

Alex Krainer: Global Economy Will Be Transformed After the Iran War

Alex Krainer is a market analyst, author & former hedge fund manager. Krainer discusses the unpredictable energy, food and economic shockwaves from the Iran War. Alex Krainer's substack: <https://alexkrainer.substack.com/> Alex Krainer podcast: <https://www.youtube.com/@kraineralex> Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennDiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glennDiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glennDiesen> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We're joined today by Alex Cranor, a market analyst, author, and former hedge fund manager, to discuss the Iran war and the market's reaction. Thank you for coming back on the program.

#Alex Krainer

Thank you for the invitation, Glenn. Always good to join you.

#Glenn

Well, I said "Iran war." I guess technically it's peace now—or a ceasefire—but it's not being upheld very well. The chances of this transitioning from a ceasefire to an actual peace agreement... I mean, I tend to be very pessimistic. That being said, the markets seem to be very optimistic. It's as if the conflict and all the underlying causes have already been resolved. How are you assessing this—the ceasefire that's been reached and the way the markets have reacted?

#Alex Krainer

Okay, let me tackle the markets first. I've spent my professional life in the markets, actively trading commodities, financials, and currencies. I would read exactly zero into that. The fact that the markets feel optimistic doesn't mean a thing. Markets can be very, very delusional in the short term—and they often are. And, you know, that short term can last, as they say, "markets can remain irrational a lot longer than you can stay solvent." So I'd read exactly zero into that. As for the—how do you call it—the very surprising announcement of the ceasefire yesterday, I have to say I was very surprised.

Yesterday I wrote an article for my newsletter, and it took me about three or four hours to finish. As I was writing, I kept going online to check things, to do a bit of research, just to make sure I wasn't writing nonsense. By the time I got to the conclusion, my takeaway was that it's very unlikely the ceasefire will hold, and the probability that it will lead to peace is very close to zero. In fact, before I hit send on that article, I went online one last time—and I saw that the ceasefire was already being breached, that the narrative was already coming apart.

And that all makes a very poor foundation for peace. But more importantly, we always have to go back to the ultimate incentives for war in the first place. And that is—well, we've discussed this before—it's the conquest of collateral. And, you know, if you follow the day-to-day news, you'd think it's about the Strait of Hormuz, it's about women's rights, it's about the veils, it's about the, you know, clerical regime in Tehran, freedom and democracy, the ballistic program, the nuclear program—all these things. All of these are merely pretexts. The ultimate reason is that Iran is the fifth or sixth wealthiest nation in terms of natural resource wealth. They're estimated to have about \$35 trillion in natural resource wealth.

And if the Western empire, which still enjoys the support of the United States as its military enforcement arm—uh, if they could gain political control over Tehran by, you know, maybe reinstalling the Shah, Reza Pahlavi, on top of the government—then that natural resource wealth would become collateral for the Western banking cartel. And \$35 trillion could go a very, very long way toward refloating a system that's fraudulent and currently imploding on itself. You know, it's being squashed together by liquidity that's being flooded into the system out of whole cloth. The problem is that for every dollar, euro, yen, or whatever that's printed out of thin air and put into circulation, it dilutes the currency already in circulation. So it's making everybody in the system poorer.

This will continue until they manage to conquer new, money-good collateral so that the system can be kind of re-inflated and take off the ground again. This is ultimately always the reason for war. This is why all wars really are bankers' wars—and why they will never give up. Because for the bankers, it's either bringing new collateral into the system or watching their whole system implode. They don't know how to do anything else. They don't plow fields, they don't build anything, they don't write novels or symphonies. They do absolutely nothing. They just pull money out of thin air, lend it to us at interest, and then collect payments on those debts. That's what they do. That's the only thing they do. And they will sacrifice every nation they occupy—like the United States, Great Britain, France, and so forth—completely, in order for their system to survive and continue.

#Glenn

Yeah, and I'm also often surprised by how people buy into narratives. Like you said, they believe that all of this is real. All countries throughout history have always had to sell wars. Usually, you have strategic competing interests, and they're sold as good guys versus bad guys. I mean, if you

look at how things went—governments that were rejected—if you go back to the '90s, Russia was so eager to be part of the West that it was willing to turn its back on traditional allies, former Soviet republics, China, anyone in the East who might slow down its sprint toward the West.

