

Alex Krainer: China DESTROYS Trump's Blockade – Iran Now RULES Hormuz Strait

Follow me: Substack: [https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?](https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page)

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=)

utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=

#Nima

Hi, everybody. Today's Thursday, April 16th, 2026. I'm just handling a little bit of business. Alex, let's get started with our dear friend, Alex Krainer. Our brother is here with us. Alex, welcome back.

#Alex

Thank you for the invite, Nima. Always good to join you, and greetings to everyone from Croatia.

#Nima

Alex, let's start with what's going on physically, what's going on practically. George H. W. Bush is heading to the region, and they're not going through the Red Sea. They've chosen another route to get there. And here is the report on Fox News.

#Speaker 03

The USS George H. W. Bush aircraft carrier strike group, which left Norfolk, Virginia, on March 31st, had to go around the southern tip of Africa following threats from the Houthis to strike ships in the Red Sea and close the Bab el-Mandeb Strait in solidarity with Iran. Remember, from March to May last year, the Pentagon carried out Operation Rough Rider, a six-week operation to degrade the Houthis' ability to threaten ships in the Red Sea. It cost over a billion dollars and led to concerns about depleting U.S. munition stockpiles. Two hundred million dollars were spent on missiles in the first three weeks of that operation. The U.S. lost seven MQ-9 Reaper drones worth \$30 million apiece and two F/A-18 jets worth \$50 million each. CENTCOM hit more than 1,000 targets using these weapons, and yet the Houthis survived and are now threatening to disrupt global shipping by closing the Bab el-Mandeb Strait, very similar to what they're doing in the Strait of Hormuz.

#Nima

Yeah. What is it, Alex? Because we've learned the other thing would be 10,000 more soldiers to the region. And there are some rumors that the NICC is thinking of a ground invasion. What we've learned from the Iranian side just yesterday, they said, welcome, if you want to start a ground invasion of Iran, nobody would survive that. You're not going to survive that if you do that. And we have the blockade happening. Your understanding of the current situation?

#Alex

I struggle to explain it to myself, Nima, because it barely makes any sense at all. I think that by now everybody understands that Iran is an enormous country. It has a 92 million plus population. It has a million plus man army. It has a very long coastline, which is difficult, mountainous terrain. What are you going to do with another aircraft carrier that you couldn't do with the first two? And one of them is out of commission. The Gerald Ford is out of commission. Ground invasion? What are you going to do with 50 or 60,000 troops? You know, it would be like sending 50 or 60,000 troops to occupy Western Europe. It's just silly, and it seems to me that the only reason for all these moves is because Donald Trump cannot concede defeat.

He cannot lay it to rest and say, we messed up, let's not do this anymore. I think you and I have discussed a number of times, let's say prior to the 28th of February when Trump attacked Iran, that Iran actually should be Trump's logical partner in this region because it's a very rich country. It's the fifth richest country in terms of natural resource wealth. They have an estimated \$30–35 trillion worth of natural resource wealth. If you wanted to have a meaningful footprint in this region, you should partner with Iran, not with Israel, which is nothing but a liability for the United States. This is why, purely on the basis of, let's say, rational assessment of the situation, I thought they would never do this.

But not only has Trump triggered this attack, he remains committed to it. And I can't find a better explanation than he can't let it go because he can't admit defeat. Militarily, Iran definitely, clearly, obviously has escalatory dominance in this region. Everybody knew this. Trump was advised accordingly. We now know that Benjamin Netanyahu has begged every administration from George W. Bush on, maybe even Clinton, to attack Iran for him. Nobody has done it because everybody came to the same conclusion: it's too risky, it can't be done, the chances of success are too low, too little. We're not going to attack Iran.

Trump did. And now he just can't withdraw because there is no face-saving exit. And the Iranians are not giving him one. And so he's bringing more. He's escalating more. The rhetoric is escalating. Trump isn't—you know, like now you keep hearing about how, oh, we won, we won. Trump will repeat the same set of narrative points in the same conference with the press several times over, practically repeating exactly, you know, like he learned by heart: oh, we sank their ships, oh, we took care of their anti-aircraft, they don't have an air force, we killed all their leaders—as if that's somehow acceptable.

