

Alex Krainer: Iran CLOSES Strait of Hormuz – Trump’s Lebanon Position

#Nima

Hi, everybody. Today is Thursday, April 9th, 2020. It's Texan, our dear friend and brother, Alex Krainer. Welcome back, Alex.

#Alex

Good to be with you again, Nima. Warm greetings to everyone out there.

#Nima

Alex, I know you've been following what's going on with the war between the United States and Iran. I won't go into details about that, but I'd like to know your understanding. What do you make of what's happened so far with the ceasefire and the difficulties surrounding it?

#Alex

Well, it appears that it was the Trump administration that was asking for a ceasefire. Initially, they were apparently asking for a 45-day ceasefire, and the Iranians were not interested in any kind of ceasefire at all, because they've been insisting since the beginning of this war that they want a permanent peace and want to remove the causes of the conflict. It's understandable, too, that the Iranians—since this war has been forced on them—want to take advantage of the fact that their whole nation has come together, backing the government. They want to use this moment to remove not only the causes of the conflict but also, you know, we have to remember that Iran has been harassed by Western colonial powers for over 120 years now.

And this has prevented Iranian society and their economy from developing to their full potential. It has also distorted the political process to the extent that, you know, if your country is under siege constantly, then political power has to be more repressive than it would normally be, because you're constantly dealing with internal and external enemies—threats to your society, threats of terror, sabotage, overthrow, color revolutions, and so forth. So it requires a certain vigilance that ends up causing limitations to freedom, and those limitations ultimately become limitations to economic initiative, innovation, development, participation in trade with other nations, and so on, because all of those things can end up being openings for a threat.

And so this moment might be extremely, extremely important to the Iranian government, which is why I think they cannot back down, and they cannot allow a return to the status quo. It's easy to imagine that a 45-day ceasefire, for the American and Israeli side, would be a welcome breather. It would allow them to regroup, rearm, and bring back more of their interceptor missiles and everything they need to refresh their attack on Iran. But this is not a good thing for Iran, so it's obvious why they would be reluctant and why the American side would be eager. Yesterday, I wrote about this in my report.

As I was writing my report and looking into particular issues of the situation, I came to the conclusion that there's very, very little likelihood this ceasefire is going to hold at all. Before I hit send on my report, I went on X to see the latest developments, and already—about 12 hours after the ceasefire was announced—we saw it unraveling. The Israelis said, "No, we don't recognize the ceasefire with regard to Lebanon," and they launched a massive bombing campaign against Beirut. The Americans started equivocating, saying things like, "No, it's not the Iranian ten points, it's our fifteen points," and, "Nobody ever mentioned Lebanon; we don't know what the Iranians are talking about," and so forth.

So we'll see what happens. But I think this ceasefire is extremely fragile. We know that the Americans are largely agreement-incapable, that they'll breach any commitment as soon as it becomes expedient for them to do so. Let's not even mention Israel—they just do whatever they want. It doesn't matter who thinks what about it. I think we have to go back to the fundamentals. Right now, if you follow the day-to-day news, you might think this conflict is about Iran's nuclear program, about their ballistic missiles, about the repressive regime of the fanatical clerics in Tehran, about the freedom of women and girls in Iran, and all these things. But it really is not.

These are all just pretexts. The fundamental cause of the conflict brings us back to the geopolitics of the empire and its imperative to dominate the Eurasian landmass. Iran has been, for decades, one of the main obstacles to the empire's hegemony over Western Asia. So they've been salivating over the prospect of regime change—installing a puppet government in Tehran, like they've done in other Arab countries—so that Iran's wealth could become their collateral. We have to remember that Iran is estimated to be the fifth or sixth wealthiest nation in the world in terms of natural resources. They have over 92 million people, which is not irrelevant, because all those resources won't just extract themselves.

You need to enslave a large population to do that. And, you know, when I say "enslave," of course, in the West we talk about "bringing jobs," but usually these are not very high-paying jobs, and colonized countries are rarely prosperous or wealthy. And then Iran is a major element in enabling the expansion of this hegemony to other parts of the Eurasian landmass. This is the ultimate, fundamental reason for the Western desire to change the regime in Iran. And this will not change. It

doesn't matter if the current government in Iran gives up its nuclear program, gives up its missile program, allows all women in Iran to open OnlyFans accounts and wear miniskirts—if Iran conceded on all those points, it still wouldn't change the situation.

