

# Alastair Crooke: Iran CRUSHES US Navy, Trump's SHOCK – Dollar Next?

Alastair Crooke uncovers the hidden reality behind the imminent US-Iran war and how Iran's game changing missile capabilities will be bolstered by China's unstoppable economic strategy for global realignment. 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](https://chroniclesofhaiphong.substack.com) Cashapp: \$Dhaiphong Venmo: @dannyH2020 Paypal: <https://paypal.me/spiritofho> #iran #trump #dollar #ww3

## #Danny

Deception is a very key word here. Americans may not be unaware of the fact that a lot of wars the U.S. wages rely heavily on deception. They may be shocked this time around when it comes to the possible consequences—where this deception leads.

## #Speaker 1

It says the U.S. president will fail to defeat Iran, citing Donald Trump's acknowledgment that Washington has failed to do so for the past 47 years. Ayatollah Sayyid Ali Khamenei pointed to Trump's repeated threats as he boasted about the U.S. military. The leader said that Trump claims the U.S. has the most powerful military in the world, adding that even the strongest military can be struck in a way that it cannot get back on its feet. The leader noted that more powerful than a warship is a weapon capable of sending it to the bottom of the sea.

## #Danny

That has been Iran's response essentially from the beginning of this escalation, Alistair. What do you think the possible consequences could be for the United States?

## #Alastair Crooke

Well, I'm not a military expert—first of all, you have to understand that. But secondly, I mean, you know, this is what I understand: it's an all-out existential war if it's started by either side—by Israel, or America, or if Israel joins with America in the war. And, you know, this was being underlined, I think, by the Supreme Leader, who said, "Listen, you say you've got all these things, but we could

even, you know, put a missile into a carrier." Now, I'm not suggesting they're going to do this, but you remember that the Yemenis did do that. They didn't aim to sink it, but they damaged it so badly that it had to limp away and go back to base.

So they're quite capable. They have defenses all around the coast, and this has been the case for some years. The coastline is honeycombed with silos built right into the cliffs, deep inside, with anti-ship missiles. And as I said to you, even in 2006, Hezbollah nearly sank the latest Israeli frigate with a shore-to-ship missile, and it had to limp back home. So, I mean, the idea that this—this is really, in a sense, Western Orientalism. You know, "Iran? How can it be technologically advanced? How can it have all these things?"

Because, well, the answer is, you know, of the top ten engineering and technological institutes in the world, I think four of them are in Iran. They have a huge investment, a great expertise in technology—and in weapons too. And so, you know, as I say, who knows what will happen. But I think the Supreme Leader gave a very clear message there. I mean, he delivered it more forcefully than the rather halting transcription we had, but there was no sense of, if you like, backing down or seeking a compromise. He was saying, "No." So I don't think the Iranians expect any compromise at all.

In fact, I know they're not expecting any political process to come out of this, so they're preparing for all-out war. And what will be the consequences? Well, we'll see—and we won't know for a few days after it starts. In my experience, the first strikes are spectacular; there are video images of missiles landing, and people will say, "Oh my goodness, Iran is finished." But it's usually in the following days that you see what's really happening on the ground. The first thing to look for will be missiles hitting Israel, and I think those will start quite soon after an attack. The missiles will come through.

You remember it was the Israelis who had to plead with Trump to go for a ceasefire because of the damage caused by Iranian missiles fired during that period. Their hypersonic missiles—and the fact that Israeli air defenses weren't adequate to stop them—made a big difference. They could stop the drones, but the drones were there as decoys, to draw out Israeli air defense systems and deplete them. But the actual, sophisticated Iranian missiles got through, and the Israelis tried to censor all the details of the damage. A number of key sites, including some scientific laboratories and several military areas, were hit by the Iranians. Of course, there will be heavy censorship in the West, shaping the narrative into one of victory for the West.

I mean, narratives have become—well, they're really overtaking the ability, particularly in the West now, to have a firm grip on geopolitical realities. The narratives are so bizarre. I mean, the one that just came out from a group claiming to have done surveys in Iran, saying that 70% of the people want to overthrow the regime—it's just nonsense. They should have seen what happened on the

annual Republic Day, when millions came out in support of the state, millions everywhere across the country showing their support. So we live in this world where we're not allowed to see, not allowed to think, or to really understand anything. You know, it's all down to one man and how he feels.