And it seems to me that it's turned into a psychotic situation, you know, perpetuating the risk of war just because you can't admit defeat. And you're going to keep insisting until your adversaries give you something that you can qualify as a victory. And then maybe you're going to say, like, ha, look, we crushed them, we win. Now, look, here's our token of victory, our trophy. And now we can close. Without that, it seems that they're just going to continue to escalate. But I don't see how they can. I don't. You can't do anything with two aircraft carriers. I mean, you can blow up things. You can't take control of the country. You can't take control of the Strait of Hormuz. You can't open it against Iranian opposition. You can't control the coastlines, the islands, the oil terminals.

You can't prevent Iran from striking at your targets in the region. I just simply don't understand, and I think that the rational thing to do would be to simply say, okay, we lost, we withdraw, that's the end of this story. But we're clearly not dealing with rational actors here. And so I don't know where this goes, but for the United States, it's going nowhere good. For Iran, in the short term, it may be painful, but in the longer term, Iran might reach a completely different level of national security by eradicating their enemy's presence in the region. So it's for Iran that slogan they invented some weeks ago, short-term pain for long-term gain, that might work in Iran's favor, but not in the United States' favor. For the United States, this is short-term pain for even more long-term pain.

#Nima

Yeah. Alex, when it comes to the blockade of the Strait of Hormuz, its blockade is happening in the Arabian Sea. Does it make sense for you to blockade the blockade? What is that?

#Alex

It doesn't make any sense at all. The Gulf of Oman is about twice as wide as the Strait of Hormuz, so it's a large area of sea. In normal times, the Strait of Hormuz would be traversed by between 120 and 150 ships per day, every day. Policing this traffic would be an extremely difficult thing to do. Because what would you do? You would have to board every ship to inspect, to look at their paperwork, to see whose cargo it is, who paid for it, who shipped it. How are you gonna do that a hundred times per day? And maybe today it's less, but still, maybe it's 30, 40, 50 vessels, I don't know. With time, the traffic is probably going to pick up. This is impossible. And then, you know, in practical terms, it's hard work. You may have to accost the vessels with other ships, or more likely with helicopters, but you still have to fly out those helicopters, land on the ship, bring the troops in, do the—it's just heavy-duty policing work that nobody believes in, right?

So I imagine that the US troops would not be super zealous about doing this work, you know. They would probably slack off big time. So it will inevitably be an extremely porous blockade. It's just not gonna work. It may work as a narrative device, you know, like you come out and you tell your public at home, "Well, they blocked the Strait of Hormuz. Now watch us. We're going to block it. Not them. We block it. We control the situation." You know, it's like when your girlfriend breaks up with you

and then you say, "No, I break up with you first," because your pride just can't take it that she dumped you. So you're like, "No, no, no, I'm dumping you." That's how it strikes me. It's like junior high school.

And it's consistent with Trump's social media posts of late. They really increasingly read like a mean high school brat who is making all those communications. I don't know how they came to the decision to block the Sea of Oman. But they, well in advance of the attack on Iran on 28 February, knew that almost certainly Iran's countermeasure would be closure of the Strait of Hormuz. So how is it that for 40 days this idea never occurred to anybody? Or how is it that in their studies and assessments of the possible confrontation with Iran, when they came to the conclusion Iran's going to close the Strait of Hormuz, they didn't say, they didn't write somewhere, "Oh, the brilliant countermeasure is we're going to close the Sea of Oman." There.

That's how we're going to deal with that. So it seems to me that it's probably a decision that was reached in a certain desperation among a very narrow group of policymakers, you know, maybe Trump and Kushner and Witkoff and so on, and Pete Hegseth, none of whom apparently have any particular depth to assess strategic moves and what their broader consequences will be, or even operational capabilities, because this is operationally a very heavy policing homework that you've now imposed on your troops, who are already sick and tired, exhausted. They don't particularly know why they're there, what the point of all this war is. I think that most of them think they're fighting a war for Israel. Israel is not the United States. None of them swore allegiance to Israel.

And I think this is why we're seeing mishaps with American ships happen as often as they do, because, you know, rather than mutinying, American troops just sabotage their own equipment and say like, yeah, you know, we'd love to go and fight this war for you, we just can't because our ship broke down. So we're going to have to be hauled to some shipyard for repairs. And where are you going to repair it? I don't know if their base in Diego Garcia has the facilities necessary to repair their ships. Maybe they have to take them back to the United States. I don't know exactly, but it all feels like sheer desperation. And the only reason why they're doing all this, that I can tell, is because they just can't man up and say, we cocked up, we're out of here. This was a big mistake, and we are gonna cut our losses and leave.

#Nima

Alex, one of the very important figures in Washington that we usually talk less about is Stephen Miller. He's so powerful in Washington. And here is what he said on Fox News.