They would still want regime change, or else they'd want the government to completely succumb to the Western diktat. And what does that mean? It means that, for example, if Iran wanted to have a peaceful nuclear program for generating electricity, the government would have to award those contracts to, say, Westinghouse. Then Westinghouse would build the nuclear power plants—no problem—except that every kilowatt hour of Westinghouse's nuclear power would cost five times what a similar Chinese-built power plant would cost. This is a fact. But it doesn't matter.

Westinghouse would pay for building those power plants with loans taken out from JP Morgan, Goldman Sachs, Citigroup, and similar financial institutions. That would mean the repayment of those loans would ultimately come out of the pockets of the Iranian people. So the price they pay for electricity—nobody in the West cares about whether it's competitive or not—so long as the wealth of Iran is extracted westward to the City of London or Wall Street. This is the ultimate cause of war, and it brings us back to the slogan that all wars are bankers' wars. This is literally the truth. It's the ultimate incentive for the wars we see, not just against Iran but also against Russia—and, in the near future, probably, if Iran falls, against China.

#Nima

Alex, when it comes to focusing a little bit on the details of what's happening with the ceasefire, you mentioned there are various negative points right now in terms of the ceasefire. One of them is the case of Lebanon. First, they said that Lebanon was going to be part of it. Then J.D. Vance—even J. D. Vance yesterday—said that it was a misunderstanding on the part of the Iranians. But the reality is, as you can see, the New York Times reported that the text posted by the Pakistani prime minister was written, managed, and shaped by people in Washington. And it's not just about looking at this.

And he mentioned in that tweet that it included Lebanon and other places, not just Lebanon. And look at this, right? It says "Draft – Pakistani Prime Minister message" on X. He basically copied and pasted the same message he got from Washington. It's unbelievable. You see J.D. Vance trying to—well, I don't know what his understanding is of negotiations with the Iranians, because they don't have a good history of that. They attacked Iran twice while negotiating with them, and now he's trying to do the same. How do you see the way they're trying to make their case before the negotiations even happen in Pakistan?

#Alex

Well, if I wanted to be charitable to the Trump administration—which I'm not so inclined to be since February 28—but if I wanted to be charitable, I could say they have to spin this in a way that doesn't look like a strategic defeat. So they have to pretend they're imposing terms, that they're defining the

framework for negotiations, that the Iranians basically got this ceasefire because they were begging for it, and so forth. Because if what the Pakistani prime minister is saying were true, it makes it obvious that it's the inverse—that the United States is the supplicant and the Iranians are dictating the terms. So J.D. Vance obviously has to stay in line with the administration's messaging. And that, unfortunately, makes it quite clear they're being deceptive about this, that they're deceiving the public.

But overall, I think it lowers everybody's expectations for these negotiations. I think the Iranians, for the sake of history, have to make every goodwill gesture they can to show they're willing to end the hostilities, if that's possible. So when the history of this episode is written, nobody can say, "Well, no, the Iranians actually wanted war, they favored war, they were completely closed off to every peace initiative." They have to see the negotiations through to the end. They have to reach the point where the responsibility for the outcome can clearly be attached to their adversaries. And then the conflict continues. Unfortunately, I think it will continue, because the West will not give up its dreams of hegemony over the region, and they'll do everything they can to weaken, sabotage, and take down the Iranian government.

#Nima

Yeah. I think, Alex, what happened is this: yesterday we learned that Iran was going to launch an attack in the aftermath of that massive strike on Lebanon. They killed many civilians—kids and children, by the way. But Iran had decided to attack last night, and then, at the final moment, they chose not to go through with it because they still want to see if they can resolve things through negotiations with the United States, with J.D. Vance. Don't you think J.D. Vance has everything to lose in this game? He's holding a losing hand right now. He doesn't have the opportunity for 2028, but he could do something about it—he could change the course, change everything for his future. And how do you see J.D. Vance as Vice President of the United States? Are we going to see, as our friend John Helmer put it, the Christian faction somehow showing some kind of leverage over the Jewish faction in Washington?

