't have any Abraham Accords without KSA and Qatar. It's not going to happen. So, and what about the Kingdom of Jordan? They're not doing very well at the moment. Yeah, Iran took care of them pretty badly. So I'm not saying this is going well, but it's going. And it's going to go in this direction, and I don't know what that's going to mean overall. But if we save any kind of nuclear escalation by the U.S. or Israel against Iran, that would be a game changer. But as long as it stays in the conventional frame, I see Iran winning a war of

attrition. And Iran is—at least the impression I got, Danny, when I was there—is they're locked in for a couple of years on this mode.

And for Trump and for the U.S., especially politically for Trump, does he want to have it on his resume that he lost control of the region and he presided over this catastrophic shift in the balance of power and towards a new multipolar order, or something like this? He doesn't want that on his resume. Stronger Iran, yeah. So he's going to do everything possible that that can't be declared during his administration. That means no assets will be unfrozen. There will be talks or threats of unfreezing assets. Sanctions will not be lifted. There will be talk, or maybe even temporary sanctions lifted, to keep this thing going. But he doesn't want to give anybody that.

And so what within the U.S. political frame will be, when the 2028 presidential election debates begin and that conversation starts happening, it will be, "Look, Donald Trump is not giving an inch to these Iranian terrorists. It's the Biden administration and the Democrats and Obama that have been weak with Iran, and that's the reason why it's this crisis. And Donald Trump was the first president to put his foot down with these terrible mullahs." And that will be the paradigm debate for the 2028 election. So when it gets to Gavin Newsom and J.D. Vance, they'll have at it, and it'll be, "Are you going to be shrink-wrapping cash like Obama and sending pallets of cash to the mullahs so that they can build more missiles?"

Is that what you're going to do, Mr. Newsom? And it'll put them on the spot. And then the Israeli lobby and the Mark Levines of the world, the whole machine will be in gear to make sure the Democrats' leading candidates will be singing from the AIPAC hymn sheet on that. And there may be an opportunity to de-escalate in the next Democratic administration, but you can be damn sure, Danny Haiphong, I don't see anything serious happening for the remainder of the Trump administration—not anything like a major ideological epiphany or anything from the U.S. I don't see it, and not from Israel either. This is an ongoing conflict, and it will continue to be an ongoing conflict through the remainder of Trump's term.

#Danny

Those are great points. And, you know, I've been saying that if a Democrat does end up putting up Gavin Newsom, that's very—it's like Gavin Newsom, J.D. Vance. It's like looking in the same mirror. But, you know, two incredibly well-trained cons. But they are. But I could see the Democrats, just for no other reason, as you just predicted, this conflict, this war, will go on all the way up until the election. So I could see Democrats trying to stay away from the war, distance themselves, just for the sake that it will be even more unpopular than it is now. Given the fact of what I said earlier with the U.S. troop losses, the U.S. can't really handle that.

The more rounds there are, or strikes, the larger those casualty numbers are going to get, the longer the economic pain is going to be. And so there will be major, of course, attempts to distance oneself and try to frame it on the other side by the Democrats as Trump's war failed, and we'll be

much, much better at being aggressive toward Iran than them. That will be probably how they'll try to spin it. But nonetheless, Patrick, you brought up the Saudi question. You know, this is what Saudi Arabia has been hamstrung into doing. Obviously, there was major pressure. They're having their oil facilities.

They're claiming now Iraq is hitting their largest refinery—the resistance, their largest Aramco refinery. Yemen hit it. And you and I brought this up earlier as you were talking. And this feels almost like negotiating with Tony Soprano, you know, like Trump literally has Saudi's arm behind their back and twisting it as hard as possible to... To get something from the U.S., you're going to have to give, and that's the Abraham Accords. And it's a disaster. But then I want to put this up because it's the Israeli-U.S. connection. And who better than Barak Ravid to represent this? He's constantly communicating that connection to us.

And this is what Trump is saying right now: "We're having deep conversations with Iran. If they don't succeed, we'll go back to very powerful military action. It's not going to take much time. These so-called negotiations, either it moves fast or it won't happen at all." So it sounds a lot like what you're predicting here, that this is just a pause. But pause for what is the question? Because a lot of the losses—you can't get back the troop lives. You can't get back the soldiers' lives. And the weapons... If you want to pause for that, you're going to have to pause for a couple of years because it takes a couple of years to build the Patriots. So none of that seems to matter.

#Patrick Henningsen

Not necessarily. You can pause long enough to get munitions that will get you through a conflict exchange cycle that might last. I mean, let's just take what's happened the last 13 days. Let's just call it a 13-day window, which isn't that unlike Operation Midnight Hammer. I hate that name. It's so stupid, but it's just Team America. But let's just say that 13-day, two-week, right, two-week window. That's all that's needed. So that's what we've established. Now, that's the precedent. The model is the two-week window. I think it's always kind of been that. February 28th and the 40-day war, that's an anomaly. And I think it's all pretty well agreed that that significantly depleted a lot of the U.S. stocks in terms of missiles and interceptors, and Israel as well.

So Israel needs to be fortified temporarily for these conflict exchanges. But the U.S. has shown, and this is the dangerous part, Danny, is that what we've shown over the last 13 days is that Israel got a pass. So the U.S. took the brunt of the Iranian retaliation, and Israel took nothing. So this can be repeated as far as Israel is concerned, and quite frankly, as far as Washington is concerned. This is acceptable because they don't have to report their losses. The United States media has closed ranks on the KIA or casualties. They're not going to push. None of these journalists are going to push hard on that. There's also a national security letter over that story.