#Speaker 04

Embargo and every other option is on the table as President Trump seeks that final, safe, secure outcome for the people of the world. All right, Stephen Miller.

#Nima

Yeah. When you talk about if he won, he won, the final safe and secure sort of solution. But what is missing, Alex, in my opinion, in Washington, is that they don't know who's Tehran, who's Iran, who's Tehran. Because you remember every time they're talking, and Marco Rubio, every time he talks about Iran, he's saying these radical Islamists, you know, ideologists, all this sort of nonsense. I think Iran has proven so far they're more pragmatic than being radical and that they know what they're doing. They didn't, you know, even with the case of civilians, killing civilians, they didn't respond the same way. They knew what would be the main targets on their part and what would make sense for them. And Iran, I think, Alex, looking at the history, because every time they're talking, these are terrorist, you know, governments in Iran.

But as our friend Larry Johnson has mentioned multiple times on this podcast, looking at the numbers, it's not even there. The policy in Israel is assassination. Whenever they have a spy in Iran, they want to find these high-ranked people to kill them, to assassinate them. But on the other hand, you see Iranians are totally the opposite. They want to get the information out from Israel. I think this shows hugely what is happening in the mind of the Iranian leadership, which is missing in the calculation of Washington. I think the first step would be to understand your enemy. You have to understand your enemy, what your enemy is, and what is the process of assessment on their part, the way they feel, the way they respond. That's missing in Washington. Nobody's talking about that.

#Alex

Well, Nima, what you say would make sense, except that this administration, and the Israelis, seem to be driven by hubris. They think that they are so superior to everybody else that they don't need to learn anything about anybody. They can just make their way by force. You can see how they responded to the Pope in this recent spat. They're like, we are the United States of America, we do what we want, and you better make sure that you're on our side if you know what's good for you. You know, that's their mindset: we are so big, so powerful, so invincible, we don't need to waste time learning about these Iranians or whoever.

We can just crush them. You know, we can just crush them and that's the end of that. And, you know, maybe even learning about the Iranians would—maybe they would think that that's like demeaning themselves, you know. Why should they? But I'm glad, Nima, I'm glad you brought up Stephen Miller, because Stephen Miller is one of these shadow entities that you don't hear so much from or about. But I would expect that he played a very important role in leading the United States to this war, because back in 2019, when the British ambassador, Sir Kim Darroch, mounted a pressure campaign against Trump to try to persuade him to go to war against Iran during his first term.

Trump declined, and then the ambassador was very upset that Trump didn't start a bombing campaign against Iran. But then, in the correspondence that emerged, he was saying that, well, we

could still pressure Trump into attacking Iran. We could achieve it. And he said that this could be done by surrounding Trump, flooding the zone around Trump with so-called Trump whisperers. And then we got some names of these Trump whisperers that would push Trump to start a war against Iran. And one of them was Stephen Miller. And so he is... he probably still has that role. He's probably still connected to the networks that wanted this outcome. And he's part of the problem for the U.S. administration and for the American people, because the American people never wanted this.

American people voted for Trump because he actually explicitly promised that there would be no more wars, that the United States would not attack Iran. And somehow all of this was thrown overboard on 28 February this year. And I suspect that Stephen Miller played a very, very important role in this. And so statements like he gave recently—and he said more than what you just played—I heard his statements. It's all more rah, rah, rah, we're the winners, we're going to do what we want. I think that he's also defending his own legacy, defending his own position in government, because this is a massive screw-up, a colossal blunder that he is responsible for, and he certainly knows it. And I think that many people in the administration also appreciate that.

#Nima

Yeah. Alex, looking at Russia and China today, you heard from China, for example, Donald Trump said, by the way, this blockade is—China is happy with that because we are helping China to open up the Strait of Hormuz. The Strait of Hormuz was never closed for China since this war started. They were using the Strait of Hormuz without having any sort of difficulties. Iran is their partner in the Middle East. But when it comes to China, do you think they're... It seems to me that the war in the Middle East has put them in a very different position right now.

They're not there even, you know, just looking at the sequence before the war in Ukraine and after the war in Ukraine, before the war in the Middle East and right now. What is China? We have the opposition leader going to, you know, to Beijing, meeting with Xi Jinping—the opposition leader in Taiwan. She went there, you know. These are huge changes. I think Taiwan is learning something from the Middle East, from GCC countries, from what has happened so far. What is that, in your opinion?