#Alex

Well, I don't know. I don't have very high expectations. J.D. Vance has been presented to us as the good guy in the Trump administration. He's made some really nice speeches, particularly regarding values like freedom of speech and freedom in general. He's reprimanded European leaders for infringing on civil rights and free speech and so forth. So that all looked very good, but we have to appreciate that the United States is a Christian faction—the whole country is a Christian faction. But nevertheless, it has proven itself to be completely beholden to the Zionist project. And there doesn't seem to be any political faction strong enough to really assert the principle of "America first." When push comes to shove, it's always "Israel first." I was quite shocked a few weeks ago.

I was watching a clip on YouTube, or maybe one of the other social media platforms, where some freelancer went into the U.S. Congress, walked through the halls, and randomly asked congressmen and staffers, "America first or Israel first?" And not a single one of them said "America first." One of them actually said "Israel first," but not a single one would say, unequivocally, "America first." I mean, they're supposedly representatives of the American people, but it seems there's such a fear of Israel, of AIPAC, and of Israeli interests on Capitol Hill that nobody dares even say "America first." And then we see that when Benjamin Netanyahu comes to the U.S. Congress and gives a speech, it doesn't even matter what he says—they all give him a hundred standing ovations.

It's actually quite surprising. I don't think that J.D. Vance is in any way exempt from this. And I don't see how this Zionist project fails, except by force—by being destroyed through military means. I think the only military force capable of doing that is Iran. And, you know, we're going to find out, because I think Iran hasn't played all its cards yet—far from it. I think the axis of resistance has been jolted back to life. It's stronger today than it's been in the past, and this wave is gathering strength. We can't predict what's going to happen, but all these atrocities that Israel is committing are having an effect.

You know, there's always a reaction to every action. When you push desperate people far enough into a corner, they lash back—and I think that's coming. Israel is a very small country; it's got, what, eight or nine million people, of which only about half are Jews. And it's surrounded by hundreds of millions of Muslims. This looks extremely bad. Israel is completely, one hundred percent, dependent for its security on its Western allies—the United States, NATO, Great Britain. And we're seeing these powers prove themselves to be paper tigers. I mean, the future doesn't look good for Israel. I don't see any light at the end of this tunnel, other than, you know, an oncoming train—a massive train wreck coming Israel's way.

#Speaker 03

Yeah.

#Nima

Alex, the problem with the ceasefire—or with continuing the war—is how Donald Trump and his administration are going to manage the economy, because the economy is under pressure from what's happening in the Strait of Hormuz. And the reality isn't going to change. You know, yesterday, when Israel attacked Lebanon, Iran said the Strait was closed again. That's a huge source of leverage for the Iranians when it comes to putting pressure on Donald Trump and the GCC countries. And that's not going to be removed from the scene, from the calculation. So how's that going to work out for Donald Trump if he decides not to negotiate in good faith, but instead tries to deceive people or drag out the conflict and continue the war?

#Alex

It's not going to go well, for sure. I think there's a 100% probability that the United States, and also other Western countries, are going to face a severe crisis of stagflation—meaning economic stagnation coupled with rising price inflation. And, you know, this could become a very, very severe crisis. Maybe the United States has a bit more room to maneuver, to engineer a softer landing, but for the economies of Europe, Great Britain, Japan, and probably South Korea, the crisis is going to be very severe. And the inflation—I think there's no way of avoiding it.

I think the closure of the Strait of Hormuz is merely a catalyst that will accelerate these tendencies. But the real cause of this inflation is the overhang of unpayable debts that all Western economies are now sinking into. The United States has a national, public debt approaching \$40 trillion. That's just the federal government's debt. When you add state and local government debts, and then private debts—households, corporations, financials—it goes beyond \$120 trillion. This is an absurd amount of money. It's completely unpayable.

So it forces the government and the monetary authorities—the Federal Reserve—to backstop the bad debts, because most of these debts are never going to be paid. They have to backstop them with money printed out of thin air, meaning they basically have to monetize the debt. That means you need to print more and more money to cover up all these holes. And with every dollar you print out of thin air, you're diluting the purchasing power of the dollars already in circulation. Over time, you destroy the currency. You can sense that the people in the Trump administration are very aware of this problem, because Trump is already talking about having to completely change the monetary foundation of the economy—that they need to switch to cryptocurrencies, that the dollar has to be taken out of circulation, and so forth—because they understand this is a massive vulnerability.