But this was not good enough because, again, it's about the size of the country—same as China. Whenever we criticized China, I was like, "Oh, they claim Taiwan." Well, they always did. They never stopped claiming Taiwan. We recognized that Taiwan is part of China. What changed is the size of the Chinese economy—it grew more powerful. And as you said, with Iran, I think they could open a strip club on every street and adopt every law we have in the West, and they still wouldn't be accepted. But on the other side of that coin, you know, we'll back a genocide—which we've proven. We'll put an ISIS leader in Syria.

We'll back actual genocide—Nazi groups—and, as Trump suggested, be willing to kill an entire civilization, and then have the NATO Secretary General chair it. So the idea that this is all about values and principles and headscarves, I mean, it's quite ludicrous. And it's also a bit frightening, I have to be honest, when people actually buy into this—that this is why we are bombing—well, not we, why the U.S. and Israel are bombing Iran, because they want to liberate women. I mean, yeah, every time... every time. I have to say, that amazes me, you know, because we've seen this film so many times before, you know? Uh...

#Alex Krainer

They always demonize the other side in order to justify the war. But it was just a few years ago they were doing the same thing—when they wanted to go into Syria, Bashar al-Assad was the worst person in the world. He was killing his own people. And before him, it was Muammar Gaddafi—he was killing his own people. And Saddam Hussein was a madman; he was killing his own people. And Slobodan Milosevic was a madman. And then, you know, in other parts of the world, you had Salvador Allende—he was, you know, a communist. Horrible, horrible. We have to go kill him too. And Daniel Ortega—he was horrible, he had to be taken out.

And Manuel Noriega, and Hugo Chávez, and Nicolás Maduro, and in Cuba, Justin Trudeau's father—Fidel Castro, sorry. You know, it's always the same: we create these villains and then pretend we're going around the world slaying dragons, slaying evil, to make the world safe for democracy and human rights and progress and so forth. But it's as if nobody looks back to remember these stories and then asks, well, where exactly did we create this shining example of a prosperous democracy? You know, look at where Syria is today—it's in the hands of an al-Qaeda terrorist who, until recently, had a ten-million-dollar bounty on his head.

Today, he's an honored statesman everywhere in the West. And then look at Libya, which used to be the most prosperous African country, with the highest standard of living under Gaddafi. Now it's a failed state with open slave markets, ruled by warlords. Afghanistan, Iraq, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan—everywhere we went, we created mayhem and destruction. We caused immeasurable pain to the

people, destroying their countries, destroying their infrastructure. Yet there are still people alive who buy the story every single time. That is just amazing. I suspect we're arguing with artificial bots in bot farms, because I can't believe anybody is that stupid. It can't be.

#Glenn

I remember the scandal. There were some CIA papers that were leaked, I think by WikiLeaks, showing that in Afghanistan the war was losing its appeal—sorry, the occupation was losing its appeal among Europeans. So the CIA suggested, “Let's frame it as being about women's rights,” because that's popular in Germany, France, and the countries where they were losing interest. And, you know, you didn't even need the leaks. That's their job—you have to sell a war. I mean, it's just... I don't know, I got sidetracked. It always shocks me to see that people are actually buying into this.

#Alex Krainer

When it comes to women's rights, you know, let's go back to Afghanistan. The United States withdrew from Afghanistan in August 2021. They said they were there to bring democracy and freedom. And then, when they withdrew, everybody had their hearts broken over the rights of women and girls. I don't know if you remember, but for several weeks you couldn't even turn on the TV without hearing “women and girls” mentioned a hundred times. It was all about women and girls. But when you look at the actual results of the Western occupation of Afghanistan, you find that more than 50% of all children born during that time, when the United States was in charge, suffered permanent stunting from malnutrition.

So more than half of the children were stunted from malnutrition for life because the women didn't have enough food to give their children. So what are we supporting women and girls for? To have OnlyFans accounts and become professionals running—I don't know what—in their cubicles, commuting to and from the office every day? I don't understand. But the frustrating thing is that there's always a segment of the West that's willing to swallow absolutely any lie that's thrown their way.

#Glenn

I remember after this report came out about Afghanistan, there was an article co-authored in The Guardian by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg and, you know, some Hollywood celebrity—Angelina Jolie—titled something along the lines of “Why NATO Is Now the Leading Organization to Protect Women,” or something like that. I mean, you can't make it up. But, you know, people want to believe this, and that's important. It's human nature—you want to see yourself as one of the good guys, that what you're doing, what you're participating in, what's being done in your name, is for something greater than just some horrible, selfish interests. But let me ask about this ceasefire, because one of the reasons it got off to a rough start was obviously Lebanon.

