

# Alex Krainer: Trump TRAPPED in Iran War - The Exit Plan Is Falling Apart...

## #Nima

Hi, everybody. Today is Thursday, April 2nd, 2026, and our dear friend, our brother, Alex Krainer, is here with us. Welcome back, Alex. Hi, Nima. Good to connect again.

## #Alex

And warm greetings to everyone watching or listening.

## #Nima

Alex, let's start with what happened last night at 9 p.m. Eastern Time. Donald Trump said there was a new, very important message—he had to address the nation. And he did. But basically, it was nothing new. It was kind of a summary of what he's been saying so far on his social media, all those posts he's been putting out every day. It was a sort of combination of all of them. And one of the messages he gave, which had some repercussions in Iran, was when he said, "We're going to hit you hard, back to the Stone Age." And here's what he said.

## #Speaker 03

Tonight, we are on track to complete all of America's military objectives very shortly. We're going to hit them extremely hard over the next two to three weeks. We're going to bring them back to the Stone Age, where they belong. In the meantime, discussions are ongoing. Regime change was not our goal. We never said regime change, but it has occurred because all of their original leaders are dead. The new group is less radical and much more reasonable.

## #Nima

Yeah. Here's what Pete Hack said, again repeating what Donald Trump said—"back to the Stone Age." And the response from Sayyid Majid Mousavi, who is the head of Iran's IRGC aerospace division, was: "It is you who are taking your soldiers to their graves, not Iran, whom you seek to drag back to the Stone Age. Hollywood delusions have so poisoned your minds that, with your paltry 250-year history, you threaten a civilization over 6,000 years old." Alex, how do you see the way Donald Trump is trying to threaten Iran? Because it's not just about what was—you remember the atmosphere before the war started. Iran didn't want to go to this war. They did everything to bring some sort of sanity, negotiations, agreement, you know. But Donald Trump decided to go with this

war. And right now he's repeating the same thing. And what's changed in Iran is that nobody is afraid of what Donald Trump is trying to, you know, picture or draw anymore. What do you make of it?

## **#Alex**

Well, there are two parts to this question, right? One is the content of Trump's speech, and the second is the credibility it has or gains. As far as the content of his message goes, I think it's very sad to hear because there's a certain obscene vulgarity to it that's completely unnecessary. What is this business of bombing a country into the Stone Age? Why? Why would you do that? Why would you even think that? What has Iran done to you? Nothing at all. So you just choose to beat somebody up who hasn't provoked you, and then, as you beat them up, you're also saying these are the most evil people in the world, that we're going to bomb them to the Stone Age, where they belong. Why should Iranians belong to the Stone Age? What is he saying—that they're Neanderthals?

That they're Cro-Magnons? This is so ugly and so unnecessary. It doesn't achieve anything. It appeals to the lowest—well, to the lowest passions in people who believe him, which is a very, very shrinking segment of the population. And then, as far as his credibility goes, the percentage of people who actually believe what Trump and Hegseth are saying is smaller and smaller every day. But then, you know, we don't even have to be too abstract about it, because it seems to me that Trump's intention with this is, in large part, to try to give confidence to markets. The United States is in a lot of trouble if interest rates continue to rise—and they are rising. I think about a third, or roughly 30%, of U.S. Treasury debt rolls over this year. And if the interest rate—every 1% rise—adds about \$300 billion...

## **#Alex**

...to the total debt-servicing burden of the United States. So it seems to me that he's trying to boost market confidence, keep interest rates low, keep oil prices low. And I think that's the whole point of these speeches, because, as you noted, he never said anything new. But then, you know, what's interesting to look at is how the markets reacted to his speech. When he started speaking, I think the oil price was about \$102, \$103, if I'm not mistaken. It was quite low—well, low 100s. And then, as he spoke...

## **#Alex**

The price went up to about \$104. Well, guess where it is this morning—less than 24 hours after his speech? It's close to \$112 a barrel. So obviously, the markets don't believe him. Nobody believes him. His whole dog-and-pony show is getting very, very counterproductive. And, you know, markets are unforgiving. They don't care; they don't have any ideology. This is the collective action of hundreds of thousands of market participants who don't care, who make their trading decisions for their own reasons. And they've clearly given their verdict: they don't buy Trump's rhetoric. So, you

know, I think it was on your podcast a few weeks ago that I said the only way for him to save himself would be radical truth therapy—that is, owning up to the disaster he created.