So what's going to happen at some point is that the dollar will be withdrawn from circulation and a new, different currency will replace it. Then probably a lot of investors and bondholders will have to take a major haircut, meaning they'll lose a lot of their wealth. The game restarts from a blank slate, meaning the new money might come into circulation either debt-free or with much less debt attached to it. Then you get another period where you can push new credit cycles and hopefully revamp the economy, repair the infrastructure, reindustrialize the economy, and so forth.

So I think that is the agenda, in broad brushstrokes, of the Trump administration. I can't tell you what the agenda is for European governments or for the British government, because it seems to me that everything they do just makes things worse. And I think their only plan is war. They talk about competitiveness—Keir Starmer, every so often, talks about putting more money into the pockets of the British people—but everything he does takes more money out of those pockets. And now you have more social pressures that are going to erupt, that are going to become social uprisings.

And then, you know, if you listen to specialists, they're saying that a civil war in Europe is inevitable at this point. How does that happen? I don't know. But these things tend to happen at unpredictable junctures, sometimes for reasons nobody could have foreseen. You know, some church gets burned down, or some pupil dies in a school for some stupid reason, and then the discontent overflows and there's no taking it back. It becomes like an avalanche, and nothing can stop it. So we are, unfortunately, in uncharted waters.

What can be predicted today with certainty is stagflation—economic stagnation with rising levels of inflation. And, you know, if you go back to Lenin, he said there's no more certain way of destroying the foundation of society than through inflation. That's not an exact quote, but it's pretty close. And at least in this one thing, Lenin was very correct. If you look back to 1991 and how things played out in the Soviet Union, or to 1922 in the German Weimar Republic, you can get a sense of the social collapse that lies ahead of us. And I don't think there's any possibility of us avoiding that outcome.

#Nima

There's a lot to be learned, Alex, from the conflict in Ukraine, the war in Ukraine, and the war in the Middle East. Because anything the United States touches, in terms of going in militarily and fighting militarily, ends up turning into a drastic, you know, sort of change—creating new problems for the United States in the long run. The war in Ukraine was the same, and it's a huge problem, I think, for the United States right now. And the war that's happening in the Middle East with Iran—there was no problem with the Strait of Hormuz before this war started.

#Speaker 03

Right now, everybody's talking about the Strait of Hormuz.

#Nima

This is the real issue right now. Who created this problem? It was the United States. Iran wasn't talking about the Strait of Hormuz before this war started. Yeah, so this is a problem the United States is making by itself. It's not a problem that Russia made or that Iran is trying to make. And part of what's happening is about how the United States sees itself as time goes by. The people who voted for Donald Trump didn't want this—they didn't want another Ukraine. That's why you see Tucker Carlson asking, "What about the American people? What about what's going on here in the United States?" Here's what Tucker Carlson said, Alex.

#Speaker 03

So any leader whose focus is outward rather than on his own country is going to be a bad leader. And this is the core problem with maintaining a global empire. You're never going to find a leader—

you'll never find an American president—who's more interested in governing America than in governing the world. And honestly, would you be? What job would you rather have? King of the world! The world! King of the world! Colossus! Astride! Here I am! I'm king of the world! I make all the decisions! I'm going to eliminate your civilization for breakfast!

I'm going to overturn your economy for lunch! And tonight we may have Operation Eternal Darkness. I mean, there's an appeal to the megalomaniac in all of them. It's not just this one—it's all of them. That is irresistible to leaders: "I run the world." Now, running America, by contrast, is hard and messy, and you know a lot of the people. You're going to make them mad. You go to war with the Houthis—people don't know what a Houthi is. They're never going to meet a Houthi. There's no cost to you whatsoever.

#Nima

I think it shows how the United States, as an empire, has reached its limits. We've seen that with the latest operation on Iranian soil, where they tried to make a case that it was a huge success in Iran—that it was, you know, to save one of the pilots of an F-15E. But we know that wasn't the case; it was something else. And it shows the limits of the American empire. They can't go beyond that.

#Alex

Yeah, absolutely. I think Tucker's commentary is very good—very succinct about this. I couldn't agree more. You see, the thing is, empires always have their limitations, right? We have a long history of this always being the case. And they always collapse. The reason they collapse is because the benefits of empire to its vested interests are always far outweighed by the costs of maintaining the empire to the whole society of the—let's call it—the imperial power in which those interests are based. So this is a well-known thing.

