

Alex Krainer: Why This Military Comeback Changes EVERYTHING

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, May 7th, 2026, and our dear friend, our brother, Alex Krainer, is here with us. Welcome back, Alex.

#Alex

Thank you for having me, Nima. Good to be with you again.

#Nima

Alex, we had a lot, you know, since last time we talked. Donald Trump, just days ago—two days ago—announced what he called Project Freedom in the Strait of Hormuz. He wanted to open up the Strait of Hormuz after that. Remember what happened with the Europeans? He wanted the Europeans to open up the Strait of Hormuz. Then he decided to do it by himself, with the United States alone doing that. And the project, after 24 hours, he said it was concluded and there was no achievement out of that operation, Project Freedom. And then he announced that Axios reported on a framework of talks, which was mentioned by the Iranians, or they said it's a wishlist of the Trump administration. And here is what Marco Rubio said yesterday.

#Speaker 03

has said, and the facts clearly bear out, the United States of America holds all the cards. There is no scenario here in which, if they decide to join a ladder of escalation, they wind up getting the last say. But our preference is for these straits to be opened the way they're supposed to be opened, back to the way it was—anyone can use it, no mines in the water, nobody paying tolls. That's what we have to get back to, and that's the goal here, yeah.

#Nima

What are those cards that he's talking about, and your understanding of what's going on?

#Alex

Well, I would just challenge your statement that there was no achievement, when obviously it was a glorious victory for the Trump administration. And that's what they're apparently running with. They created a problem, and now the victory seems to be undoing that creation. But obviously, you know, if he's talking about the United States holding all the cards, he's not talking about a poker game. He's talking about an Uno game where, you know, the one who holds all the cards lost the game. I don't know what to say, Nima.

This is like, it's surreal that the administration in charge of the world's superpower, the preeminent global superpower, is just making it up as they go along, inventing narratives that suit them best today, inventing a new narrative the next day like the previous one didn't exist. You know, it's almost like George Orwell's *1984*, where they're saying, we've always been at war with Eurasia, and then they just switch to, we've always been at war with East Asia. And that's what's being fed to the public. And they just hope that the public will swallow the narrative every time. And there are people who will swallow the narrative every time. But I think that increasingly, people are not buying it anymore.

And the administration's support is melting away slowly but steadily. And unfortunately, you know, I truly do regret that because I think that Trump and his administration had a very, very strong popular mandate to change things, to effect a very radical course correction in the United States' foreign policy. But I think that by attacking Iran on the 28th of February, they have jeopardized all of it. Trump, I don't know if he's still capable of winning in the midterm elections. It doesn't seem that way. But who knows, you know, by November, things might change. But he's definitely taken enormous risks, and not only with the midterm elections, but with his whole presidency and his political legacy.

And all the, you know, not so long ago, you know, the message was going out from that administration, you know, switching from the free trade system to the American system of political economy. All of those elements, they seemed real, they seemed genuine. They delivered that message to the World Economic Forum in Davos in January. They reinforced that message the following month at the Munich Security Conference. And then two weeks later, they are at war with Iran. To me, this is incomprehensible. And I think that at this moment, we are so far off the charts that I can't even imagine where this will go over the coming months. But right now, it seems to me that Trump is in a very similar position as Benjamin Netanyahu, where he has to craft policy to suit his political goals, which could just go from one pitfall to the next.

#Nima

I think, zooming out and considering what is going on in Iran — the Iranian foreign minister going to Russia, talking with Vladimir Putin right now. He went yesterday. We saw him in China. And the countries are somehow finding their way to deal with the United States. And it's not about those

countries deciding about it, it's about the United States forcing them to react. This is the reality of what's going on in the Middle East. In Ukraine, I would say, finally, eventually, we're going to have it in Taiwan as well. But Alex, looking at the Trump administration, don't you think that, you know, they have two negotiators? Let's assume that.