So it's of paramount national security importance, casualty numbers, that they not be reported or that they be underestimated in the U.S. media. If any of that does come out, if there's any leaks,

that is devastating for the Trump administration. We all know how important those numbers are in terms of gauging the public buy-in for any particular policy or war or whatever. But now Israel has established that it can basically sit on the sideline and out of the maelstrom. And the U.S. can continue this kind of matador movement dance with Iran. They can continue doing this, and the U.S. believes, the Pentagon believes, that they can inflict death by a thousand cuts to Iran between now and the midterm elections or now and the new year.

And then they can just systematically degrade all of the Iranian facilities and infrastructure along the south and in and around the Strait of Hormuz, and they're absolutely fine in Washington waiting to do this over the next six months or 12 months. And they could at any point punctuate that with a massive assault or even a temporary symbolic ground assault at any point. And it's how they manage that. Now, that could be a huge disaster for the U.S. if they overplay their hand, like, for instance, a ground assault on any of these islands. That could be a massive miscalculation by the Trump administration. But, you know, we'll cross that bridge when we get to it.

But in the meantime, they have a strategy. It's very clear. And people need to see that, see the big picture, and stop getting too caught up in Trump's just crazy memes, AI images, tweets, because a lot of this is just theater to really kind of cover and keep the press at bay and keep people distracted from what they're really doing, which is kind of really sunk cost into a long-term conflict that they're probably not going to be able to win. That if the American people or Congress or the Senate had a real discussion or debate about whether they can actually gain any objectives or political settlement out of this, and the answer being no, why would you continue doing it?

But it's funded. So they're going to continue this game. I'm telling you right now, it's just going to be lies upon lies and deceit upon deceit to keep this thing going, this gaudy roadshow of a war going that the president has dragged the country in. And you know what's crazy is they've dragged European countries and the U.K. specifically into this. So I've been looking at that very closely, and that's a huge development, specifically because they changed prime ministers. And Andy Burnham comes in, the new Labour leader, unelected. He was a coronation. He was anointed. Didn't even go through a proper party vote of Labour membership. Forget about the general election. And he comes in.

His first act as prime minister was to greenlight the U.S. use of B-1 and B-2 bomber runs against Iran from RAF bases in the U.K. And the IRGC immediately comes out and releases a statement saying, "We're going to regard this as an act of war by anybody who facilitates these attacks," which means Britain is in. Now, that was intentional, Danny. The U.S. could have used a number of other countries to do that. Britain could have quietly been neutral. That could have been done by Bulgaria, Romania, Greece, a number of other countries. Germany. Germany could have carried the water on that, and they have before. But they needed to get the United Kingdom locked in. And the question is why? And, of course, we know the answer.

Part of the answer came via Zelensky striking Iranian ships in the Caspian Sea. And that would be absolutely Britain and the United States behind that operation, 110%. Definitely got the green light from NATO. The implications of that are severe. And we can talk later about that, but the war doesn't look like it's going to de-escalate. In fact, it looks like it's going to escalate. So the U.S., by attacking Iranian ships—the U.S. or Britain, let's just say the U.S. and its allies—using Ukraine as a proxy, okay, what they're doing is enforcing a wider blockade. That's what they're attempting to do. The threat is it would drag Russia into this conflict. Russia doesn't want to be dragged into this conflict for many obvious reasons, and they'll do anything to avoid that.

But it means that if that act goes unanswered, then the Caspian Sea is now a front. And that's, you know, in terms of supplying Iran and trade and, you know, just normal goods, food, stuff, resources, not even military trade, that's now a potentially enforceable blockade. You have an aggressive Azerbaijan deal on the border there, and you have other nefarious actors potentially in Ukraine itself, you know. So what, is Ukraine now going to be involved in drone deployment from Azerbaijan, you know, into Iran? And they played a role in the collapse of Syria, Ukraine did. Very important role, pivotal role in Idlib and Aleppo in totally blindsiding the Syrian Arab Army with drone attacks. They didn't know what to do. They just retreated immediately.

And you see the FPV drones, how they are game changers on the battlefield. Not to say Iran's not prepared for a lot of these things. I'm sure they are. However, it's just an example to say, is Ukraine going to be used as a proxy against Iran? And who's going to be outraged by this in the international community? Is there going to be any opposition to this? Have you seen any opposition to this so far? Any announcements from any of the European countries, like, what the hell are you doing? I've not seen any. Maybe we'll wait a couple of days and see if there's any statements by any of these NATO countries. But they're trying to paint Ukraine as this burgeoning democracy with this honorable democratic hero, Zelensky, at the helm. And here he is trying to basically drag Europe into a Third World War with Central Asia. This is insane.

#Danny

Crazy times. It is insane, and it also plays along into how Donald Trump frames the whole proxy war U.S.-Europe relationship. Different, but to me it's the same. Rather than try to massage and make nice, it's bully and force compliance. And now we're seeing some of the results of this: getting Ukraine to hit the Iranian vessel in the Caspian Sea, kill an Iranian. They did, and now Iran has an EU target list all drawn up, which, you know, if Iran retaliates, which it would have every right to since this was an attack—I mean, look at this list. It's huge. Pipelines everywhere. These are all hittable for Iranian missiles and drones. This is the target list that the IRGC has drawn up in response.