That is, uh, you know, the main mediator—or the one facilitating or proposing the peace agreement, the ceasefire—was the Pakistani prime minister. He confirmed that Lebanon was part of the peace treaty, or the ceasefire. And shortly thereafter, Israel began to bomb, like, the hell out of Lebanon, which is kind of strange—that they would wait for this vicious attack until the first day of the ceasefire. But put that aside. The Americans also came out and said, well, Lebanon's not part of the ceasefire. What do you make of this? Was this just a way of allowing Trump to step back a bit after he made those crazy remarks? Or was it the Israelis stringing the Americans along? How do you make sense of this? Because this could be what sinks the whole ceasefire.

#Alex Krainer

Well, again, you know, if I was—well, if I was going to be charitable to the Trump administration, which I no longer see any reason to be—but if I was thinking from their point of view and pretending they had some constructive goal in mind, I'd say this has been such an embarrassing defeat for them that, for domestic audiences, they need to pretend they're in charge, that they're in control, that it was Iran who came crawling to them begging for a ceasefire, and that they're the ones dictating the terms of the ceasefire negotiations.

We all know that this isn't true—the reality is that the United States has been begging for a ceasefire, and the Iranians are in control of the framework for any negotiations. So the ten points are Iranian. They've been carefully formulated, carefully discussed, and communicated by the Pakistani prime minister to the American side. It's been received as such—there's no doubt about that. And if people in the United States can read and write English, then they understood the message, and they know what it contained. There's no doubt that Lebanon was included in those communications. So now, to pretend, "No, no, no, we never said anything about Lebanon," is very disingenuous.

And I think it will only move those consumers of the news cycle who don't really pay close attention to events and don't have an attention span longer than that of a goldfish. Most people can tell there's a deception. Why? Because the Trump administration has to pretend they're in control, that they're winning, that this ceasefire is the result of their glorious victory over Iran. They also have to show the Zionist elements, who apparently have predominant influence in American foreign policy, that they're not putting any constraints on Israel. But if I were more critical, I'd say this is very typical—that the United States is truly incapable.

You know, we already know that while they were negotiating with the Iranians in February, they were sending weapons to the Kurds to infiltrate Tehran and prepare a color revolution. So they were preparing weapons, the bombing campaign—they were already activating Mossad and CIA elements to try to overthrow the government while they were negotiating, or pretending to negotiate, with the

Iranian government. Now, apparently, there are reports about a large surge of American troops in the region, in apparent preparation for a ground invasion. I think they're talking about 50,000 troops, which I don't understand. I don't see what they hope to achieve with 50,000 troops.

But, you know, we saw these videos with Chinook and other helicopters bringing American troops from the United States to the Gulf region. For what reason? It's not for picnics, obviously. They're coming to try to wrest control of the Persian Gulf and the Strait of Hormuz from the Iranians. But they need time for this, right? They need time to prepare that ground invasion. And I think this is why the United States asked for a 45-day ceasefire rather than a two-week ceasefire. The Iranians agreed to a two-week ceasefire under certain conditions, but I don't think this is going to hold, and I think that at best we're going to see a two-week ceasefire and then renewed hostilities.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, I can't imagine 50,000 troops going very far in trying to seize the Strait of Hormuz. I mean, as Lindsey Graham said, once we get the Strait of Hormuz, we're going to make a ton of money. How do you—yeah, again, again. Well, this is what's interesting with the Iran war, though: the narrative control is quite horrible compared to all the other wars. Everyone has marched in line. They've all made it clear that this is about good values versus bad values, civilization versus barbarism.

But on this one, Trump keeps making references like, "Oh, we're going to get all their oil, and we're going to destroy their civilization." It's a little bit like Venezuela. I think the Europeans would have gone fully along with it if they had just changed their language—stopped talking about the oil and talked more about democracy, freedom, or human rights or something. Then they could have put their full weight behind it. But what is the economic relevance, though, of the Strait of Hormuz? Or maybe "political economy" would be a better term?

#Alex Krainer

Okay, so that's the part where I'm a little bit confused. I mean, it's not confusing what the impact of the closure of the Strait of Hormuz is—that's almost obvious, you know. One-fifth of the global oil supply is constrained. About one-fifth of the natural gas supply too—sorry, twenty percent of natural gas. This is much more serious. Oil will continue to flow, but natural gas will not. Apparently, the Qatari ability to export gas is now shut down completely and probably won't be brought back online very, very soon. And then there's the question of urea, you know, the feedstock for artificial fertilizers. The almost inevitable result will be famine in large swathes of the world.