None of them is serving, you know, the United States. Both of them are serving Benjamin Netanyahu and his administration. Basically, Iranians call them Zionists, you know, sort of Israeli agents. And that's why they asked for J.D. Vance to join the talks. But the other point is, he added another guy to this conversation, to these two — Steve Witkoff and Jared Kushner. The guy who's gonna be part of the negotiations if something happens is former IDF. How is that? I think there is no possibility for talks between Iran and the U.S. Look at what happened yesterday. Donald Trump said, we are negotiating.

The framework was in access. Later on, we've seen the new attack on Beirut in Dahye — an assassination attack. There is no ground for talks and negotiations. And the first line, those three steps on the part of the Iranians: first of all, ending the war permanently on each and every front, which would be between Israel and Lebanon as well. Without Lebanon, Iran is not going to make any sort of deal. I can assure you that's not going to happen. And Israel is not willing to end that war. And I don't see Donald Trump being able to force them into some sort of position. How do you see the relationship between Donald Trump and Benjamin Netanyahu?

#Alex

I'm not sure, Nima. Genuinely, I'm curious about who is actually—where is the moving principle in this whole equation? Who is moving these events? Because, again, in this edition of war against Iran, we saw that the pressure to move was coming from Benjamin Netanyahu and the whole Zionist cabal in the United States. But in 2019, the pressure was coming from the British, through the British administration and their ambassador, Sir Kim Darroch, which was in the summer of 2019. So the fact that the pressure to pursue the same agenda came from two different sources, to me, suggests that there's probably a whole different layer of power play that's above Benjamin Netanyahu and above Donald Trump.

And I suspect that Trump really didn't want this war because, you know, maybe about two weeks ago, Tucker Carlson had one of his monologues in which he said that he has spoken with Donald Trump about this for decades, the last 10 years many times, and that his very strong impression was that he and Trump were on the same page, that Trump understood that this was a terrible idea. Trump said many times in public that this was a terrible idea, that it shouldn't be done. And how he ended up doing it is very difficult for me to demystify to myself.

So it seems to me that what we're dealing with is, again, that conflict between two systems of governance. And I think that it's escalating very rapidly because the Western centers of power, which are on one side of this conflict fault line, are probably in a panic. You know, we recently had a

major battle in Mali where a contingent of about 12,000 jihadists tried to overthrow the Mali government. Very probably it was France that instigated that conflict. Thankfully, it didn't succeed, thanks to Russian support of the Mali government. And they ended up, I think, destroying about 2,000 of these jihadi terrorists.

We also see an escalation of conflict between the populations and their governments in the United States and in Western Europe. We see that the British just last month formalized a new military alliance called the Joint Expeditionary Force, which groups ten northern European navies. Obviously, this Joint Expeditionary Force is being formed to confront Russia. And they're saying that we need to bring back the focus from the Middle East to Russia again. The headquarters of the Joint Expeditionary Force is in London, and the top commander is a British military brigadier general, Tom Bateman.

We see that in European countries, you know, the governments are all sitting on thin ice. There's a likelihood of social uprisings of—I wouldn't say overthrows of the government—but like in Romania, the people are forcing, they forced the fall of the government, and they want Colin Georgescu back in power. Well, back in power—he never was in power because the election was overruled by courts. But it seems to me that all these conflicts are part of the same big war, and that the other side, the Western centers of power, are so panicked that they're not even choosing methods anymore. They're going with outright terrorism, with sabotage, with escalation of existing conflicts.

And now we see a new attempt to create a pandemic crisis, a public health crisis, with this whole hantavirus outbreak, which, if you follow the news, just started about a month ago. But now it's, oh no, it went to Switzerland, it went to the Netherlands, it went to Singapore. We don't know who carries the virus. We need to go with contact tracing. Maybe we're going to need the whole social distancing and masking and lockdowns and everything. And so I think we're in a phase where the world is rapidly entering a perfect storm of converging crises, which are not just geopolitical, they're also internal crises of the Western world. And that obviously creates political pressures on governments. And, you know, what happens with Starmer—he's facing election now in a few days, or maybe today.