So, yeah, this could very well use Ukraine as a proxy to drag Europe deeper into another war, so to let the United States get a bit of plausible deniability, that's perfect. I've also found, Patrick, it

fascinating that, you know, Iran has only been going up in terms of numbers, in terms of its estimates of U.S. troops killed. But I found so fascinating the lack of outrage over the fact that the U. S. CENTCOM has been fudging up numbers about what little troop casualties they will report on. Now the total is seen as 600. But you probably noticed, Patrick, that right after those troops were killed in Jordan, after the dignified transfer, they were taken off.

I think it was four. It was three in Jordan, one in Iraq because of the drone detonation. Now they're being put back on the total count list, according to CNN now, through the Pentagon. But all of that, it doesn't make a difference in terms of, yeah, they're still dead. Everyone can, of course, count them if we saw the dignified transfer over at the Dover base. But the United States is showing that it is doing its best to fudge up numbers that already have been counted. So what does that say about the ones that aren't, that we don't know about? I mean, this damage was so extensive, Patrick.

#Patrick Henningsen

So they got caught fiddling. Firstly, they got caught fiddling following the attack on the Jordanian bases. So we can all agree, the United States—and this is just the typical ham-fisted style of the Trump administration, because they're micromanaging everything all the time—and they feel like they're above it, that they can just go ahead blatantly and just do open fiddling, and they really don't have to justify themselves because they'll never really be pulled up by the U.S. media in any meaningful way. So we've established that. But this is exactly—so you remember when the retaliations began after February 28th, okay?

And we said at the time, and I was recording a podcast at the time with a colleague who is a very good podcaster and, I'd say, a very good, judicious, and critical thinker, who's also a West Point veteran. And his contacts told him that there's quite a few that were marked as wounded or injured, and they'll immediately be sent to the infirmary in Stuttgart, in Germany, because that's where that facility is, and they handle those situations for those troops. But the accounting that you see for injured in terms of casualties, because casualties are dead and killed in action and injured, and those who die after from injuries, that's where the gray area is after they've been shipped out. And if they're in stable condition or if they're in critical condition, they're still injured, okay?

They haven't yet gone into the dead column. And then from there, they're shipped off to North Carolina eventually, when they're stable enough to make that journey, which is a much longer journey. Okay, so we were told that there was fiddling going on back then at the beginning of March, that those numbers are actually much higher—deaths much higher than were being reported, which is almost nothing was being reported at the time. I think it was like seven or maybe 13 or something like that. It's a very small number considering the amount of injured. So there's a huge ratio of injured to killed, and massive damage across all of these bases. So it's—and people will say, well, they can't hide that from the families. No, they absolutely can. This is a national security situation.

These are classified. All of these reports, casualty reports, medical files, everything, it's classified because it's paramount to national security. The public relations narrative is paramount to the security of this operation. And that's what will be told to the families. And in some cases, the families won't need to know exactly where they were when they were injured or the injuries that would eventually lead to them dying if they were working on something that was classified. It's on a need-to-know basis. Families don't have to be told everything immediately. Absolutely not. They can hold off hundreds of families if need be. That's standard operating procedure. So, I mean, there's a lot of people that are saying, "Oh, they couldn't cover that up," and, "Oh, that's not how the military works."

It's absolutely how it works. In fact, it works more like that now because the U.S. public has such a low threshold for outrage when it comes to dead troops. And no president is going to want to own that. No leader in the world wants to own that. I mean, look at the lengths that the Ukrainians have gone to cover up their battlefield losses. And everybody knows what the real numbers are because whenever they have the exchange of dead bodies and the Russian refrigerated articulated 18-wheeler lorry pulls up, and the Ukrainian 18-wheeler articulated lorry pulls up, and they do their swap, the Ukrainians don't have anything to give the Russians. It's a 1 to 44 ratio or something crazy. So everybody knows that was covered up, and that because the minute a country like Ukraine is a perfect example—the true numbers are known and admitted to and acknowledged—then all of a sudden, the moral or ethical argument for keeping this war going ends immediately.

It drops like a hammer. It's over. It can't be justified on any moral or ethical basis. So they just covered it up. And in fact, what the U.S. have done is reversed it by putting out fake claims. I see it every day. U.S. politicians even do big, silly PowerPoint presentations mounted on white foam core board to basically say Russia's battlefield— I just saw one this week, I forgot what senator it was—one point four million Russians dead on the battlefield. Like, what planet are these people on? These are our U.S. elected representatives who are completely— I don't want to use a derogatory term, but I mean, this stuff doesn't correspond to reality at all. It's just pure propaganda. That's the extreme argument on battlefield casualties. This is much more subtle, but still Donald Trump could not handle double, triple digits over a hundred.

He's done. And they know it. And I'll bet you the numbers are well over 100, well over 100. The Trump administration did exactly the same thing. They covered up after Donald Trump did the bright idea of assassinating Qasem Soleimani and Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis at the orders of Israel. And then Iran responded in January, you remember, in 2020, and they wiped out the U.S. Assad airbase, or army base. They just leveled it with missiles. No one's ever hit a U.S. base like that in a long time. And the U.S.—Trump administration, his first term—what was their response? Nothing. They just went, oh, quiet, no response. And what they did, they shipped everybody out to Germany, as I told you. And then a month later, you see this report, oh, 50 U.S. troops had concussions. Everybody had a concussion, a head injury at the same time. Same injury. Wow. How does that happen?