## **#Danny**

So I was hearing numbers—uh, somewhere between a third of the country, maybe—was engaged in some way, if not out in the streets celebrating the 47th anniversary of the Islamic Revolution in Iran. So, uh, that's a lot of people. That's just those who were found in the streets—that's a third of a country of 90-plus million. So that's an extraordinary development, given that, you know, as you said, a big part of the United States is, uh, if we call it a strategy, "please don't disturb us, we're gently sort of, you know, sipping our chardonnay." And, uh, you know, I'm just back from—

## **#Alastair Crooke**

Munich and Davos—and we don't want to be shaken by bad news. So, I mean, I think they really don't have a sense of it; they don't understand the consequences. Because the consequences are—let me put it this way—one consequence is that the United States has a weakened economic position at the moment, particularly vis-à-vis China. China had a huge trade surplus, equivalent to about 4% of GDP this last quarter—a huge trade surplus. And what happened was that the imports they bought from America were down 20% during this period. That may sound bad, but actually, the level of their total exports to everywhere except the United States went up enormously—I mean, staggeringly.

So they had this huge surplus in China. What the Americans are beginning to wake up to—what the United States is waking up to—is that they can't do anything about it. I mean, they'll go and say, "Well, we'd like you to consume more in China." But all China has to do is keep going. It's largely self-sufficient in manufacturing. It's undercutting enormously all of Western manufacturing prices because they've pursued a different form of AI from ours. Instead of ours being focused on data sensing and data management, they decided to go for a kind of weak AI that's diffused widely at the shop level, factory level—in terms of what might be called automation, robotics, things like that. I was in China just before Christmas, talking to a businessman who had a large number of factories.

And he said to me, "Look, Alistair, just take one example—one random factory. If I had 2,000 workers at the beginning of the year, I now have 200 because of the productivity gains we've achieved and the competitive edge we've gained." And I said, "Oh my God, this is a serious crisis. This is a moment—because, you know, you've got price deflation, and we have price inflation. So we're completely uncompetitive against you after what you've done with your application of AI." And that's what it was. So you see these things, and what happens is that, you know, dissent is going carefully, saying, "Well, people have got to buy our treasuries because we need money coming in, because there's a huge deficit."

We're short of money. We need money coming in. And, of course, what's happening is money is going out because people see that the dollar is devaluing—that its competitiveness is so low that it can't possibly, you know, out-compete China. Take one example: a gigawatt of generated energy in China costs about one-sixth of what it does in the United States. How do you equalize against that kind of very advanced manufacturing structure they've created? And at the same time, you'd need to devalue the dollar by about 140% just to match electricity costs between the two countries. So there is this... I mean, you know, of course, we don't hear much about it because it's not something people want to talk about.

But it means that China is in a very powerful position—not only economically, but militarily, too. I mean, there's no doubt about that. So, you know, China's not going to be brought into line by more tariffs. It's already clear that was going to fail. I mean, you remember Biden said, and Trump said, "Oh, we'll put tariffs on China, but the Chinese will have to eat the costs." Well, that hasn't happened. It's actually been the opposite. It's been the U.S. consumer and the producers—the people who need raw materials and specialized materials from China—who are having to pay so much more. And so manufacturing is failing.

And also because AI in the West—and this is not just an American problem—but the AI in the West, which is so focused on managing data rather than actually making manufacturing more effective and cheaper, is going to really bite into the middle classes of Europe. There's already a job crisis. The level of middle-class and youth unemployment has reached a new all-time peak in the UK, for example. And it's going to hit, and is hitting, America too. And this time it's not going to be the blue-collar workers who've lost their jobs because of the offshoring of manufacturing.

This is happening because AI is targeting jobs like bank staff, legal staff—anywhere data is important. All their products are built around that. But what does that mean? What does that mean when the elections come around in America, in the midterms? I mean, the job crisis is starting to hit, and will keep hitting, the middle classes—not the upper middle class; they're still doing very nicely, dining well and living well. But a lot of middle-class and young people just can't find work.

## **#Danny**

Yeah, no, so true. There are a lot of reports about even the Department of Labor here in the U.S. just absolutely fudging numbers, scrapping reports, erasing things. And a lot of that has to do with new reports, too, about unemployment—how the U.S. economy right now is relying heavily on people 55 and older, the last generation to have any kind of savings or jobs that paid them enough to save. So this is, it's indeed a dire crisis.

And Alice, before I get to some of the more global implications, I wanted to ask you about the regional situation. How worried do you think the countries in the region—the Gulf states—are, not just about Iran's potential military response, which could be quite devastating, but also about the economic situation? Because we're already hearing that oil prices are rising just based on these

escalatory threats by the United States. And of course, many analysts have noted that the economic consequences of an all-out war would be devastating. How worried are these regional countries about that?

## **#Alastair Crooke**

In one word: very, very worried. First of all, because if Hormuz is closed, many of them won't be able to export their oil, gas, or liquefied gas. The Iranians have made it clear they're going to shut it down almost long term if they're attacked. And then, like the Yemenis, you can negotiate with Iran for a special license for your vessel to pass through as a non-belligerent. But any Gulf states—or any states in the region, Arab states—that allow America to use their facilities in an attack on Iran will not be allowed to traverse Hormuz. And as I said, the Gulf states—the monarchies, the Emirates, and others—are very anxious because there's already a movement among the Shia population in Iraq, and, you know, take Bahrain as an example.