#Alex

Well, I think that Taiwan doesn't want to end up like Ukraine, because they use these so-called allied nations as proxies to fight their fights. And it does seem that this war is partly, or maybe primarily, motivated by weakening the position of China, which is dumb and desperate, but it seems that this is what they're doing. This is why they're bombing the China-Iran railway, which is part of the BRICS—sorry, Belt and Road Initiative—which kind of smacks of the World War I scenario, where the Germans built the Berlin-to-Baghdad railroad and the British decided that they needed to completely destroy all this.

So they did. They even engineered the overthrow of the Ottoman Empire because most of that railway was going through Ottoman territories in the Middle East. And they orchestrated the Balkan Wars, uprisings against the Ottoman Empire, which was strong, which had been present in the Balkans for 500 years, and then engineered World War I to destroy Germany, which they all did successfully. Now that power is no longer Germany, but it's China, and China is building alternative infrastructure so that they make themselves resistant to maritime control of the choke points.

And, you know, the trade choke points are things like Gibraltar, the Bosphorus, the Red Sea, Bab al-Mandeb Strait, Strait of Hormuz, and then, very importantly, the Strait of Malacca, right? Because I think that most of the Chinese trade with Western Asia and Europe goes through the Strait of Malacca, meaning something like 80% or 90% or more. And so, the potential—Hormuz and Bab al-Mandeb are two of your choke points, but a more important one is the Strait of Malacca. And then we saw just today, 16th of April, three days ago, the U.S. Secretary of War, Mr. Pete Hegseth, went to Indonesia to sign a military cooperation agreement with Malaysia.

And it seems, it's not completely clear from the communiqués that we saw, but it seems that the idea is for the United States to be able to take control of the Strait of Malacca, so that they can again say like, oh yeah, we'll keep the Strait open for you, but it's going to be on our terms. We are in control. You're gonna have to submit to our conditions and terms. And so, with the action that we see in bombing Iran, trying to take control of the Strait of Hormuz, trying to take control of the Strait of Malacca, it does seem that at least in part, the grand strategy is aimed against China. The other part is supporting Israel so that they have this grand bridgehead into Western Asia. And so, I think that the idea that Trump had was to go to China as a victor, to have really, really strong cards to play against Xi Jinping. It didn't work out that way. And I think that this deal three days ago, the military cooperation agreement with Malaysia, was to try to get some new cards to play against China. But the whole world sees now what happens to the American friends and allies. They can see that quip by Henry Kissinger, that it's dangerous to be an enemy of the United States, but it's deadly to be a friend, that this is literally the truth. Because look at what happened to Ukraine. It's practically destroyed. More than one million men have been sacrificed in their proxy war against Russia.

Look at what's happening to the UAE, Qatar, Bahrain, who knows, Saudi Arabia. They all end up sacrificed as pawns in this game. And who knows, you know, maybe Pete Hegseth's attempts to get Malaysia on their side are not going to work out. But people in Taiwan can see, they can see what's going on, and I think, like, do we want to end up like Bahrain, like Ukraine, like all these countries that end up completely wasted and broken, fighting somebody else's imperial war? And so a lot of people are now probably realizing we can't do this. This is... this is... And so, of course, the leader of the opposition goes to Beijing to say, we want a peaceful reintegration with China.

And I think that, you know, I remember some local elections that were being held in Taiwan, and it turned out that a significant majority of the people all voted for the parties that were looking for

friendly relations with China. So I think that this is already probably a dominant point of view in Taiwan. And I think that as the Trump administration shows itself to be incompetent and fumbling and very dangerous in their desperation, I think that more and more countries are going to be recognizing that it's not in their interest at all to be the pawns of the empire in this very dangerous game.

#Nima

CNN reported, Alex, this report on CNN shows how European countries are today militarily. It shows that their decision not to join the United States in the Strait of Hormuz to fight against Iran is not a mere political sort of decision, because they know they're militarily not that powerful to go with that plan. He said they're weakened militaries. They call it their weakened militaries, and that's not a solution for them. What is your understanding of the European countries and the way they're talking about the Middle East and the Strait of Hormuz? Because Donald Trump, it's obvious, he tried to do everything. He put a lot of pressure on European countries in order to force them into the fight. And what's so amazing to me is that Benjamin Netanyahu wants American troops to fight for him. And then Donald Trump is afraid to put an aircraft carrier in the zone, you know, in the reach zone of the Iranian military. He says, Europeans, you have to go there, and we're going to back you up. Yeah.