And with respect to the so-called American empire today, this was well understood by, let's say, sober, competent people inside the U.S. government. That's why we know from people like Wesley Clark that Iranian regime change was planned for 2006. The idea was to overthrow the regime in Iran within that year. But nobody dared to do it because, based on so many reports, assessments, and analyses of the situation in the Middle East, they understood that the likelihood of defeating Iran—or changing its regime—was very, very low and would probably have catastrophic consequences. In fact, knowing all that is why I was convinced, almost until the very end, that Trump would never dare pull the trigger, because it seemed so incredibly dumb.

Very little upside, very little potential for success, and huge downside—with consequences you couldn't even imagine—because they were certain to accrue, grow, and compound. Nevertheless, he went and did it. And so, given that all these things were known ahead of events—and I mean, even General McKenzie, the former commander of CENTCOM—he wrote a report, I think just a few weeks

or months before the war with Iran, saying we are very, very vulnerable. The way we've geographically spaced out our military bases makes us extremely vulnerable to Iranian counterattacks. Do you think the Iranians weren't aware of this? That the first thing they'd do wouldn't be to take advantage of all those vulnerabilities and punish their attackers—which is exactly what happened.

So all of this was predictable. All of it could have been predicted—and was predicted. But nevertheless, Trump went ahead and pulled the trigger. And if it wasn't Trump, it would have been Kamala Harris, Hillary Clinton, J.D. Vance—it doesn't matter, whoever. So what we have to ask ourselves is: what are the incentives that make this imperial collapse possible, almost inevitable? Meaning that the people who are closest to the levers of power in the empire will not hesitate to completely destroy their host nation in order to try to achieve their imperial goals, even when they're extremely unlikely.

The only answer I can offer is that those vested interests are the leading banking families, who are doing it because their financial system is imploding on itself and will collapse unless they can win political control over new colonies to bring in fresh money and good collateral to keep their fraudulent, Ponzi-scheme monetary system flowing. And so, you know, they're wealthy enough, powerful enough, to buy all the politicians who supposedly represent the people in a democracy. They're able to buy up all the media companies.

And we've just seen this happen in very recent times with, you know, Larry Ellison and other Zionist billionaires rushing out to buy TikTok, CBS News, and I don't know what else, in order to craft the narrative—to deceive the host nations into backing their agenda. And then the result, ultimately, you know, if you succeed with Ukraine, fine, move on to the next target. If you succeed with Russia, fine, move to the next target. Iran, next target. China. Well, all of these military misadventures weaken the empire little by little. And then you have to rely on proxy forces. And the proxy forces are mercenaries. They have no loyalty to you.

Somebody can pay them more, and they'll turn against you just as easily. Eventually, the imperial power breaks its teeth, and then there's no going back from there. I think the current Western American empire has reached that moment with Iran, as many empires have in the past. Iran is known as the graveyard of empires, and I think we're now watching this history unfold in real time. Only a miracle could restore the United States to the level of influence in Western Asia that it had on February 28. But I think the ultimate outcome will be the complete eviction not only of the United States but also of other Western interests from West Asia.

#Nima

The decision on the part of the United States, I think, Alex, if we simplify it—it's a gigantic issue, you know—but if we simplify it, it comes down to the expansion of the American empire: in Eurasia, in the Middle East, in West Asia. And, or rather, dropping that sort of agenda—dropping the agenda of

expansion, dropping the agenda of Israel as they want to dominate the whole region, from their territory up to the borders of Iran. It's a huge territory when you look at the agenda on the part of the Israelis.

I don't see Donald Trump or anyone in the United States being able to do anything about it. But after all, how do you see their decision? Are they going to change course? Are they going to change? Because the dominance of the dollar is just fading away—it's just not there anymore. And Donald Trump knows that, and he's trying to do everything he can to lessen the impact of these wars on the power of the dollar. If he wants to go that way, he needs to understand the agenda; he needs to change course. Do you see that happening?

#Alex

No, I don't, unfortunately. I think that for that to happen, you'd have to disenfranchise these very powerful interests that ultimately determine the foreign policy of the United States. You know, these are the same interests that have the whole U.S. Congress cowering in fear of the Zionists, where they don't dare to say "America first." Somehow they enjoy complete impunity in American society. They can't be held accountable for anything. We've seen that one of these bankers—he's just a managerial-class banker, Jes Staley—was caught in the Epstein files with compromising material that should, at the very least, warrant an investigation against him. And, you know, in a very litigious society like the United States, there should be a hailstorm of lawsuits against him.