So, you know, this misadventure might cost millions—maybe tens or hundreds of millions—of lives in the Global South, and, uh, who knows where else. We'll find out how severe it will be. So that's not confusing. What is confusing, Glenn, is that, you know, it was not so long ago—it was in January of this year—that Trump brought his delegation to Davos, and they pretty much declared war on

globalism. They said globalization failed. They were talking about implementing the American system of political economy. The Secretary of Trade, Jameson Greer, in his remarks, explicitly mentioned Alexander Hamilton and Abraham Lincoln, and so forth. So to me, I thought, OK, this could not be more clear and more explicit. The Trump administration has made their intentions very clear, very categorical.

And so this must be it, you know—what does that mean? Embracing the American system of political economy means you bring your capital and your resources back home. You impose tariffs to create a protected market for your manufacturers and mom-and-pop businesses. You let your economic system invest at home—to build prosperity, repair infrastructure, create jobs that pay good salaries, to go back to an economy where one blue-collar income could support a family and put children through school and university, and so forth. And I thought that made all the sense in the world. I kind of believed it, because Trump has made those remarks repeatedly, for many years.

And then he's been, you know, trying to—well, we know this from insiders. For example, Colonel Douglas Macgregor was an insider in the previous administration, and it appears that Trump definitely wanted to bring American troops back home from Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan, which is also part of all this. You want to bring your troops home. You don't want to waste the nation's resources policing the world and maintaining hundreds of military bases everywhere. And then Trump also wanted to bring troops back from Germany, even. And we know there was tremendous pressure on him in 2019 to go to war against Iran, and he said no—he declined that. So I was kind of inclined to believe that he was sincere, that he really wanted to turn away from being the global hegemon.

#Alex Krainer

So... if that were the case, then the Strait of Hormuz wouldn't matter all that much to the United States. That is, it would be a secondary thing because the United States is very much self-sufficient. They have their own oil production. They have Venezuela and Mexico there in the neighborhood. They have Canada to the north—all very resource-rich nations. And so, you know, the American economy could have restructured in accordance with the American system of political economy. And I thought—I believed in a very bright future, longer term, for the United States, you know, maybe the following 10, 15, 20 years at least. But something happened on February 28, and he did what he knew not to do in 2019, and what every president before him knew not to do, because there were all these reports, all these intelligence findings that kind of built a consensus that attacking Iran would be a colossally idiotic thing to do.

And if we go back to that famous speech by General Wesley Clark, when he said "seven countries in five years," right? The timeline for those five years starts in 2001, which would imply that the neocon plan for Iran was to regime-change it by 2006. Well, we're 20 years past that point, which means all this pressure, all this burning desire to take control of Iran, was never realized because nobody dared—because everybody knew it was mission suicide. And I believe we've discussed this

on your podcast as well, that it was obvious it would be mission suicide because Iran had all kinds of capabilities to make this a catastrophic endeavor for Trump. So I was convinced he wouldn't do it, because who is that dumb? Nobody.

It just can't be. Well, he went ahead—he pulled the trigger. And now we are where we are. I think the consequences will be very disastrous, though more so for Europe and Great Britain than for the United States. The United States has many ways to cushion the blow. As I said, it's a very resource-rich country. They have resource-rich neighbors, and they obviously have no problem using their political, financial, and military power to bludgeon those neighbors into submission and use them effectively as colonies. So I think the United States won't be able to avoid stagflation from this, but Europe and the United Kingdom will face a much more severe crisis as a result.

#Glenn

I'm glad you brought up the Europeans. I was looking for a segue there anyway. I was wondering how they'll be affected by this, because Trump isn't wrong. Even though he started the war, it's not the United States that's so reliant on this—it's Asia and Europe. And I just saw, what was it, two or three days ago, the Financial Times had an article with a headline along the lines of hedge funds making record bets against European stocks. So, in other words, they're betting on things going south in Europe fairly soon. So how are you assessing this, or what are your expectations? Because even if this ceasefire were to hold and the war were over, there's already a lot of damage that's been done. And by the way, the Strait of Hormuz is still not open. So how do you make sense of what's going to happen to Europe now?

#Alex Krainer

Europe has largely painted itself into a corner. They, you know, deliberately cut their access to Russian oil and gas, even though one-fourth of the Nord Stream pipelines is still intact and could deliver, I think.