He could say, well, you know, I was listening to Kushner, I was listening to Hegseth and Rubio, and they all gave me very bad advice. Fire them all and say, sorry, that won't happen again. That would be humiliating, but it would be cutting your losses. You're supposed to cut your losses when you've done something wrong, not double down like a gambler. And he's obviously doubling down like a gambler. Nobody's buying it anymore. The markets are not buying it anymore. And so from here, we can see that oil prices are probably gonna go higher. Interest rates are probably gonna go higher. And again, oil prices at \$112 a barrel may seem high, but I'd like to remind your listeners that they were already at \$140 in 2008, and they were at \$120 in 2022. So \$112 is not particularly high. This could go to \$150. It could go to \$200. We don't know where this could go, but Trump would be well advised to cut his losses and...

## **#Alex**

But he won't. And what he's risking is complete and total catastrophe.

## **#Nima**

Because part of his plan, he said, is to hit the energy grids in Iran. And this could be the repercussion of that sort of attack—how Iran would react toward the Arab states and Israel. That is hugely dangerous, for the reasons you just mentioned. And it seems that he's going to do that, Alex. I think in the next two to three weeks, we're going to see Donald Trump intensifying the attacks on Iran and the response from Iran. How do you see it? As time goes by, in such a short period, do you think it's going to get to \$150 in three weeks? Or if he intensifies the attacks and the response comes, I would argue that many of these oil and gas facilities could be hit by the strikes if it goes in that direction.

## **#Alex**

I think it would be impossible to predict this, Nima. Commodities markets are relatively small compared to treasuries and equities, for example, and currencies. These are huge markets. Oil is relatively small. All commodities are relatively small by comparison, and they're very sensitive to liquidity issues. So you could manipulate the price of oil down—and also gold and silver and everything else you need to lower the price of—by constricting the liquidity that's available in the markets. The problem is that if you do that, you'll also get a big reaction in the treasury markets and in the equity markets.

So the stock market would go down, and the bond market would go down—I mean the prices of bonds—and then you'd have a corresponding increase in interest rates. So they've really painted themselves into a corner. In order to keep markets from crashing—the stocks and bonds—they need

to keep pumping liquidity into them, but that's also raising the prices of other things. You know, it's a flood that raises everything. Gold's going up, silver's going up, food and agricultural commodities are going up, and energy prices are going up too. So whatever they do, it's going to be bad.

There's no good outcome. Before this war started, I said the only winning move would be to just dump Israel and leave them to their own devices—to stay out. But for some reason, Trump and his people chose not to. They chose to join Israel and fight Israel's war for them. And now there's really going to be hell to pay. There are no good solutions at all—there really are no good solutions for them. In 2012, the British Ministry of Defense was predicting that, due to geopolitical instability and the energy crisis, the price of oil would go to \$500 a barrel.

They said that would happen in 2040—twelve years from now—but we don't know. It's impossible to say. One problem with all this liquidity that's been pumped into the market, not just since the war started, but really since 2009, is that we had quantitative easing. More and more money was flooded into the markets, and they created this enormous amount of liquidity in the so-called shadow banking system. The shadow banking system consists of financial institutions that have a lot of liquid, investable money, but they can't create it like the banks can—they can't issue loans from nothing. We're talking about pension funds, hedge funds, private equity, insurance companies, endowments, charities, and so on.

The total amount of money in the shadow banking system is about \$220 trillion. So if they see oil prices going higher, if they get concerned that energy prices are going higher—if just a small number of these money managers decide they want a bigger allocation to crude oil, natural gas, or things like gold and silver—they can cause a massive spike in those prices. And we've seen over the last ten years or so that one asset after another, once it gains traction, once it gains popularity, goes almost vertical. One of the last ones was silver, which I think practically quadrupled in four years—it went from twenty-something to about \$100 an ounce just a few weeks ago. And the price of gold more than doubled.

We saw things like NVIDIA, Tesla stock, Bitcoin, and cobalt. A lot of these things have this hockey-stick dynamic—once they start moving up, the move tends to accelerate. I think the reason is that all this liquidity is sloshing around in the markets, and it's so enormous that once some investment becomes popular, you get a big stampede. So if that happens with crude oil—who knows—maybe we get to \$200 within this year, maybe \$500 in two or three years. It's impossible to predict, but this was all unnecessary. It shouldn't have happened, and it will end up costing enormous amounts of money to people who can least afford it. I think it will put billions of people at risk of poverty and famine around the world.

**#Nima**

Alex, you know, we had the CEO of JPMorgan, Jamie Dimon, and he was somehow encouraging Donald Trump to continue this war. It doesn't matter what the consequences would be for the market. Here's what he said, Alex.

### **#Speaker 04**

You know, the markets are unpredictable, and it's hard for me to tell you exactly what. But I think they're just looking at whether there's a chance something can go wrong. Now, we should all hope nothing goes wrong. We should all hope that these bad people are—well, that we win this thing, clean up the straits, and that Iran is no longer a threat to everybody. But, you know, the markets will be concerned until it's over. Still, I think it's very important—it's much more important that this be successfully completed than what the market does.