I forget, maybe it's today or tomorrow. Merz, Emmanuel Macron—they're all extremely unpopular. AfD in Germany is rising in the polls. It seems that everything is so off the charts that it's very difficult to see how the situation evolves. And then... next week, Trump is going to China. I don't know what might happen there, but I suspect that the Chinese might force him to back down against Iran, because the Chinese have started to take an increasingly hard line, which they never did up until now. They realize that this conflict, this war, is ultimately aimed at them and that they have to respond. They can't just sit back, issue these very ambivalent statements, and remain passive. And we see that they are getting active and that they are now much more aggressively responding to American tit with their own tat.

#Nima

We've seen that the Chinese government said to the refineries in China, don't care about the U.S. sanctions on Iranian oil, and you can go ahead, we're supporting you here. This is the first time, as you've mentioned, China is moving. And we've seen the pictures of how the Iranian foreign minister and the Chinese foreign minister are hugging and the way they're approaching each other. It somehow reminds me of Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping hugging each other, you know, when Putin went to China.

This is the new era, I think, for the United States. They forced all of these countries—particularly, I'm talking about China, Russia, and Iran—all together. They know that if they want to survive, they have to stay together. There is no way for them, for none of them, in my opinion, to act single-handedly. That's why all of them are coming together. And how do you see the way that they're trying to go against the United States, but they don't want to be that aggressive against the United States? They want to show the United States how they would react.

#Alex

Well, I believe that the reason for this is that the preference, particularly for Russians, is to bring the United States into a multipolar world because they realize that the United States is not a monolith. At the moment, it seems that the neocon factions and the pro-Zionist factions have taken control of U. S. foreign policy. But there are also factions in the U.S. public sphere that do want to get along with the rest of the world, trade with the rest of the world, be at peace, reduce the military budgets, re-industrialize the nation, and so forth. And they are in a certain conflict also with their former allies in Europe.

So, you know, if they resist the impulse to antagonize the United States too much, they can allow these alliances to weaken further and maybe bring the United States on board, which would be extremely important. If they antagonize the United States, they might push them back into the old alliances. And then you have, again, the risk of a world war between the united West against Russia, particularly. You know, that's going to be the first target for sure, and this is why the British are furiously working their secret diplomacy and intelligence and military circles to try to achieve that. And they will certainly try to make sure that the United States is on board, because if the United States is not on board, then they are too weak to face a united Russia, China, and Iran.

They're too weak to face Russia alone. But with the United States, you know, they probably feel that they have a chance, not necessarily to win in any military conflict, but to, let's say, bleed Russia and make it weak to the point where they can effect regime change. If they manage to effect regime change in Russia, then they could use Russia against China the same way they used Ukraine against Russia. And then, you know, that way they eliminate two big obstacles in their quest to dominate the Eurasian continent. And then Iran remains isolated, so it can remain there isolated like Cuba or North Korea until at some point they manage to topple Iran as well. And then they take the big prize.

So I think that as far as Russia and China are concerned, and Iran as well, it's important to play this with a great deal of patience and over a long time, because with time, the internal structure of Western society will collapse. It's already collapsing. We already see the bond prices tanking, interest rates going up, prices of commodities going up, inflation is going to follow. There might be a food crisis that is going to have an impact. So that all leads to political upheaval. And in that political upheaval, these alliances are likely to splinter, and the United States might see a lot of sense in doing good, honest business with China and Russia and Iran, if that's still possible.

Because, you know, before the war started, the Trump administration was discussing deals with Iran, and the Iranians were inclined to open up to U.S. businesses coming into Iran and developing the Iranian economy and participating in that market, which is enormous, which is absolutely huge — 92 million people and a nation that is the fifth richest in terms of natural resource wealth. So, great potential there to cooperate. So I think that we could see that the Russians have been very, very muted in criticizing Trump. The Chinese as well. They all took measures to respond to American gambits, but without necessarily embarrassing Trump too much in front of the global public.