#Alex Krainer

Twenty-five million cubic meters of gas per year, if I remember correctly. Anyway, it's something like a hundred million—or billion—cubic feet or meters; I forget the exact number, but it's very large. A quarter of that could still be delivered to Europe, but they won't take it because, you know, Russian hydrocarbons are not worthy. "We're too good for it." And so, no deal—even at the cost of destroying the European economy. Instead, they decided to rely primarily on Qatar and the United States. Now we know that Qatar can't deliver anything either, and we also know that the United States might blackmail Europeans for access to natural gas. So they've really put themselves in a very, very difficult situation.

But then there's another very significant vulnerability for European economies, and that is that most global trade is still conducted in U.S. dollars. Under conditions of distress, European banks have had a lot of difficulty with dollar liquidity. The U.S. side—the Federal Reserve—has helped them out by creating these very large swap lines so Europeans can access dollar balances to conduct foreign trade. But, you know, all these swap lines could be canceled at any time. They might not be canceled under Jerome Powell, but we're going to have a new Federal Reserve chairman nominated by Trump.

And so that relationship might become very rocky. I know for a fact that European bankers are extremely worried about this. If they had to buy dollars at market prices, the euro could collapse. The result would be a big jolt to inflation—price inflation in euros. It would be a crash of the euro. It could turn into a crisis of stagflation because you'd get very sluggish or no economic growth and accelerating levels of price inflation. And that brings us to—well, how do you call it—a lot of dry tinder for social revolt, because people are already suffering in Europe.

I think that, according to Eurostat—and these figures are a few months old, so it might be worse by now—across the Eurozone, about 35% of all households in Europe have difficulties making ends meet. And in some countries, it goes beyond two-thirds. So two-thirds of all families have difficulties making ends meet. That's not prosperity. That's not economic success. That's a society that's moving closer and closer to the edge of a massive social revolt. And I think that, you know, people who are specialists in this area—I'm talking primarily about David Betts of, I think, Imperial College in London—are saying that European nations are now explosively configured for a breakout of civil wars.

We might be looking at revolutions, social uprisings, or even civil wars in many European countries. I think the ruling establishment will try to avert this by orchestrating a major war against an external enemy—and I think we all know what that means. The whole continent is being actively prepared for a big war against Russia. That war might take a few years, but unless we push back very decisively against it, Europe could end up sharing the same destiny as Ukraine.

#Glenn

Yeah, the language coming out of Europe is quite extraordinary. You'd assume that at some point reason would start to kick in. And, you know, if you see that we don't get the energy we need from the Middle East, we don't get it from Russia, and the United States is becoming more unreliable, at some point you'd think they'd try to diversify and repair some of the relationships that have been damaged. But there only seems to be an effort to double down on this continued proxy war against Russia. I think one of the triggers could be these efforts to seize Russian ships, which they'll now see as a possible flashpoint—or even allowing Finland or the Baltic states' territory to be used to strike Russia in the north, or the Scandinavians, for that matter. Yeah. How do you see the world reconfiguring? Because they're not the only ones.

The Europeans—I mean, I hate to say this—but we're not doing very well on the international ranking of reason and rationality. I think it was the foreign minister of Hungary who made the point that we have a crisis of reason in Europe now. But how do you see the rest of the world? Because the Gulf states paid a very heavy price for being frontline states for the United States. And I hear, you know, if you follow some of the media in East Asia, you see that this is also a concern there—like, why did we bet so much on this partnership with the U.S.? Will they actually protect us, or will they lead us into trouble? So how do you see—well, I guess, you know, with so many variables playing out at the same time, one shouldn't make too many bold predictions. But where do you see the overall trend going in terms of the world changing? Sorry, very large question.

#Alex Krainer

Yeah, look, I think there's going to be massive fracturing in the Middle East and in Europe, and I think it's going to result in the rise of a multipolar global order. I think the United States will have to withdraw into its own hemisphere and find its identity—whether it wants to be a hegemon or more of a pivot power in its own, how do you call it, in its own hemisphere that actually has good, constructive, and friendly relations with its neighbors. But I think for that to happen, you're going to need a complete reformation of the monetary system, because, going back to that saying that all wars are bankers' wars, the United States is still completely dominated by the banking oligarchies. And they don't see the world as you and I see it. They see the world as slave labor and natural resources that have to be turned into financial flows accruing only to their banking institutions.