### **#Speaker 05**

And that sounds like what the UAE, Saudi Arabia, and the Gulf states are saying: finish this off the right way. They see the urgency here.

### **#Speaker 04**

Do you? Yes. I hear some people say they weren't an imminent threat. A threat means I'm threatening you—I might do something bad. These people have been doing bad things for 47 years. They've been killing people, they've been killing Americans. They funded that terrible Hamas attack. Several Americans were killed on October 7th. And they've had proxy wars, they've been threatening people. I think people are surprised to find out they had a ballistic missile that can go 3,000 miles. These are bad people.

### **#Alex**

So that's the CEO of JP Morgan. How and why does he weigh in on geopolitical issues? How and why does he get to say that Iranians are bad people? They're killing Americans? Why does the United States have twenty-some military bases surrounding Iran? Why? Why are they there? That's not the United States. That's not their neighborhood. The explanation is that banks like JP Morgan have financed the development of energy assets in the West Asian region, and the sales of those resources generate revenue for these banks because their clients—like BP, Shell, ExxonMobil, and Chevron—have loans. JP Morgan has financed their operations in West Asia, and when their clients repay those loans, that's direct revenue for them.

Now, those loans are secured by the natural resource wealth of the region as collateral. So if the Iranians blow up the oil infrastructure—the facilities, the whole shipping network—then their clients' business goes to zero, and they won't be able to repay those loans. If those loans can't be repaid,

they become bad loans, they become losses. The loss of that collateral, the loss of that revenue stream, could actually collapse the Western banking system, because the whole system is very fraudulent. It's completely fraudulent. It's like an inverted pyramid balanced on a relatively small segment of real money—good collateral.

But then on top of that, you add, you hypothecate and re-hypothecate, and you build this big, giant, inverted pyramid. If that money—good collateral—is removed, the whole pyramid could collapse. The only way to keep it from collapsing is to print money out of thin air and backstop all those bad loans. So obviously, from JP Morgan's and Jamie Dimon's point of view, Iranians are very bad people, because they might have something to say about whether that natural resource wealth in the region belongs to the people of that region or to Wall Street or the City of London. As far as Jamie Dimon is concerned, it obviously belongs to him.

As far as the people in the region are concerned, it belongs to them. Now, if you're able to intimidate them and bludgeon them into submission—where they say, "Okay, we'll be your slaves. We'll work for you, but you can take most of the wealth from here"—then he's going to say, "Oh, they're wonderful people. They're democrats, they're liberal, and all these nice things, you know. They respect human rights and everything, acknowledge all the genders and pronouns, and so forth." But if they say, "No, this is our wealth, we're going to decide how it's going to be used," then they're obviously very bad and should all be bombed and destroyed back to the Stone Age.

And that's—as Jamie Dimon gave away—he said that's more important than the prices, the markets, and all those things, because without political control of the region, you lose access to the collateral. And if you lose access to the collateral, then the whole Western system collapses. It's not going to collapse, though, because they've gradually taken complete control of the financial system, especially since the pandemic. So what that means is the Fed can print unlimited amounts of money to backstop all these losses and give it directly to the banks.

That is, it's not direct because it would be illegal, but they've invented little loopholes and cutouts so that, instead of the Federal Reserve buying the bonds of these failing institutions, they do it through an intermediary. They've basically made an illegal thing legal—if you don't question it too much. But what that means is, if you're printing money out of thin air, you're stealing purchasing power from the entire economy, from every person who uses dollars to earn money, pay their bills, their pensions, their education expenses. So what you're doing is diluting the purchasing power of the currency that everybody else depends on.

And so, over time, what you get is inflation, which means that everybody becomes poorer in order for JP Morgan not to fail. So, you know, of course, you could even question—why on earth is Jamie Dimon even on television? Why is he on Fox News? It's because the whole media thing has become a public relations industry. So if Jamie Dimon has to come out to persuade people that war is good, that we should fight this war harder and quicker, well then, you know, the media is there for that. And nobody's gonna tell them the story that you and I are discussing here—that this is a

horrible idea, that it's unjust, that it's unfair, that it's barbaric, obscene, vulgar, and dishonorable. It's very ugly. And maybe if you live outside of that media space, you see just how ugly it is. If you're inside it, maybe you think, like, "Oh yeah, the Iranians are bad."