Did they all, like, jump off a building and land on their heads at the same time? Like, how does that happen? And will we ever know who died? Or were they reporting some of these deaths as training accidents later, a month later, two months later, or whatever, in North Carolina? Apache helicopter goes down in training incident. Eight U.S. servicemen die in Germany. And, you know, who knows how these numbers are diffused over time. But even if it was five, or even if it was three or four or five or six, as a result of that Iranian missile strike in January of 2020, that would have been hell to pay for Donald Trump.

Because he'd have to answer to the American people and to all the branches of the military: why on earth did we carry out a targeted assassination on behalf of Israel, killing somebody who was fighting ISIS? But that's fine. Fox News calls Soleimani a terrorist. That's on the AIPAC, you know, talking points memo that every U.S. lawmaker gets. They have to repeat, like dutifully, Soleimani was a bad dude. I even hear J.D. Vance saying this. People are like, "He's a bad dude." It's like the Team America lexicon comes into action there. And they have to then explain why they did this. How was Soleimani? Oh, he was planning an attack on America, and we don't know where, but Israeli intelligence told us there was something cooking.

Something was cooking. So he had to act, and they ended up losing U.S. bases as well as a U.S.-Israeli base in Erbil, and all of those injured and possibly dead U.S. soldiers from that base in Iraq. All of that had to be covered up, and it was. So now scale that up. Do that 100x, 100x. What they're managing right now, the fallout of this, that Washington is attempting to manage with all of these bases in the region, and casualties now, as you pointed to, Danny, the numbers are significantly higher. This is a huge operation, just keeping this, managing all this. And that's to say nothing about the military capabilities and staging areas and resources that the U.S. once had in the region six months ago. Now they don't have.

Okay, that to me, I mean, from the Pentagon's point of view, from a Pete Hegseth point of view, this is the worst probably disaster since, I would say, Vietnam. For the U.S., Vietnam was much worse, orders of magnitude, in terms of lost aircraft, men, everything like that. But in terms of actual—in a very strategically important, I would argue more strategically important than Southeast Asia, West Asia and the Middle East—the U.S. has been decimated six months, and Hegseth is just swooning around, festooned with his stupid American flag handkerchief and his Captain Kangaroo jacket with American flag silk lining. It's like Captain Kangaroo. It's like—anyway—pretending like none of this is going on. And the U.S. have lost more. Just think about this: we're in Gulf War I, big operation, massive deployment, hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops, military assets like you wouldn't believe, air assets, and the Iraq War from 2003 to 2010, seven, eight years, okay?

The U.S. has lost more fixed-wing aircraft between their attacks on Iran and Yemen in the last 14 months, 15 months, than the United States lost in both Iraq wars. I think right now the U.S. is at, I

don't know, the tally is like 130 fixed-wing aircraft lost. In Iraq, both wars, it was around 100. That's—I mean, how is that a success? Like, tell me, plus 13 or 17 bases now evacuated, abandoned, or inoperable. How is this a win?

How is this not a total abject failure by the Department of War and the Trump administration? I mean, Jimmy Carter is a champion in comparison to Trump. Trump, this is just a disaster. And then they're going to Congress begging for another \$1.15 trillion. No, we're going to need another trillion to get this right. So now they're in the same trap that Lyndon Baines Johnson was in, or some of these other past U.S. presidents: the sunk-cost spiral trap, where they need more money to course-correct when, in fact, the only real prudent option is to basically cut your losses and get out. They can't do that. They can't do that. So it's so funny that, you know, we learned all these lessons in history in America, and here it is.

We're faced with it once again. And it's like, no, no, we're going to do it again. We're going to do it again. It's not as simple as that, of course. It's more complicated because we've got another, you know, did you ever see Total Recall? Remember that film? Arnold Schwarzenegger. It's a classic. One of the main characters had this thing—he had an oracle growing out of the side of his chest called Kuato. And you couldn't separate Kuato from the main guy there. And so where he went, Kuato went. Israel is like Kuato for the United States. You just can't get rid of it. Now, Danny, the implications of the UK and the European countries in that list that you showed.

Yeah, massive list. As luck would have it, if you go to our DM chat, I sent you a video. You can play this. It's just a minute and a half. I asked a question. Two or three weeks ago, I was in Mashhad, and I asked the head of the parliamentary committee on national security and foreign policy. I said, "Does Iran see a difference between the Gulf states letting America have bases and use the Gulf states as a launching pad for acts of aggression against Iran? Does Iran see that as any different if European countries are doing the same as the Gulf states?" And I asked him that question. Ibrahim Azizi said, and we have a recording of that.

#Danny

Oh, if you wanted—well, is it translated? Yes, it's translated.

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah.

#Danny

Okay. You might want to send it to me a different method because I'm connected to the cord. I can't AirDrop this from my phone. So if you send it through X, I could probably pull it up.

#Patrick Henningsen

Sure. But I can drop it to you on X.