And that's their lever of power. That's all they know how to do, and that's the only plan they have. But with regard to the Gulf states you mentioned, I find it quite amazing. I think Henry Kissinger famously said it's very dangerous to be an enemy of the United States, but it's fatal to be a friend. And I think they're now learning that this is actually true—it's their turn now. I thought Saudi Arabia would have wised up to this at least a little, because they've been on the receiving end of some very nasty stabs in the back from the UAE and Israel. They've been setting up military outposts in Somaliland and southern Yemen, practically surrounding Saudi Arabia and making it very vulnerable to being cut off from global trade.

And then, when you look at so many of these IDF soldiers, on their uniforms they have these shoulder patches of "Greater Israel" that include a very large chunk of Saudi Arabia as well. You'd think they would choose the side of Iran in this war, because obviously the UAE, Israel, and the United States will ultimately cost them their kingdom. Once Iran is out of the way, the next easy pickings—the low-hanging fruit—would be Saudi Arabia. But for some reason, instead, they joined the other side against Iran, which to me is amazing.

I think the explanation is that Saudi Arabia has—I don't know how much money exactly, but I think it's more than a trillion dollars—sitting in their accounts with the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States. And they've seen what Western bankers would dare to do to Russia, even though Russia is a

nuclear power. So I think that if they chose the wrong side in this war, they'd be cut off from their money and probably never see it again. I think that's the reason why, for them, the short-term considerations are much more important than the longer-term ones. And I think the ultimate result is that a lot of these Gulf kingdoms will disappear, and then Saudi Arabia maybe will be reconstituted in some way.

I think that, as far as Iran, Russia, and China are concerned, they probably have no choice but to push these conflicts all the way to the point where they create a completely new and different security architecture on the Eurasian landmass. Because this British-style geopolitics—where you're constantly fomenting wars everywhere, pitting any power against any other power to keep everyone weak and divided, and making sure they remain clients of Western banks, Western corporations, and the Western military-industrial complex—I think that has to end. It's just creating millions of war casualties, destroyed economies, suffocated growth, and stifled development. And I think people now understand that if you allow this to persist, it's always going to have exactly the same results as it has over the last 200 years. Yeah.

#Glenn

You mentioned before that you were optimistic about Trump because of what seemed to be economic nationalist policies that fit into the broader American system. So I'm thinking of Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay—this whole tradition that continued with Friedrich List and others. But now it seems that even the Iran war follows a different kind of logic, one that's going back to empire. Because if you look at all the infrastructure being hit in Iran—the railroads, the ports—a lot of it is the corridor that connects Iran with Iraq.

But it's also the International North–South Transportation Corridor, which connects Iran with Russia and India. So it seems that the way they're prioritizing this infrastructure, which has been built up over the years, is to essentially take a sledgehammer to the whole Greater Eurasian project. And of course, if you can't regime-change Iran and turn it into a new Syria—fragmented and chaotic—then at least destroy all the infrastructure. I'm not sure if you see it the same way. Do you think this is still a war aimed only at Iran, or do you think Russia and China are also targets here?

#Alex Krainer

Oh, no, no. This juggernaut never stops. I think that if they manage to overthrow Vladimir Putin's government in Russia, they'll use Russia against China in exactly the same way they used Ukraine against Russia. You know, they take over political power in a country and then use that country's economic and military power to turn against the next victim. They didn't go fight Russia themselves—they militarized and weaponized Ukraine to fight Russia. And if they succeeded, they would militarize Russia against China. And then, if they succeeded in Iran, they would probably cut off Russia from its North–South International Transport Corridor.

They would force Russia again to depend on the Arctic and Suez trade routes, and they would keep using their divide-and-rule strategy until they had complete and total hegemony over the Eurasian landmass. I mean, this is the Mackinderian politics that goes back, I'd say, probably more than a hundred years—where the British perfected this system of constantly using wars and intrigues to pit power against power, keeping them all weak so they could dominate everything. And, you know, there isn't a point in time or space where they say, "Right, okay, we've got a big empire now, we have a bunch of really rich colonies that we exploit, we can stop here." They never stop.

And whenever any nation becomes a bit more powerful, a bit more prosperous—you know, kind of like Libya—that wants to be left alone, that wants to develop its economy for the benefit of its own people, it has to be destroyed. Because, you know, that malignancy never rests; it's always looking for targets to attack. That's why we're in this state of permanent warfare now. And, you know, all of these wars are coming from the West. They're not being instigated by Iran, or by Syria, or by Russia. It's always the West that's fomenting these wars. I agree. Yeah, and the dynamic always, always, always leads back to the financial centers, to the banking oligarchies.