They're terrible people. This is correct. This is right. We should fight this war. But we've been here before. We've seen all this before. Saddam Hussein was really, really bad, and we had to go fight him. And Bashar al-Assad was killing his own people, so we had to go fight that war. And Muammar Gaddafi was a madman, so he had to go. And Slobodan Milosevic was horrible, we had to go there. The Taliban—terrible—we have to go fight that war. Manuel Noriega, horrible person. Salvador Allende was a communist; that had to be done. It never ends. It never ends. There's always a justification. Every story is its own story. Every war is justified somehow. And you always have a segment of people who think, "Okay, they lied to us about all these things, but God, you know, when it comes to Iran, I'm sure they're telling us the truth."

So yeah, you know, let's destroy Iran, and then maybe the world will be at peace. Except it won't, because next it'll be Turkey, then it'll be Pakistan, then it'll be China, then it'll be back to Russia, and so forth. So this will never end. It'll never end until people say, "Stop, enough." Well, people did say stop and enough, to be fair. And the American people, they consistently vote for anti-war candidates. But by now, we should've learned the lesson that the whole system is rigged. The system doesn't work. You vote against war, you get more war. So the whole system is broken. I'm sorry to say, but if there's a silver lining in all this, I think that every last person with an IQ above room temperature should understand that the system is broken—that it's impossible to vote your way out.

## **#Nima**

Alex, what's so amazing to me is that these people who are basically deciding on many of these wars you just mentioned have no understanding, militarily or geopolitically, of what's going on. The way he's talking about capturing the Strait of Formosa—it's not just about the head of JP Morgan. We had Scott Bassett saying the same thing: "We're going to retake the Strait of Formosa," as though the United States was in charge of it before the war started. You know, these are some sort of fantastic delusions, I'd say, because you have to understand the reality of war and what's actually happening on the battlefield—between Iran and the United States, that's what we have.

It's similar to what we've seen in Ukraine. You know, we have two parties fighting each other—one of them using drones and missiles, basically. We know that Russia is a superpower when it comes to air power. But look at the reality of what's going on in Ukraine: it's all about drones and missiles. And Iran is fighting the same way—mostly drones and missiles—the new, 21st-century sort of war. The United States is still in the 20th century, fighting with air power, sending airplanes to hit targets and somehow feeling that they're winning.

This is the reality that isn't considered by the people in power—people who have tremendous influence when it comes to crucial decisions about going to war. These bankers, and even, you know, the Prime Minister of Canada—who's a banker—you see, he's saying nothing against this war that's happening. What you just mentioned is important. I think the bankers are part of this system of endless wars, and they're driving it. They don't understand the reality of military strength or power, geopolitically—the reality of this new kind of war, with new weapons, new attitudes, new strategies. And yet they decide everything.

## **#Alex**

I agree with you, Nima. I'll just make one correction: the bankers are not part of this forever-war reality—they're the originators, the instigators. The whole system of incentives that pushes countries into war flows from the banking institutions, exactly because they want to control resource-rich regions of the world and turn those resources into their own collateral. It's very straightforward. Nobody else has that incentive, because even the corporations that go there—like the big oil companies, Halliburton, and KBR—they could do business on a different basis. You know, they could simply buy those resources from local producers, trade like every other country does.

You know, you have oil, diesel, and gasoline in Denmark, in Switzerland, and in Nigeria. These countries don't have military bases everywhere—they just buy the oil from whoever's selling it. The only reason you need to politically control any region is to make sure the collateral is awarded to you, that it's your clients who get the loans to develop those resources, and then to back those loans with the collateral that's there. So nobody else does. And then, you know, the people—the ordinary people, the ones who fight the wars and pay the cost of it—they're always anti-war, because they understand they have nothing to gain from it. Soldiers who go to fight there, the best they can hope for is just to survive.

That's all. There are no upsides. They're being asked to fight, to sacrifice themselves, and to die—but there's nothing in that for them. There's a lot in it for Jamie Dimon, but not for the soldiers who are sent there to fight and die. And you're right, the battlefield has changed completely. This whole idea that you can send large battleships with rockets, missiles, bombs, and aircraft is a delusion. You can blow things up, but you cannot control the territory. I don't understand how people don't see this, because the United States military—the greatest fighting force in the history of the Milky Way Galaxy—tried to subdue the Taliban in Afghanistan for twenty years, and they failed.

And they've also tried to subdue Ansar Allah in Yemen for ten years—and they failed. Iran is the size of Western Europe, with ninety-two million people. They've seen the U.S. military fight its wars; they know what they're up against. They've been preparing for more than twenty years for this. It's the height of delusion to think you have any chance whatsoever of defeating Iran. It's just so—well,

Nima—it's so insanely crazy. That's why I've been insisting on your podcast for many weeks, or months, that Trump would never do this, because it's just so dumb that nobody could possibly be that dumb. But it looks like I was wrong about that. Yeah.