#Alex

It's almost funny. It's almost funny. It would be funny if it wasn't so horribly dangerous and deadly. But yeah, Donald Trump has made just about every possible statement about anything. So you can pick and choose what you believe, but none of it looks good. None of it gives the impression that he's in control and that he knows what he's doing. And with regards to European allies of the United States, the reality is that they are very weak. They're completely dependent on the United States. They do not have the logistical capability to send any significant forces to the Middle East and to stay there, you know, as a viable power policing Bab el-Mandeb or policing the Strait of Hormuz.

They did join the Operation Prosperity Guardian that kicked off in March of 2024. No, sorry, in December of 2023, to try to prevent the Ansarallah from blocking maritime traffic through the Red Sea. And they failed miserably. They failed miserably. And Italian and French naval ships withdrew because they were shocked that the Yemenis were firing back at them. And when they came under fire, they were in shock. And they're like, oh, well, wait a minute. This is not fair. We get to bomb others; nobody gets to shoot back at us. But, you know, they basically thought, okay, we're not doing this. Goodbye. We're leaving this.

And then, you know, Operation Rough Rider, they didn't even participate, which was 15 March 2025, you know, when Trump came to power, and then he was like, okay, now we're going to bomb these Yemenis like nobody's ever seen before. And then a few weeks later, he had to say, okay, okay, so let's make a deal, because he couldn't defeat them. So what would Europeans with their, you know, pathetic naval assets do in the Strait of Hormuz, in the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman? They

would just get beat up and sunk, probably. So they're not even thinking about participating in that. We have to also take into account that their priority now is the war against Russia. And as far as the leadership of the European Union and countries like Great Britain, France, and Germany, this is their priority project.

You know, they will do everything in their power to get the war against Russia going in earnest. And remember, their due date, the anticipated date, is 2028, 2029. And by then, they hope that they will be prepared for an all-out war against Russia. And it seems that they are dead serious about it. And so, going to help Trump in Western Asia would probably weaken them. And then, you know, Ukraine is a higher priority war for them because, you know, this is all part of that Mackinderian geopolitical strategy, which has as its objective the control of the Eurasian landmass. And the thinking is, who controls Eastern Europe controls the heartland, who controls the heartland controls the world island, meaning the Eurasian landmass, and who controls the world island controls the world.

So the top priority area is Eastern Europe, meaning Ukraine. And so winning the war in Eastern Europe by proxy of Ukraine is the highest priority. Now, they were prepared to fight that war until the last Ukrainian. And now we're coming very close to running out of the last Ukrainian. And that means that they will try to mobilize Poles, Bulgarians, Romanians, Moldovans, Germans, French, the British, everybody. This is the European obsession. And I think that this is also largely the reason why they're not interested in deluding themselves in Western Asia. They're happy to leave that to the United States. And even if the United States loses that war, as they have done, it doesn't matter. It's Eastern Europe for them.

#Nima

There is a very interesting player in Europe, which is Spain. Reopening the embassy in Tehran, going to China, redefining the relationship or partnership with China under tremendous pressure from the Trump administration. And then they have been threatening them with everything, you know, cutting trade, everything, putting pressure, sanctions. But he doesn't care—well, he cares, but he feels that the future for Spain would be... How do you see the way that Spain is behaving these days? And is that going to be a new sort of move on the part of European countries, or are we somehow optimistic if we feel that way?

#Alex

I sincerely don't know, Nima, because Pedro Sanchez, to me, is a very murky character. He's making all the right sounds with regards to Iran. He's making a lot of right sounds with regards to the Palestine war against Gaza and so forth. So I would give him credit for that if it wasn't for his government's complete commitment to the United Nations 2030 Agenda, flooding their own nation with immigrants in a completely uncontrolled fashion, and implementing a program of censorship

and repression against their own people. So I don't really know what to think about Spain or the government of Pedro Sanchez. I'd like to be cautiously optimistic, but I'm a little bit suspicious of him.

And then we have another element in Hungary, which I think is extremely interesting, because we had Péter Magyar replace Viktor Orbán. But so far, it seems to me that Péter Magyar's policies are almost exactly the same as Viktor Orbán's. So I'm wondering, did the Hungarians somehow manage to deceive the European Union into supporting a candidate that they thought was going to be their own Trojan horse in Hungary, but in fact, maybe he was set up by Viktor Orbán's party to pretend that he's in opposition, but he isn't? It's very early to know the answers to these questions, but let's say that I would be a little bit more optimistic about Péter Magyar at this point than I would be about Pedro Sanchez. But I could be wrong. Who knows? We'll find out.