#Danny

And while you're doing that now, I'll just say, yeah, Patrick, it gets really bad. I can pull up that list of EU targets again, too. But it's really bad. You probably heard the report. This was yesterday. I covered it. NBC News, through U.S. officials in the Pentagon, saying that the United States was letting Iran hit Israel. They were letting them through because they wanted to preserve the interceptors, which means that the U.S. couldn't intercept these missiles. And it means that they were making significant damage.

And therefore, yeah, the fact that the U.S. is trying to fudge up the numbers about troop losses is likely really significant. The numbers are probably closer to Iran, because what we've seen over the course of this period is that Iran—what they say, it's not about taking sides—eventually, it comes out to be more true, closer to the truth than anything the U.S. has said, anything CENTCOM has said. So here's that list again: pipelines linked to Europe, oil and gas fields linked to Europe, LNG linked to Europe, whether it's in Azerbaijan, Cyprus—we can go on—Saudi, Middle, you know, West Asia, as well as even in Greece. But let me pull up the chat here. Let's see if I can see if it didn't come through. It didn't. It just says "vid," but no video. Maybe it's loading. But anyway. Yeah, it's loading. It's loading.

#Patrick Henningsen

All right. So, you can, you know, want to comment on this? I mean, it's Zelensky. I mean, that would be a real doozy if Iran did come good on any of those threats. Yeah. Because who are you going to blame at that point? Well, they'll try to blame Iran, but Zelensky's going to have to be answerable in that regime in Kiev. And that's going to really hurt their kind of reputation, as it were, and their whole position. But yeah, the video's there.

#Danny

All right, yeah, it's coming through now. I'm going to see if I can open it in a tab. So here we go.

#Patrick Henningsen

I'll just continue while you do that. And so that's the point, is that if you look at the legal argument from the Iranians to strike against U.S. bases in the Gulf, that's absolutely admissible under international law. Absolutely admissible. So all of those countries—the UAE, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Kingdom of Jordan, Kuwait—they're being used for acts of aggression against Iran. They're covered under UN Security Council Resolution 3314, under the auspices and descriptions defining

acts of aggression. And I believe, and also under the UN Charter as well, I believe it's Article 7, but I might be mistaken, Article 7, Paragraph 4, in terms of UN members have obligations as good neighborly states not to allow other states to use them to launch undeclared wars of aggression.

So all of the European countries are basically falling foul of the same problem that the Gulf states that facilitate U.S. bases to launch attacks against Iran, they fall foul under international law, under all of those clauses and all of those international agreements. These are treaties that all of the European countries have ratified. That is law in Europe. So that's codified, those treaties and the UN Charter, everything. There's no escape from this. So if Iran decides to send an intermediate-range intercontinental ballistic missile hitting any of these European targets, or even hitting Germany or the UK or Italy, who have been facilitators, or Greece, who have facilitated an illegal undeclared war of aggression, the UK is already trying to redefine these as defensive strikes.

So they've added a new sort of term, but I don't think that's going to work. They're trying. They're trying to say these aren't offensive strikes, that the U.S. are doing their defensive strikes. Tell me how that works, Danny, because I'm still trying to figure it out. So this is—they've painted a target. These European leaders have painted it by succumbing to U.S. pressure. They've painted a target on their own countries in the exact same way that the Gulf Arab states have. Okay? So again, it's this protection racket. It's just been exposed, this U.S. protection racket. But anyway.

#Danny

Yeah. Well, here's a great point. Here's the video you were referring to, Patrick. You were just in Iran. I hope the volume is good. I think it will be. But I haven't tested it yet because sometimes playing shared things on stream, it can be a little dicey. But let's see how it works. Maybe you can describe the video once again.

#Patrick Henningsen

So this is a press conference in the second-largest city, Mashhad, the last day of the Supreme Leader's funeral. And this is Ibrahim Azizi. He is the chair of the Parliamentary Committee on National Security and Foreign Policy. So he's their top-ranking foreign policy parliamentary person, minister. And I asked him about this actual question three weeks ago, two and a half weeks ago, actually. And he gave a very, very clear answer. So you could take this to the bank, Danny, his policy. But go ahead. Here we go. Thank you.

And briefly, the GCC countries, when Iran retaliated at the beginning of the 40-day war and struck U. S. bases across the Persian Gulf—in terms of the laws of war and the Geneva Conventions, Iran is within its right to retaliate against the source of the threat. And that's why the world community did not really push back very hard. However, what is the difference between the U.S. launching attacks

from the GCC and the U.S. launching attacks from Germany, from Italy, from Greece, from Romania, from Cyprus, et cetera—the EU, NATO? How do they consider these two things? Or is there no difference?

#Speaker 1

Any action, any attack on Iran.

#Speaker 1

The result is the same. The origin of hostilities will be targeted. And we have always said, time and again, if we are targeting U.S. bases in the region, the reason is that there are many bases in the region—the origin of hostilities against Iran.

#Speaker 1

Wherever it is in the world, it will be targeted decisively. We have reiterated this time and again.

#Danny

And we emphasize again, anyone, any country, any political system, that they...

#Speaker 1

They're complicit. It's our natural right, legitimate right. It has a defensive logic behind it. Thank you. So, yeah, to hit Iran, you'll get—

#Danny

You'll get it right back. You'll be targeted. It doesn't matter who you are. And I think that's a pretty stark message. But, Patrick, you know, the last two minutes or so we have here, your final comments, and then we can get into one. There's one question here, too, that was basically already answered, but I'll ask it to you anyway from an audience member.