But obviously, he's a free man. He has nothing to worry about. We also saw in 2012 that HSBC got caught laundering almost \$900 million for the Sinaloa cartel in Mexico. They got a parking ticket for it. You know, they got caught—it was proven. It was even proven that part of that money was used to finance terrorist organizations in other parts of the world. They got a parking ticket, which amounted to something between two and five percent of their 2012 revenues. Nobody went to prison, even though, according to American laws, I think about 30 top-level executives of HSBC in the United States should have gone to prison. Nobody did. The bank got to dictate its own deferred prosecution agreement with the Department of Justice under Obama—Eric Holder.

And the whole affair was forgotten. They got a five-year deferral during which they were supposed to not break any laws, and then everything would be fine and everybody would live happily ever after. And that's exactly what happened. So they enjoy complete impunity. They can do whatever they want. They continue to do whatever they want. They manage all kinds of organized crime around the world—not just Mexican cartels, but basically all of them. And this is the power that has the whole political class trembling in fear of them. You'd have to disenfranchise them somehow. And to do that, you'd have to completely overhaul the monetary system, to change it so they don't have a way to become the dominant force in society, which they are.

And I was sincerely hopeful that Donald Trump and his government would at least begin the process of disenfranchising them—start bringing white-collar crime to justice. And then, you know, since the

US dollar will fail—that's a mathematical fact—they would take advantage of the opportunity to change the system. You know, this can be done, it has been done, but it requires a lot of political will and a lot of political capital. And I don't see that in the United States. I don't see where it would come from. We had an example in Russia: when Vladimir Putin came to power, Russia was completely dominated by a group of seven bankers. It was called Semibankirshchina.

These were the seven dominant oligarchs who ran Russian society and practically destroyed the country. They would have been the dream custodians of a society serving Western interests. If that kind of oligarchy could be installed in power in Tehran, they'd be winning the game. At the time Vladimir Putin came to power, the average salary in Russia was literally about \$56 per month—talk about enslaving the population. But very early in his presidency, Putin lined up all those oligarchs and told them: new rules of the game. You get to keep your businesses, you can continue to run them and profit from them, but you have to pay your taxes correctly, treat your employees properly, and stay out of politics.

Meaning: you take care of business, I take care of politics. And then, you know, Putin is accountable to the people; oligarchs are accountable to themselves. So, you know, this was a rough transition. There were numerous court cases where these oligarchs tried to challenge the government—they all lost. One of them, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, who was the representative of Rothschild interests in Russia, ended up in prison for nine years. The prison sentence wasn't for his actual crimes, which included murder; it was for tax evasion. But it doesn't matter—you know, Al Capone was in prison for tax evasion, but he was put away. And that was the signal to all the other oligarchs.

Look, folks, we mean it: take care of your business, enjoy life, but stay out of politics. And after a while, these oligarchs had to make peace with the fact that they don't run the country. They're wealthy, they can enjoy life, they can do all kinds of things with their wealth, but they cannot run the country. So that kind of transition is due for the United States, for the United Kingdom, for Western Europe—but I don't see where the political capital for that kind of transition could possibly come from. Again, you know, I was very hopeful about Trump's administration because he had this massive public support. He was making all the right sounds in the beginning.

He even explicitly said in one of his campaign speeches—he called for the people to join him in, I mean, I don't remember the exact quote, but it was exactly what was needed. He was saying, "Join me in the final battle against the financial oligarchy," or something like that. It was exactly the right message. And I thought, all right, the fact that he said this tells me he understands the source of the problem and that he'll address it if he becomes president. But I think that with the attack on Iran, he's irreparably damaged himself. He's jeopardized everything else he might have changed. And he made himself impeachable—impeachable in a way that his impeachment at this point will be a slam dunk. It's not one of those long-shot things they attempted between 2017 and 2025.

#Alex

Now he's, at law, a war criminal. And that means everything he might have tried to do, even if he meant it sincerely, is now jeopardized and probably out of reach. With this attack against Iran, he's completely squandered almost all of his political capital.