#Nima

You know, the war in the Middle East was an opportunity for India. Many people believed that India could be that country to bring all sides together. But as we see, it's not India, it's Pakistan doing that right now. Pakistan is bringing Iran and the United States together to talk. And we had yesterday Munir going to Iran, and he's going to be in Washington soon to give the message to Washington. And I think, how do you feel about Pakistan, the role of Pakistan so far, compared to what India did? India was, you know, India is huge when it comes to BRICS, and many people thought that India would play that important role. But you see India just removing itself from the scene, from the equation. They're not commenting on anything. They're just there for, I don't know, to not comment about anything. But is that going to help them? Is that going to be a positive point for India in the long run?

#Alex

I think that India has damaged its own diplomatic standing and their prestige over this war. You know, on the eve of the war, Narendra Modi goes to Israel and he embraces the genocidal maniac Benjamin Netanyahu as his great friend. There's this strange loyalty to Israel from India that I don't quite understand, other than their Islam derangement. They also have a bit of a Pakistan derangement syndrome. And they seem extremely jealous of the prestige that Pakistan now enjoys in the world and the credibility by, you know, working hard to broker the ceasefire, to bring the two belligerent sides together, even though, you know, Iran's stance was quite hard and they didn't even want to talk to the Americans at all.

Pakistan brokered with the help of China and other players, but they brought them to Pakistan, they hosted them, they organized the meeting, they provided the security for the Iranian delegation so that they would come and then, you know, the Americans and the Israelis wouldn't kill them, you

know, as they were negotiating. So Pakistan now looks very good, they look very credible, they look like a constructive, goodwill player in this world, in spite of Pakistan itself being something of a repressive dictatorship.

#Nima

And many Pakistanis live in fear of their government.

#Alex

But nevertheless, they played a very positive role for the world, for the future of peace in the world. And the Indians played a very, very poor role. They stabbed Iran in the back. It seems that the sinking of the Iranian frigate after those military games in India was deliberate, or at least it was done with an acquiescence by the Indians, who then failed to come to the aid of the Iranian sailors. It smacks of betrayal. Narendra Modi's embrace of Benjamin Netanyahu looked awful, just awful. Not only the thing itself, even the timing of it.

No condemnation of Israel, no condemnation of the genocide. And then, you know, every comment about Pakistan's role in this, they try to demean it. They try to pretend that, no, Pakistan doesn't deserve any credit at all. So they just, I don't know, I think that they damaged their standing in the world. And I think that they even damaged their standing in the BRICS group, you know. Meanwhile, Iran has risen. BRICS could now be Brazil, Russia, Iran, China. I think they've put themselves at the back of the queue.

#Nima

Yeah. Alex, when it comes to the policies of sanctioning other countries, Scott Bessent yesterday said that sanctions are gonna be back on Iran and Russia in a few days. What do they want? Is that gonna be a zero-sum game? Because the whole concept of sanctions is based on a zero-sum game — you are with us or against us. That's why we are sanctioning you. But they know that the power of sanctions is reducing as time goes by. They know how things are changing. This rate of formation is the new sort of alternative in the whole calculation, in my opinion. But they're doubling down. They're not understanding the new situation. Scott Bessent is doubling down on sanctions. How is that going to help the global economy? That's not the case. Sanctioning another country is not going to help. Right now, Russia and Iran are playing a very important role in the whole calculation, but they have decided to go in that direction. What is that, in your opinion?

#Alex

It seems to me that the United States has been using this weapon of sanctions for so long that it's just a, you know, hammer looking for nails to strike. You know, it's one of the main tools, and so this is almost like a knee-jerk reaction — well, you know, if you don't do as we say, we're going to

sanction you, that's the punishment. And, you know, initially, there were certain expectations about sanctions that I forget now exactly what they were, but in the United States, they calculated that if they imposed sanctions on a country, then almost automatically the stock markets would go down in that country, so many GDP points would be lost. And so they had fairly specific predictions about the effects of sanctions on sanctioned nations. So they knew that this would put tremendous pressure on the governments and maybe even lead to their overthrow if the people were very unhappy. And so a consensus was built up about the effectiveness of sanctions on targeted countries. However, if you sanction Serbia or Iraq or, I don't know, Costa Rica, whatever — let's say relatively small economies — then it delivers large damage to those countries but very little damage to the United States. But if you end up sanctioning 20 or 30% of the global GDP, that's also the global trade that you exclude yourself from. Right, and so the more you use the sanctions weapon, the more you end up sanctioning and isolating yourself.