## **#Nima**

I think the outcome of what's happened, Alex, for the region is going to be some sort of drastic change—and I think it's already happening with the attacks on the Americans. You mentioned many American bases around Iran. They're not there anymore because Iran destroyed most of them. And you don't see that kind of eagerness in the Trump administration to go back into those countries. This is a huge change. Donald Trump, by the way, didn't mention any of this. He didn't say what the reaction was. Yeah, you attacked Iran, you hit the targets—but what was the reaction from Iran? What was the response from Iran?

You see, today Israel was supposed to cut off the head of the octopus. The whole strategy was: go ahead, Iran is the head of the octopus, the Axis of Resistance is the body—go there, destroy the head of the octopus, and everything's going to disappear from the scene. But since the war started, you see the Axis of Resistance just coming out. You see something new happening in the region. You see that Kuwait is not the Kuwait it was before. Bahrain is not Bahrain as it was before. Saudi Arabia, the UAE—you see the fragility of these monarchies in the Persian Gulf. These are the outcomes of what has happened so far, which were not mentioned in Donald Trump's address to the nation.

## **#Alex**

Well, yes, of course, because Donald Trump didn't make his speech to inform people about what was going on. He made that speech to boost confidence in his leadership and to boost market confidence. And so, obviously, you lie about everything else. You lie about everything altogether, and you only give the parts of the story that make you look good, completely omitting the holes in your story. We've become used to this being Trump's style. And I have to say, in the beginning, I was always saying, well, don't listen to what Trump is saying.

You know, that's bad for your mental health. Just watch what he's doing. The problem is that now what he's doing is almost as awful as the things he says. And I think it's not going well anywhere. History is full of hubristic leaders who thought they could create reality by force, that the whole world would have to bend into shape to submit to them. And then they found out they couldn't. Especially with markets—if you have markets in the equation, markets are very unforgiving. They don't care at all about you, your agenda, your ideology, or how great you think you are.

You had, you know, in Roman times, Diocletian, who thought he could force the markets to stop inflation. And so, you know, they had death penalties for traders who exceeded the decreed prices of goods. I think thousands, if not tens of thousands, of traders were put to death because they

contravened Diocletian's price edicts. But in the end, the whole thing failed, and inflation exploded during his reign. And unbelievably, it's as though we never learned any of these lessons. You have Trump, in the 21st century, in the United States—the wealthiest, biggest, most powerful country in the world—doing exactly the same errors as previous emperors have done.

And it's going to lead to exactly the same outcomes. Unfortunately for the rest of the world, I think there's going to be a lot of suffering in the Global South—much more than in the United States. And then, you know, we're probably going to see the collapse of the European Union. We're probably going to see the collapse of NATO, which, in a way, Trump does want to see. He does desire to destroy NATO and the EU, and maybe that could be a silver lining in this war. But as far as his leadership goes, he's failing.

## **#Nima**

Alex, looking at what has happened, I think there's a lot to be learned from the two wars—in Ukraine and in the Middle East right now. The war in Ukraine started because the Biden administration rejected negotiations with Russia in December 2021. Russia was trying desperately to talk with Washington and with NATO, but nobody seemed eager to go in that direction, to talk with Russia. Then we've seen what has happened up to this day. Donald Trump, when he was elected, said, "If I were president of the United States, this could never have happened." Which, I think, is not really a problem with the president—it's a problem with the empire.

The empire doesn't understand, doesn't learn. The learning curve is so flat because it did the same thing the Biden administration did. Iran tried desperately to talk with the United States. And now we're more than a month into this war, with Iran saying no ceasefire, Russia saying no ceasefire. Right now, the battlefield will decide the outcome of this war. This isn't Iran and Russia deciding about these wars; this is the United States forcing them into these wars. And I think something has happened in Russia, and something is happening in Iran. The people are saying, "No, that's enough. We're not going to accept this anymore."

## **#Alex**

Yes, because both Russia and Iran—and this is also true for other countries like Cuba, Venezuela, China, and a few others—are being perpetually harassed, oppressed, and sanctioned by the Western powers, obviously led by Britain and the United States. Part of that harassment includes sanctioning them financially so they cannot trade with the rest of the world, leaving their economies almost permanently suffocated. And then part of it also has a military dimension, where you surround these countries with military bases. In the case of Cuba and Venezuela, they were subjected to practical embargoes where they can't even produce enough energy for their economies. Iran has been under maximum-pressure sanctions and surrounded by American military bases. The United States has financed the MEK terror organization.