You know, that's 80% Shia. I mean, even Saudi Arabia is about 13% to 15% Shia. They're very worried this could turn into something like an Arab Spring if they've been complicit—if they've given airspace and support to an American attack on Iran. So yes, they're very worried about that. And there are already great tensions in the region between Saudi Arabia and the UAE. It's virtually a war between those two states now. Saudi Arabia is calling the UAE a Trojan horse of Israel in the region and is withdrawing assets from the UAE, and the UAE is complaining about that.

But it's bitter, and this is part of the tension coming from the situation we're in. Saudi is working closely with Turkey and Egypt in the region to create a new sort of structure, if you like. And Turkey is getting involved in it together with Pakistan. So, I mean, new things are happening, and people are very anxious about that. Of course, anyone who thinks they're just going to pass through this—if there's a major war between the United States and Iran—anyone who thinks the region is going to come out unscathed, with just a minor hiccup, I think is underrating the situation and hasn't done their calculus properly.

## **#Danny**

Alistair, I wanted to ask you—because a lot of people in the audience, and a lot of people who watch this show, wonder about this and ask me about it—why doesn't Iran preemptively strike, given all these indications that the U.S., and/or Israel, but likely both, will strike? What do you think the calculations are here in terms of going through the negotiation process, if we can call it that, and, of course, waiting for the strike to come?

## **#Alastair Crooke**

Well, there are, I think, two major elements to why they don't carry out a preemptive strike. And I think one of them might be unfamiliar to many of you listening. Iran follows, if you like, the moral

values of Islamic warfare. They have a concept of a just war, just as we have Thomas Aquinas' Christian idea—much maligned and ignored today. But they have their own concept of what constitutes a just war. And in the Shi'i version of a just war, you do not launch a surprise attack on an opponent. You are obliged to give notice and to offer an opportunity for a ceasefire, or for a hudna to come into effect.

And so, when you look back at what happened—during the Iran-Iraq war, Iraq used chemical weapons on Iran. Really, I don't know how many people, how many Iranians, were killed—something like five million were affected by chemical weapons. And what did the Iranians do? They did not follow suit. They did not reciprocate. They could have gone down the same road and used chemical weapons against Iraq, but they chose not to, even at the cost of losing more lives, because they felt it was not morally correct to take that path. And so Islam does have—Shi'i Islam, anyway—an injunction against weapons of mass destruction. And that is their position.

So, to start a war is considered morally questionable. Now, you know, I'm saying this to you sitting in America, where we've just been told at the Munich conference that the U.S.—you know, there's no such thing as international law, no such thing as morality. It's just power—might is right. So I know it's hard, but that is the truth of what I'm telling you. It does have a big effect on Iranians. And you only have to look at the Iran-Iraq war for proof of it. They held back. They lost more people as a result of chemical attacks because they didn't try to emulate that. They didn't go for a nuclear weapon.

They didn't turn to chemical weapons or weapons of mass destruction at that time. The second thing is that they're part of a partnership with China and Russia, and to a certain extent even India, in its more detached way, is part of BRICS. It's been very important to China and to Russia—and we see that in Russia's policy statements—and for the Global South to stick to the principles that were outlined after the Second World War in the Non-Aligned Movement. The Bandung Conference and others were very clear that sovereignty needed to be respected, that you had to consult with others, and that it was not for one to make a decision against the group. So I think they do observe that principle.

I mean, ultimately, when we get to an existential fight like this, the choice of what happens is going to be Iran's. But they do listen. And, you know, Russia is saying to them, it's not a good idea for you to start the war—let America start it. I mean, if it's got to be started, yes, it may mean that you lose the element of surprise. But overall, in terms of sentiment and the moral values of BRICS and the future, they don't want to go down the Western route. They want to retain a sense of moral values in BRICS and in their foreign policy. China says this all the time—that it's interested in preserving the civilizational values of states. So I think those are the two main reasons. Now, I understand that in saying that, some people will probably say, well, we don't believe that.

But I think there's a lot to understand and observe in the practice of war that has taken place. And don't forget, I'm not talking about ISIS—that's not Shiism. That's a form of extreme Sunnism, a

management of savagery, the complete opposite of what I'm talking about. That's why ISIS has been in eternal war with the Shia, wanting to destroy them. So we hear all this nonsense—I can't go into it on your program—but many of the ISIS people have put death sentences on precisely those who, in the West, are said to be practicing ISIS-type policies, when it's actually the opposite. They've threatened them as apostates, or worse, to kill them. So it's a complicated area you're opening up.