#Nima

Alex, where do you see Europe as time goes by? You know, the outcome of what's happened in the Middle East is showing that nuclear bombs aren't really game changers anymore. Russia showed that before with the Kinzhal missile—a conventional weapon that can be used without causing massive casualties on any battlefield, even if something goes wrong, like in the case of Ukraine. And Russia isn't interested in expanding the war with Europeans; everybody knows that. It doesn't matter how Europe tries to portray Russia, as if they're going to march toward Berlin or something. And the same kind of thing is happening in the Middle East.

American bases didn't save these countries. These are the facts on the ground. What's the outcome of what's happened so far for Europeans as time goes by? We've seen the prime minister of Spain—he's the prime minister, right? He's making a good stand, on his part, when it comes to the Middle East. But we haven't seen that in the case of Ukraine. They need to understand what their calculation would be as time goes by without the United States, in my opinion.

#Alex

Yeah, I don't think we should look at Spain and think they're somehow exempt from this whole Western agenda. Pedro Sánchez is saying the right things regarding Israel, Iran, and the wider West Asian region, which boosts his popularity at home. But at the same time, his government has been very active in implementing all the sustainable goals agenda, the wokery, and on Ukraine—making all the wrong noises. So it doesn't really make sense. I think it's an issue that's very important for the Spanish people, as it is for most people around the world. So, let's say it's like low-hanging fruit for him to boost his public support.

I wouldn't trust him beyond that, just as I wouldn't trust pretty much any of the European leaders, including Viktor Orbán. You know, Orbán has successfully defended Hungary against the wokery, against uncontrolled immigration, and so forth. But at the same time, he's been one of the strongest supporters of Israel, and he hasn't had very much to say about Israel's genocide in Gaza. So again, you ask yourself, why should that be? How should that be? Why are you on the right side of one fault line at this point, but on the wrong side of the exact same fault line on another issue?

I don't have a whole lot of faith, but I think the European Union is inevitably headed for disintegration—it's only a matter of time. In fact, Hungary might be the catalyst for that disintegration because there are Hungarian elections coming up very soon, and it looks like the European Union, together with Ukrainian intelligence, has done a lot to undermine the integrity of the Hungarian election process. That's going to have its consequences, its implications, and its

effects. More and more countries in Europe are deeply, deeply unhappy with the unaccountable power Brussels holds over them.

The governance system is almost exactly the same as the one that dominated the Soviet Union before 1991, and I think it will end the same way. You have unelected bureaucrats writing laws—laws that are, for the most part, drafted by secret lobbyists. These are legal groups we know almost nothing about. We literally don't know who is writing the laws for the European Union. The European Parliament is little more than a debating club where MEPs earn some money and make their YouTube videos. And the people of Europe are becoming more and more unhappy with the situation.

And so this is obviously boosting support for sovereignist political factions, which, you know, they call extreme right or far-right parties—like AfD, like Rassemblement National in France, and so forth. But they're not; they just want their nations' sovereignty restored. And so, at some point, this pan-European faction will clash with the sovereignist factions in Germany, France, Hungary, Poland, and other countries. I think that, in the end, it's only a matter of time before the side that ordinary people support ultimately prevails. I hope it doesn't involve violence, revolutions, or civil wars, but apparently that's also a very distinct possibility at this stage.

Alternatively, the future of Europe could involve a war against Russia, because that would be one way for Brussels and Strasbourg—well, NATO—to make themselves relevant, to kind of unite all these countries against a common enemy. But I think at this point, at least, that's a long shot, because I don't see anybody in Europe very worried about Russia. I don't think people really believe that Russia is about to invade Europe. So all these war preparations are running well ahead of the narrative. The narrative is there, but the people aren't being moved by it. The herd's not moving in the right direction. Are they going to be able to move the herd in the right direction?

They're trying very hard. They're bringing in heavy-handed censorship and punishing people very severely for presenting divergent views. But I don't know, in the age of the internet and social media, whether this genie can be put back into the bottle of their mechanisms of narrative control—radio, television, newspapers. So I don't know what the future is. I just know that we're in for a transition period, which might span some years. I have no idea how long. But this transition period could be very, very rough. Still, I do expect that when it plays out, we're going to have a much, much better future and better prospects ahead of us.

#Nima

Yeah, hope so. Yeah. Thank you, thank you, Alex.

#Alex

Always a pleasure, Nima. Thank you for inviting me. Until next time—see you soon. Take care.

#Nima

Bye.