It has turned Iran's neighbors against Iran. Until the last minute, Iranians wanted to resolve the disputes through negotiation. But once Trump chose to use force and wage war on Iran, I think Iran now has every incentive in the world to take it all the way and not allow a return to the previous status quo. Because, you know, that would only mean more decades of harassment, sanctions, embargoes, terror attacks, sabotage—all of that. And when the next opportunity arises to bring war to you, they'll do it again. So now, since you're forced to go to war, of course it's in your interest to fight it all the way and completely remove the threat to your national security.

And the same is the case for Russia. Russia has been under siege for decades—in fact, for centuries. You know, every time Western powers had an opportunity or desire to invade Russia or stage regime-change and color-revolution operations, they've tried it. And depending on how you want to look at it, you could go back almost 800 years to when it all started. It was with the Crusades. We learned about the Crusades for the Holy Land, and we learned about them as though they were purely religious. But there were also Northern Crusades, which attacked the regions that are Russian territories today. And the underlying incentive has always been to loot, plunder, enslave, and take the wealth of the target countries. At some points, it was even overtly so.

Today, you know, we talk about democracies and this leader being a madman, that leader being a madman, killing his own people, oppressing women, and so forth. But it's always about the same thing. It's about the collateral, it's about the wealth. It's about, obviously, enslaving the population, because all that wealth will not extract itself. You know, somebody has to do the work. And then, you know, somebody will object if I say "enslaving the people," because they're not really slaves—we don't have slavery. But, you know, when Vladimir Putin came to power in Russia, the average salary in Russia was \$56 a month. So, you know, you can say that's slavery, but that's living on less than \$2 a day. That's destitute poverty. That's maybe worse than slavery.

## **#Nima**

Alex, here's what Lavrov said. You know, he recently mentioned that international law is dead because of Donald Trump. Donald Trump doesn't care about international law. He says—well, he defines the policy, he decides everything. He doesn't care about international law, and whatever he says, that's the international law. But he added something else, which I think is important within the context of what we're talking about right now.

## **#Speaker 06**

That we are in the middle of a reshaping of the world order that will hopefully lead to the formation of a stable and fair multipolar world. But right now, this restructuring looks more like disruption in all spheres, and the fight for power across the world is fierce. Political scientists in Russia and elsewhere point to a number of signs that indicate how challenging today's situation really is.

## **#Nima**

He's literally talking about how the world has changed and is changing right now. And in this new world, Alex, how do you see the Persian Gulf Arab states behaving or reacting? Because Netanyahu wants to make some sort of—well, he said he wants—let's not, you know, he's basically saying, "Don't use this radar for Mosul. Let's fit something else going from Saudi Arabia to Egypt," to deceive them, to make Israel part of a new kind of force against the axis of resistance. I don't know what kind of army that would be or who's going to participate in it. And he somehow feels that these Arab leaders would have some sort of support from their base, from the people, which I think is not the case. But how do you see West Asia moving in that direction? We know that Iran has already decided what its path will be. How do you see the Arab states?

## **#Alex**

Well, obviously the Arab states are extremely weak and vulnerable. I think these ideas of rerouting oil through pipelines going to Haifa in Israel are just wishful thinking built on delusions—it's a fantasy. Because if that were such a great idea, how come they haven't done it already? They haven't, because it's not really doable. It's not feasible, since you'd still need to pacify all the populations along the pipeline routes, and you'd have to keep them pacified permanently. Israel is too small and too weak, and the United States is halfway around the planet to be the policeman there.

And there was obviously an awareness in American military circles that they completely depended on their local alliances to maintain any kind of hegemony in that region. They also depended on projecting power. But, you know, 30 years ago, with your aircraft carrier strike groups and your Tomahawks and precision-guided missiles, you could successfully project power. Today, nobody's impressed anymore, because not only are these weapons extremely expensive when they're fighting swarms of cheap drones, they're also obsolete—and in very short supply. So you've already lost strategically.

Fantasizing that you're going to rearrange the flow of oil somehow—to make the Strait of Hormuz and Iran irrelevant—is really just a fantasy about saving yourself when you've already lost. So I don't think that amounts to much. On the question of international law, I have to say I don't really know what to think about that, Nima, because people who speak of international law with some sentimental attachment usually refer to one document, and that's the UN Charter. And that's fine as far as it goes. The UN Charter is a good document—could be one of the best legal documents ever drafted. The problem is that the dominant powers in the world have always used that framework in a kind of transactional way, you know.

If it was expedient for them to abide by international law, then they did. But most of the time, it was expedient for them to force others to abide by international law—and they never did. Or, you know, maybe today they do, but tomorrow they walk away from every commitment and change everything. So... international law is dead today, but it didn't die with this war on Iran. It's been dead practically since the beginning. The problem is, when everybody else recognizes that

international law is dead, then everyone starts taking their future into their own hands. And they decide, like, "Oh, well, you know, I guess we need nuclear weapons, because that's the only way we're going to be left alone." Well, you can lament that—but who created that reality?