And so if you've come to the point of, oh, we're gonna sanction everybody who does business with Iran, we're gonna sanction everybody who does business with India — sorry, with China — we're gonna sanction everybody who does business with Russia, you end up pushing everybody away from yourself. And so not only are you sanctioning and isolating yourself, you're giving people a very, very strong incentive to develop alternative systems of trade. And so we see that the role of the U.S. dollar as a dominant trade currency is collapsing. The role of the U.S. dollar as a reserve currency is collapsing.

And we see that the use of domestic currency between countries — you know, like if they're in a bilateral trade — they're increasingly conducting bilateral trades in their local currencies. So, I don't know, Brazil will trade with China in yuan and in Brazilian real, which means that no money goes to the Federal Reserve Bank in New York, which means that no money is being recycled. Because, you know, the bank accounts owned by countries like China, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Russia, and so forth would end up being recycled into United States treasuries, because what do you do with those balances? You maybe have a few hundred billion sitting at the Federal Reserve.

Well, you're going to buy U.S. treasuries to generate you 2%, 3%, 4% in interest income, right? But the result of that is that you're effectively financing the American government. All your wealth that's stuck in the Federal Reserve accounts ends up being recycled in the U.S. Treasury, so you're effectively financing the American government. Well, the countries that are sanctioned and excluded from that then do not hold reserves in U.S. dollars at the Federal Reserve Bank and will not fund American treasuries, the American government. So that weapon ends up blowing up in your face. And the more you use it, the more it blows up in your face, except—you know, a rational assessment, maybe we shouldn't be doing this anymore, is lacking because what you have in its place is a groupthink that just latched onto this: we can bludgeon everybody into submission by using sanctions against them. That thinking has gotten so entrenched that nobody second-guesses it

anymore. So it's almost like a knee-jerk reaction. Oh, you're going to supply weapons to Iran? Boom, we're going to sanction you. And we're going to issue letters to Chinese banks. Meanwhile, the rest of the world is thinking, maybe we need to get away from all this.

Let's see about trading with the Chinese in Chinese yuan, with the Russians in Russian rubles, with the Brazilians in Brazilian real, and leave this mad hegemon to their own devices. I think that this is what's happening, actually. So at one point, you know, the effect of this is almost predictable. At one point, you know, if there are no foreign buyers for your debt, the only way you're going to be able to sell your bonds is by your central bank printing the money, which is called monetizing debt, which reliably leads to inflation. And so we're going to see rising rates of inflation in the United States.

And we're going to see a collapse of the U.S. dollar. Not from one day to the next. This is a process that tends to span many years, but this is inevitably coming. And the more they sanction their trade partners, the faster it will come. They're basically accelerating the process. And then, just the last thing to say, this is, I think, a certainty, but we have to also take into account that other nations like Japan, the European Union nations, and Great Britain are in even worse shape. And I think that Great Britain probably is the weak link that is going to be the first one to collapse.

#Nima

Alex, before wrapping up, the other dimension of what's going on in the Middle East is this desperate attempt on the part of the Zionists. They want to make the war an ideological war, a war between Muslims and Christians. They're doing everything in that direction to make the case. And it seems that they have managed Donald Trump. They have deceived him or bought him into that sort of mindset. Here is what Tucker Carlson reported.

#Speaker 05

That same tweet or Truth, he used the F-word on Easter Sunday, and then he seemed to make fun of Islam. "Praise Allah," he said. So in one short statement of about 110 words, he seemed to give the finger to the world's two largest religions, Christianity and Islam. And then exactly one week later, also on Sunday, the Christian holy day, he attacked the Pope, the leader of the world's largest religion and largest Christian denomination, and attacked him personally and said, basically, "He's only Pope because of me. He's bad. The Pope is bad." And then later that day, maybe most interestingly, bafflingly of all, he sent out this meme. Take a look at this. Now, there are two on the screen. The one on the right is the one that he sent out, and it's himself—it's Donald Trump, President of the United States, dressed as Jesus, healing a man.

You can see the healing power coming off of his right hand. Now, the image on the left of your screen is the original image, and it was floating around the internet. Who knows exactly where it came from, but it's been there for quite some time. The one on the right is the one the president sent out—White House communications officer, whoever does this, sent out—and you'll notice that

it's been changed. The American soldier over the president's head, the president as Jesus' head, has been changed and is now, if you look very carefully, a demon, some kind of winged creature of hell. So it goes from an image that suggests healing and light to an image that suggests, I don't know, a scene from Revelation, John's vision on the Isle of Patmos, the end times, the apocalypse—who knows? Nothing good. It suggests demonic power because there is a demon in it. So he sent that out.