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, yeah, ask me the question, and then I'll give a final comment. Oh yeah, so here we go. So it's, "How do they keep pulling the 60-day reset if we've been at war with Iran for 47 years?" I don't know if it's a— So, thank you, Sphinxer Knuckle Buster. A great name. Well, not everybody in Washington counts sanctions and targeted assassinations as being at war, so they don't. That's one of the reasons. But yeah, it's a question that exposes the hypocrisy of the whole thing. So, yeah.

#Danny

Yeah, your final comments, though, on the video, your trip to Iran, too. We didn't get too much into it, but anything you want to say about that? Because that was really a landmark trip, a groundbreaking trip, and it looked incredible.

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, for me, it was a transformational experience because I got to see a much deeper level of Iranian society at a very, very emotionally charged, critical time. And while I was there, you know, the U.S. was bombing us. So I got to kind of—me, as an American—it was kind of a unique experience to be in a country while your government is bombing you, and even targeting the actual civilian train line that we were on, the actual—the same one. And so, if we had been on that track 24 hours or roughly later—it was struck at night—the train could have been derailed and off of a ravine, filled with hundreds or a thousand passengers. I don't know how many were on it, but, um, a lot of people. And, uh, but yeah, I'd say that was interesting, to say the least.

But I really got a deeper appreciation for Iranian society. And it's very clear that the country has very strong institutions and religious institutions. And when I say that the religious institution is ubiquitous throughout society, it's not like a separate sort of thing. It's all politics, religion, the political economy. It's one there. And I'm not saying that every single person in the Islamic Republic of Iran is a devout religious adherent to Shiite Muslim practices. I'm not saying that. But I would say that based on what we saw, 15 million people came out in Tehran over the course of the weekend, and at least, I would say, eight to 10 million on the Monday, on the streets for the last day, the capital, of the funeral, maybe more.

The Financial Times says 15 million. Well, they didn't specify whether that was over the three days or the one day. But that's a leading U.S.—or a leading international newspaper, U.K.-based—admitting those numbers. And then nationally, over 40 million took part in the various cities in this six-day state funeral for the supreme leader, Saeed Ali Khamenei, who was killed by the United States, including members of his family, including a 14-year-old girl, his granddaughter. And so those bodies were together in caskets, including a tiny casket for the child that came through the processions, and that were there at the Grand Mosalla Mosque in Tehran, and again in Najaf and Karbala. The processions went to Iraq as well as in Iran.

But in Iran, over 40 million people—that's half the population, roughly. This is unheard of. This is unheard of in history, that half the population would have, in some way, shape, or form, participated in this state funeral. So this wasn't an unpopular leader. This wasn't somebody that was regarded as a dictator, none of these things. In fact, it's quite the opposite. And then you really got to see the intensity of—and also, you know, very widespread but calm, but very firm—calls to avenge the death of their leader, and how that vengeance is meted out or takes place. And there were many signs, Danny, that said, "Hashtag K-I-L-L Trump," being held by elderly people, old grandmothers holding these signs.

And not just a few. Not just a few. We're talking thousands and thousands of thousands. So Americans will be triggered by this, and they'll say, you know, the Fox News crowd, the Jesse Watters of the world, they'll go, Mark Levin will be hyperventilating, "They're shouting, 'Death to America.' They want to kill us." But wait, who killed their head of state? Who killed their pope? You did. The U.S. did. Israel did. And they never gave any justification as to how he was a threat to any of their countries, other than he has a turban and a beard, and he's a mullah. So therefore, ergo, he must be a terror mastermind, a leader. They claimed that this was going to topple the regime on the first day. That's what the president said publicly. He was calling for Iranians to rise up after the airstrikes. We all saw what happened.

But what they did, Danny, I will say this—the last thing I'll say here—what Trump succeeded in doing, and if we're going to give a participation trophy out for the Trump administration, we should recognize them for their achievements. And we should give a medal to Donald. Donald likes medals, doesn't he? He likes the trophies, the Peace Prize. He loves all that. So let's get Director Infantino from FIFA to fashion up a new trophy for Trump. Donald Trump should get an award for systematically and comprehensively dismantling the Iranian opposition. Any liberal, Western-leaning, pro-American opposition—there are plenty of them before this—Donald Trump and Netanyahu have succeeded in wiping out the opposition that the American taxpayers spent billions of dollars building over decades. Trump, Hegseth, Netanyahu, you guys, you deserve that award.

So I'm calling on FIFA to have that ceremony and give Donald Trump that award for eliminating and dismantling thoroughly and comprehensively the Iranian opposition, because that's what they've done. I met some of those opposition people on the streets. They're now calling for Araghchi and Ghalibaf to stop negotiating with the Americans. They're chanting, "Araghchi, Ghalibaf, no more negotiations." That's the liberal left. They're now the hawks among that crowd. Okay, some of the biggest anti-U.S. voices are young former Western-leaning liberals. That's a huge change. Yeah, so congratulations, Donald. You've done it. I'm sure that's what you intended to do, right? You guys are great. And we should give other participation trophies to Marco Rubio, Sebastian Gorka, of course, Jared Kushner and Steve Witkoff.

#Danny

Yeah.

#Patrick Henningsen

Shouldn't be left out of the award ceremony there. So this could be great. I think there'll be a fun award show.