You know, if you're going to attack and bomb every country that doesn't have nuclear weapons, then you're making every country think, "We need nuclear weapons." And so, you know, the consequences of that are completely on the United States, Great Britain, Israel, and all these Western globalist powers. I don't know if it's going to be possible to reverse those tendencies. I think the only alternative security—well, okay, from the military's point of view, it's hypersonic missiles. But so far, I think only three countries have hypersonic missiles, or maybe four—Iran, Yemen, China, and Russia. And the other option is maybe to join the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, which is on the Eurasian landmass and is practicable.

If you're in the Global South or South America, then it's probably not practicable. So it's a complicated situation. But on the other hand, I think this complicated situation will force leaders in many countries to come to constructive solutions—to have constructive dialogue with their, you know, neighbors, with other countries in the region—and hopefully to arrive at some kind of peaceful arrangement, maybe on the model of the Treaty of Westphalia. I don't know. But it clearly won't be achieved by submitting yourself to the hegemony of the United States, Britain, and France.

## **#Nima**

Do you think the tone is changing in Europe after seeing how the American bases were destroyed in the Middle East? Because we had the head of the IDF in Germany.

## **#Nima**

Yeah, AfD, you know, Alternative für Deutschland—she was talking about how the United States should withdraw its troops from Germany. You know, since World War II, the United States has been there, and every time they said, "We're here to protect," but I don't think anybody is that naive anymore to believe that the U.S. presence in their country would help them or protect them. This is something new, the outcome of what's happened in the Middle East.

How do you see these changes happening? Because so far we've seen the president of Spain say no to Donald Trump—saying it doesn't matter if you want to sanction us or put tariffs on us. It doesn't matter. You see Italy and France somehow moving in that direction. Is Europe going to be independent? I'm not talking about the current leaders, but if you look at the outcome of the Middle East, the outcome of the war in Ukraine, it seems to be leading to some sort of new reality, a new understanding on the part of public opinion in European countries.

## **#Alex**

I think that Europe as a whole—the European Union—is becoming increasingly irrelevant. And NATO as well. Yes, yes, NATO as well. Yeah, NATO, obviously. It's astonishing, absolutely astonishing, that NATO and the European Union, in the conflict between Hungary and Ukraine—where Hungary is a member of both NATO and the European Union, and Ukraine is not—when Ukraine attacks Hungary's energy supply lines and cuts it off from Russian gas and oil pipelines, NATO and the European Union, which should without question protect Hungary's interests and defend it against Ukraine, instead take the side of Ukraine, which is a member of neither NATO nor the European Union.

So, you know, why would any country be a member of this alliance if the alliance turns against its own members in favor of non-members? That doesn't make any sense at all. I think these structures are already collapsing—they're already disintegrating. Part of the conflict with Trump will accelerate that, and I think we should welcome it. Then, you know, the countries of Europe will have to work on making peace with one another. Germany also has a very tough problem with its neighborhood because, you know, it has Poland on its border, which is now both economically and militarily a very respectable regional power—and part of the Polish political class definitely wants to antagonize Germany.

Well, Radek Sikorski was celebrating the destruction of the Nord Stream pipelines. Then, you know, Germany also has a historically very difficult relationship with France, another major power in its neighborhood. And things can be very tense with the Scandinavian countries as well—Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. So, in fact, there's only one power in the region that could be a reliable partner and friend to Germany, and that's Russia. That's why it has been so important for the current leadership in Germany, the European Union, and NATO to do everything they can to destroy the relationship between Germany and Russia and turn it into something, you know, mutually hostile.

But I think that with time, all these things will have to change. And I think that if the AfD came to power in Germany, they would probably reach out to Russia—not only for matters of energy and natural gas, but also for security. And, you know, in the long cycle of history, when Germany came to a point of acute crisis, they usually turned to Russia and usually found a willing partner there. And I think that once this unhappy alliance of, you know, the Greens—these, these, how do they call it?

Traffic light alliance—these, these political monstrosities—disintegrate, and maybe if the AfD forms the next government, I think these relationships will begin to change. You know, Russia already has a good relationship with Hungary and with Slovakia, for example. The Russians wanted to fix their relationship with Poland, but that was destroyed as well. And I think that even in Italy and France, Russia will find open doors and willing partners in due course. And so then every country will have to make its security arrangements with the other regional powers and with its neighbors on a one-to-one basis, basically. And so hopefully, you know, if it's left to itself, I'd be very optimistic that this is what's going to happen.