#Nima

Alex, I really believe that the Zionists, they don't have any religion. They're not Jewish, Christian, or anything. Basically, their religion is to be racist, in my opinion. But they're trying to make this sort of religious war between Muslims and Christians. Are they going to be successful? Are they going to achieve that, in your opinion?

#Alex

I would say no, Nima. I would say no, because what you described is a scenario that they themselves have planned for. It's called the clash of civilizations, and basically it's meant to be a major Armageddon-type clash between Christendom and Islam. This would be one of their major projects, in the same way that the COVID-19 pandemic was one of their major projects, and the war against Russia through the proxy of Ukraine was one of their major projects, and the war in the Middle East against Iran was one of their major projects, and the war on China through Taiwan was part of that as well.

And we've seen that they failed at every single one of these big projects. And it seems to me that they're failing at this one again, because what I'm noticing on social media is that there seems to be some kind of awakening going on, a realization that, in fact, Christendom and Islam should be sister religions, because they are very, very close, in fact. Well, Judaism as well, in its original form, right? These are all, you know, people who get deep into this. And I have a few friends who are very, very deep students of Abrahamic religions. They say that basically it's one and the same religion, in effect, with some changes in form.

A lot of people in the West have been brainwashed with an Islamophobia which is false, because we think we understand Islam based on what mainstream media has been peddling for more than two decades now, practically from the start of the global war on terror and even before that. You know, Muslims were always the terrorists, and then they attacked us on 9/11, and then there was Al-Qaeda, and then there was Al-Nusra, and Boko Haram is currently slaughtering Christians in Nigeria, and so forth. But people forget, or they choose to ignore, the fact that all of these factions of Islam were in fact created by Western intelligence agencies like the CIA, like MI6, and the Mossad, and that these intelligence agencies positively want Christians and Muslims to be fighting wars against each other.

They want this Armageddon-type conflict in the world. We also know that the British government is deeply involved in education in the Islamic world, which they have done together with the CIA, and they use the money of the Gulf monarchies to create a whole alternative system—curriculum with tainted Qurans and textbooks that teach a very distorted version of Islam. And they teach that not just around the world, in, you know, Chechnya and Dagestan and Afghanistan and wherever you want—they even do that in France and Belgium and the UK. For example, in Gaza and the West Bank, the British government had, I think, 30,000 teachers on their payroll, and they provided the textbooks for what was being taught to the children in Palestine.

And then when people went and looked into what's in these textbooks, they were very radicalizing textbooks, deliberately. They were radicalizing the Palestinian youth to think that it's Islamic to sacrifice themselves in the holy war, to wield violence against their oppressors, and so on and so forth. So this is a reality that we have to take into consideration, you know, that this is, let's say, distorted Judaism and distorted Islam. And then also Christianity, you know, like if you judged Christianity by Trump's spiritual advisors like Paula White and all these American televangelists, you would think that these are complete lunatics.

You would think that Christianity is itself a violent, terrible religion, but that's not the truth. And I think that in the mainstream, or at least in a large segment of Christians in the world today, the awareness that we should actually be brothers and sisters with our fellow Muslims and Jews is rising, actually. So I think that even this grand project of a clash of civilizations is starting to dissipate, is starting to get away from them. And I think that it will ultimately fail, that people will realize that we don't really have a good reason to be at war with one another. Peace is better for everybody. And, you know, Muslims, like Christians, revere Jesus Christ.

They have a different view of him, but they consider him to be a legitimate prophet of God. Muslims, you know, not Al-Qaeda and Boko Haram, you know, violent assassins, but the mainstream Muslims, they worship and revere Mother Mary. We've seen in Iran, in Tehran, they have a subway station dedicated to Mother Mary, which portrays her very beautifully with due respect and reverence. And I think that the Christians are starting to see through this, so that's a good thing. And I think that in the same way that in 2020 they were promising us a new normal that would never go away, that would stay with us forever, and then all that unraveled and failed, I think that this clash of civilizations will also unravel and fail.

#Nima

I hope so. Thank you. Thank you so much, Alex, for being with us today. It's a great pleasure.

#Alex

Great pleasure as always, Nima. Thank you for the invite, and until next time.

#Nima

See you soon, Alex.

#Alex

Bye-bye. Take care. Bye.

#Nima

Take care.