#Danny

Yeah, get some of the—get the Pahlavi family to hand out the award. They must be happy. They're too busy now harassing Max Blumenthal on the street because they don't have anyone in Iran to call anymore to listen to their— You're not wrong, Danny.

#Patrick Henningsen

Pahlavi, just the fact that the U.S. put this—nobody likes Pahlavi in Iran. Right. He has, like, zero support. He's the butt of many jokes in Iran. The fact that the U.S. and Netanyahu were hoisting him up as the successor to the Supreme Leader just galvanized the Iranian public, and Pahlavi became more of a running joke as a result. So you're right, Danny. Pahlavi should be there to hand out those awards with Infantino from FIFA. I think that would be great.

#Danny

I'm going to invite Ahmadinejad, who is like, "What? I'm your guy now? How'd that happen?"

#Patrick Henningsen

Yeah, just invite Ahmadinejad, and I think Lionel Messi should be there along with Javier Milei as well. They can commiserate their terrible performance in the World Cup final, but there you are.

#Danny

But that's a huge change, and that's the nightmare change that the United States doesn't want to see in places like Cuba or Venezuela, this idea that it's usually the young people that intelligence can try to massage more, based on whatever generations removed from revolution, from the massive changes, you know, whatever it is. But they can't do that with Iran now because now young people have witnessed what the U.S. and Israel are really all about firsthand. Yeah, firsthand. They've lost people. They've seen people lose people. They've seen the attacks.

#Patrick Henningsen

You can't underestimate the Minab school, the effect of that on the country. It's huge. First day, the first hours. It's huge.

#Danny

It's unprecedented what—I mean, brutality and genocidal, but like genocidal, maniacal warmongering. But then just, yeah, the thought process of doing that first is something.

#Patrick Henningsen

The other one that will get a trophy at this awards with FIFA, alongside Donald, Pete, and JD, and all the rest of them, their participation medals, is Scott Bessent. If you listen to Iranian media, they've got Scott Bessent on. They keep playing the clip of him bragging about collapsing the Iranian currency. Before that, there are people in Iran blaming the government for mismanaging the economy, but because Bessent had to publicly boast about it, it destroyed the argument from the opposition that they should be attacking their own government for, quote, mismanaging the economy. They basically got them off the hook for all of that. That's Scott Bessent.

So Trump officials can't keep their mouths shut because they're constantly festooning and bigging themselves up on social media, because it's such a narcissistic culture in Washington, and this is their undoing. They have capsized their own kind of public relations armada. Their soft power armada has been capsized by their own narcissistic, just absolute carelessness, because they're all trying to basically hoist their own brands, political brands, because that's what people do now. And it's just amplified to such an outlandish and kind of crazy degree with the Trump White House than even with previous administrations that it's—I mean—you would be shocked, Danny Haiphong, how nuanced the political analysis is on everything the United States does on the media in Iran.

They don't miss anything. Look at their Lego videos. They don't miss anything. They've got all the inside jokes in there already. Like, they got Marco Rubio at a foam party in the opening scene of one of the Rubio Lego videos they just released. I mean, how did they know about that story? They really would have to have followed. They follow everything. They log and they will argue everything. It's a very vibrant political culture. And there's a lot of debate on policy between Iranians. And it can be severe. It's severe. It's not friendly debating there. But, Danny, I will argue that that's also a good—that's a sign of an actual democracy when you have that level of conflict. And we're not allowed to have that in the West.

It's not polite. So we can't—our mainstream media can't engage in any of that because we're so democratic, right? So we accuse them of not being democratic, but actually the Iranian population are more—they're more engaged in the political conversation and the consensus-building vis-à-vis the leadership than we ever will be with our current system in the U.S. or Europe. We're not engaged. We don't have any skin in the game anymore in the West. We've been totally divorced and separated from the halls of power, that we're not part of the consensus-building conversation. We might be able to make a few chinks in their armor, maybe a little bit of disruption perhaps with the current internet that's still somewhat free, but we don't have near the level of street engagement that the Iranians have with their leadership.

We don't. And they do. And that's a massive difference. We don't see that in the West. That's why they're looking at us with all of our high-minded democratic values, Western values, and they're just scratching their heads, saying, "Where are you guys getting all this? That's not how you are. We know you're not like that." And so they see this hypocrisy. And again, that's just fueling more anti-

American, anti-Western sentiment in Iran and more support for their own government by the population more broadly. Our hypocrisy is just so laid out and bare there, and they see it. And they repeat it on their mainstream programs.

They go through everything that our media and our politicians say and pick out all the inconsistencies and the lies and so forth. And the Epstein files, all of that. None of it has been lost on the Iranians. None of it. So I think it's important to just remind people of that, that that's the reality over there. And so we think we're fooling, you know, the people of West Asia, that they're backwards and they're still developing and they're under sanctions and, you know, demoralized by our mighty sanctions, demoralized by our bombs. No, they're highly resilient and hugely motivated and totally mobilized because of what we did. Just be aware of that, people of the West.

#Danny

I think that's a great place to end on. Yeah, we are... You know, there's no downplaying, of course, the tragic losses that Iranian people and people in the region have had to face. But what this war has done to accelerate especially the strongest member of the Axis of Resistance, Iran, into the position that it's in and into the dynamics you just described, that is a major blow to the United States empire, no matter how one twists or turns or how you slice it. Well, last super chat said Paul Craig spoke to NEMA. Putin should have sent Russian troops to stop the Maidan. Okay, that's a whole other topic for a whole other day. We've heard that many times, but thank you so much, Snowy, for the super chat.

