

Alex Krainer: CEASEFIRE COLLAPSE: US & Iran on the Brink

See Full Interview: <https://www.youtube.com/live/2yEhYUY8RuM?si=eS7jdwYUAIz3XuR> Follow me:
Substack: https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page
X (Twitter): https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA Patreon: [https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?](https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=)

#Nima

What's going on with the war between the United States and Iran? I'm not mentioning any details about it, but I want to know your understanding. What do you make of what's happened so far with the ceasefire and the difficulties around 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 had been insisting since the beginning of this war that they want a permanent peace and to remove the causes of the conflict. It's also understandable 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 to address the fact that Iran has been harassed by Western colonial powers for over 120 years now.

And this has prevented Iranian society and its economy from developing to their full potential. It has also distorted the political process, because if your country is under siege constantly, then political power has to be more repressive than it would normally be. 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 become 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 twelve 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," or, "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, and about the freedom of women and girls in Iran, and all these things.

But it really isn't. 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. Iran is a major element in enabling the expansion of this hegemony to other parts of the Eurasian landmass. This is the fundamental reason for the Western desire to change the regime in Iran—and that won't 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.

You know, 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 mechanism 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’ve mentioned there are various negative points right now. One of them is the case of Lebanon.

#Alex

And...

#Nima

You know, first they said that Lebanon was going to be part of the deal. Then JD Vance—even JD Vance, yesterday—said 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 that. He mentioned in that tweet that it included Lebanon and elsewhere, not only Lebanon. And look at this, right?

You know, it says “Draft – Pakistani Prime Minister message” on X. He just copied and pasted the same message he got from Washington. It’s unbelievable. You see, J.D. Vance is trying to—well, I don’t know what his understanding is of the negotiations with the Iranians, because they don’t have a good history of negotiations. 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 happen in Pakistan?

#Alex

Well, if I wanted to be charitable to the Trump administration—which, you know, I’m not so inclined to be since February 28—but if I wanted to be charitable, I could say that 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. And 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 everyone'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 want to end the hostilities—if that's even possible. So that when the history of this episode is written, no one 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, to the point where 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 just won't give up its dream of hegemony over the region. They'll do everything they can to weaken, sabotage, and take down the Iranian government.

#Nima

Yeah. I think, Alex, what's been done—yesterday we learned that Iran was going to launch an attack in the aftermath of that massive strike on Lebanon. They killed many civilians, including kids. 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. You know, J.D. Vance has been presented to us as the good guy in the Trump administration. He's made some really nice speeches, particularly about values like freedom of speech, and he's reprimanded European leaders for infringing on civil rights and free expression 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 supposed to be representatives of the American people, but it seems there's such a fear of Israel, of AIPAC, 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. And I don't think that J. D. Vance is in any way exempt from this. I don't see how this Zionist project fails, except by force—by being destroyed through military means. And I think the only military force capable of doing that is Iran. 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. And Israel is completely, one hundred percent, dependent for its security on its Western allies—the United States, NATO, and Great Britain. 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.