But I think we have these globalist powers that are actively trying to destroy all this—trying to prevent the AfD from coming to power in Germany, trying to prevent Rassemblement National from

forming a government in France, and deliberately propping up those people in Poland who want to antagonize Russia and Germany, keeping the continent on the verge of destabilization. And then there are problems in the Balkans—same thing. We'll see what happens, Nima. It's very, very difficult to predict. It's clear that people don't want war. They don't want to go to war against Russia. They don't want to go to war against one another.

But unfortunately, history teaches us that often very, very small cabals in power can start world wars. I mean, we're literally talking about a handful of people who have so much power and so much influence that they can contrive World War I and World War II, and they can orchestrate the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. So, I'm hopeful that thanks to the fact that we have the internet today, that we have social media today, that the level of discourse is much more sophisticated, much more nuanced and higher level, that peace could be defended and could prevail. But you can see that now they are trying to, you know, pull together a coalition to take down X completely, to make it unavailable in Europe.

And I don't know if they'll be successful in this, but they're trying to prevent open discourse. They're trying to go back to the times when we depended on newspapers, radio, and television—and that made it very easy for them to control the narrative. If they manage to regain control of that narrative, they might be able to push us all into war again, you know, like a world war on the European continent, as 80 years ago. So that's the danger. We'll see what happens. But I think that in the meantime, everyone—absolutely everyone—needs to stand up and defend freedom of speech. You shall know the truth, and the truth will make you free. If we lose the fight for truth, we lose the struggle for freedom.

## **#Nima**

Alex, before wrapping up, I think many of us should remember the role of one of the most important players in this whole game. What we're witnessing right now is the result of a failed policy on his part. Who is he? Here's what Benjamin Netanyahu said a long, long time ago. The policy was the same, and the outcome was somehow beneficial for all of us, all around the world. Here's what he said.

## **#Speaker 07**

...arming, systematically, most of the terrorist groups that operate against the West. They've been training them on their own soil and in countries aligned with the Soviet Union. They've been giving them money, diplomatic pouches, safe havens, and so on. If you take away the Soviet Union and its chief proxy, the PLO, international terrorism would collapse. It would cease to be so menacing.

## **#Nima**

To this day, he's the same. And it's amazing how the empire loves him, you know?

## **#Alex**

Yes, yes. Well, Empire Nima appears to be a satanic death cult—and of course they love him. I don't know what happened with Trump, but some people say he was always like this, that he just revealed himself, that he'd been deceiving us up until the 28th of February. But a friend of mine pointed out something very interesting that I'd like to look into. He said, you know, it seems that everything went downhill from the time Jared Kushner appeared on the scene. For some reason, Kushner was present and active in Trump's first administration, and then he disappeared. It seemed that Trump distanced himself from him, and for almost the first year of his new administration, Jared Kushner was nowhere to be seen.

He wasn't part of the government. Remember, Steve Witkoff was going on all these negotiations and trips by himself, not with Kushner. And then suddenly Kushner reappears—he's everywhere, practically in control of everything. And almost immediately, we have that attack at Valdai, which was very strange. But it happened, and it happened with American weapons. So now there are two very bad possibilities. One is that Trump was involved, and the other is that he was not involved—which is even worse, because it implies he doesn't have his administration under control. That would mean there are rogue elements in his administration doing whatever they want: assassinating people they negotiate with and fomenting wars, while Trump is completely lost and can't control it.

Both possibilities are very bad, and in either case, Trump owns it. Anyway, that's not to excuse him at all. But then we have to examine the role and potential life's work of Jared Kushner—who he is. And as it turns out, he's very, very close to Netanyahu. That is, he's close to the same circles Netanyahu is close with. So it leads back to this satanic death cult, which seems to be in charge. And that seems to be the same circles Jeffrey Epstein came from. And today we know who Jeffrey Epstein's employer was. You know, because—okay, so you have the hitman, but you also have to take into account who's paying the hitman, right? Who orders the wars and the assassinations and all these things.

And it seems to be coming from the same source—you know, the banking families that take pictures in front of paintings of Satan summoning his troops. You know what I'm talking about? It all seems to be coming from there, including Bill Gates' planning of pandemics, the climate crisis, lockdowns, the energy crisis, the attack on farmers, engineering a global famine that's probably a year, year and a half away—which could end billions of people's lives, and so forth. So it appears to me that Trump has basically capitulated to them. Or, some people say, no, he was always on board with them—he was always part of that. Maybe, maybe. Who knows? At any rate, the good thing is that we know who the enemy is today. We don't have to wonder about it.

## **#Nima**

Thank you so much, Alex. Thanks for having me.

**#Alex**

Until next time.

**#Nima**

And see you soon. Bye-bye.