We'll talk about that another time. Congress literally doesn't care what you think. I just want to pull this up as you were talking. Major 2014 research study by Princeton and Northwestern researchers who found that 90% of Americans' opinions have absolutely no effect on U.S. policy, based on 2,000 public opinion surveys comparing what comes to law and what people in the United States and various other interest groups think about policy. So that's—you just described the dynamic of Iranian society. Yeah, we have no influence over what the U.S. does against Iran, and not even on our own lives. So it's something to think about, something to chew on, definitely. Final thoughts, and then we can press end stream here.

#Patrick Henningsen

No, no, thank you. It's another Ivy League institution backing up our thesis.

#Danny

Yeah, yeah. Thank you, Princeton. That's 2014. I'm sure the numbers might be even worse as time has gone on.

#Patrick Henningsen

Well, the key mechanism of that dynamic, Danny, is look at public approval polling. We'll take this president and the last president, you know, averaging around 30 percent or below 30 in some cases. And so, so we—and you see. So let's say 70 percent of the American public disapprove of Donald Trump. Do you see 70 percent of the public on the street calling for his removal? Do you see 1 percent on the street? No, you don't. So that kind of proves that Princeton study pretty clearly. Now in Iran, all of those people—this is the important point people need to understand—that people came out to support their leader and support the government and the country. And they came out, half the population, 50 percent, in the summer heat.

And I'm talking, it was scorching, okay? It was scorching. The fire brigades had hoses out every few blocks, spraying the crowd. That's how hot it was. But that door swings both ways in Iran, Danny. And the leadership knows that, and they understand that. So they can get half the population out to support them and to show reverence and mourn for their slain leader. But the state there is very well aware that a large percentage of those people could also mobilize if they're unhappy about something. So that's when I was talking about how engaged the public is. It's a much higher level of engagement, and the discourse is much, much higher in terms of the sophistication, the detail, and the nuance of the issues, much higher than in America.

It's high on your podcast, Danny, and our other cohort on YouTube. We're in a kind of special corner here for foreign policy and geopolitics. But we can both agree that the mainstream media coverage and the Sunday morning news shows and forums in the U.S. are very lowbrow in terms of the conversation and very dumbed down. So our mainstream conversation is much more dumbed down in the West than Iran's mainstream conversation, is what I'm saying. Again, that just, to me, was more proof of how much more engaged they are. And they don't suppress high-level conversations in Iran. They don't. They platform them. They platform the smartest people. So what do you think?

#Danny

That's the opposite.

#Patrick Henningsen

So what do you think the public opinion is going to be? And the public discourse is going to be a bit better, right, if all the smart people are being platformed? In America, they platform the stupidest people, the people who are on the payroll of the defense contractors and defense industry, people who work for the Heritage Foundation or the Atlantic Council, just basically toadies for the military-industrial complex in Israel. That's who gets platformed in America. So it's no surprise that the level of discourse in the West is so low, and thus the public can't really push back because they don't know anything.

They just sit back and just take it and assume that the government knows what they're doing because all the stupid talking heads on CNN and NBC and Face the Nation and all these other Jake

Tappers and these ridiculous programs, because they're all reading off the same AIPAC bullet points. And so nobody thinks there's anything more to discuss. So we don't have a democratic system in America. We don't. It's a farce. It's a bad vaudevillian nightmare at this point. And these maniacs are pulling us towards more escalation and more war. Yeah. So, and talking about our, quote, adversaries, our, quote, enemies, like they don't know what they're doing and don't know what they're talking about or somehow not as well-informed as we are. That's not true at all. It's not. No.

#Danny

Words of wisdom. This was a great show, everybody. Thanks so much. "Preach," says Gina Coleman. Thanks so much for your support. Thanks, everyone, for coming out today—everyone who viewed, all the members, especially the moderators. You are very much appreciated. Those who gave Super Chats, all of that. I want to make sure everybody knows that you can find Patrick's work in the video description below. There, I believe, is 21st Century Wire, as well as Patrick's Substack. You definitely want to check out Patrick all over across socials because so much great content, not only on this, but so many things. And also, covering your trip on Iran was a great follow. So everyone should do that. Hit the like button before you go. You can, of course, support this show as well in the video description below and all the various places. Tomorrow, Scott Ritter, 2 p.m. Eastern Time, July 28th. So I'll see you then. Patrick, anything you want to say before I hit end stream here?

#Patrick Henningsen

No, it was great to catch up with you, Danny. I know we tried while I was over there, but it was hard. No, no, it's totally fine.

#Danny

I got it. I understood. It was hard to make content. You guys were so busy.

#Patrick Henningsen

Also, the internet access was, for me, on and off. I've been there.

#Danny

I've been there in China. It's the same deal. It can be the same thing. It's like trying to figure out, as a foreigner, what the system is and how to get access to the best stuff.

#Patrick Henningsen

But it's good to catch up again.

#Danny

Yeah, we'll have to do it again sometime soon, everybody. See you tomorrow, July 28th, 2 p.m. Eastern Time. Hit the like button before you go. Check out Patrick's work, and I'll see you then.