#Nima

But Donald Trump doesn't miss any sort of opportunity to humiliate other countries, because each and every time you see he's moving against Iran, he's trying to humiliate Iranians. I don't know why he's doing this and what the outcome is. What was the outcome so far for the United States? Because the latest report coming from the Washington Post is reporting on how devastating the Iranian attack was on American bases in the region. And I think as time goes by, the Trump administration would face tremendous difficulties when it comes to the GCC countries. Look at what has happened in the aftermath, or during this, you know, the so-called Project Freedom. A single attack on the UAE has reduced its capabilities with those two ports in Fujairah and Khor Fakkan.

And it was reduced from 5 million barrels a day to 500,000 a day. This is, you know, we're talking about the UAE that got out. They decided to get out of, you know, OPEC Plus, OPEC, and OAPEC, and the GCC because they wanted to sell more oil. This is the fragility on the part of GCC countries. And I think, I really believe the discussions among these countries are getting, you know, elevated, and they're getting to the point of asking, what is the point of having some sort of partnership with the United States, basically with these bases? I don't see Donald Trump has any sort of solution for that for the time being. Trump doesn't have a solution, that's for sure. But you see, the reason I think why the other side is moving, let's call it with a light touch, is because in the longer term that helps them. Trump is not going to be in office much longer. He has three years left, less than three years left, and somebody else will come in after him. So he is not so relevant in the longer term. But you see, for example, if the Iranians now sank an American ship, some very, very public embarrassment to the Trump administration, with hundreds or maybe thousands of sailors going to the bottom of the sea, that would cause an outrage in the United States, regardless of who is right, who is wrong, and it would probably draw the wrath of the American people on Iran.

However, if you let them off relatively unharmed from the whole situation, the consequences will be felt in the US economy. And we already see the oil prices are going up, the prices of agricultural commodities are going up, interest rates are going up. The American debt, which is absolutely enormous, is becoming more and more expensive for the government. Because if you look at the American stock market, you see enormous, very unusual rises in stock prices, and that is an indication that the Federal Reserve is flooding the system with liquidity, with currency.

The reason why they would do that is because their financial system is broken. And if they didn't do that, we would see again some kind of Lehman Brothers moment and a financial crisis. So the consequences of this war will be felt at home in their economy, and that's going to hurt the American people. And you know who will be blamed? Trump, but also Israel and the Zionists. So in the following elections, this neocon Zionist element is going to possibly be purged from the system, and different forces might take their place. I mean, you know, these are historical cycles.

No group, no faction can hold on to power forever. So I think that this kind of, quote-unquote, regime change will then benefit the multipolar world. So I think that if you avoid throwing some really, really powerful punch against the United States, killing thousands of their servicemen and women, then you allow the consequences to just happen internally, and then people blame the consequences on Trump and his advisors. So, you know, the Zionists, Kapow, Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, and if people put their thinking caps on, the City of London and the British. And then, you know, these people will lose political support even more than they are already losing it. And the wrath of the American people will not be directed at the Iranians, at a foreign enemy, but at the enemy at home.

The enemy at home obviously would prefer that people get mad at the Iranians, at the Russians, at the Chinese, and so forth. But if you don't give them that, if you don't give them that pretext, then the consequences will have to be digested at home. And I think that this is the longer-term strategy of the Russians and the Chinese. And I think that they discuss these strategies together with the Iranians. So the Iranians are also actually fighting their side with a great deal of restraint and responsibility. And I think that this is the reason. You know, when Donald Trump came to power last year, Sergei Karaganov said that we see it as our task now to help the United States transition from being a global hegemon to being a normal great power with the least disruption possible.

And I think that they will continue to do exactly that. And so this is why I think we see these conversations between Araghchi and Putin, and then Putin calls Trump. And then Trump's whole war rhetoric kind of dissipates and splinters, and he says, okay, well, victory achieved. We can wrap up Project Freedom, and we won, and he will continue probably to antagonize the Iranians, but probably without any success. And then when Trump goes to China next week, I expect that he will get the same rap from Xi Jinping. And he will probably have to consider the downside risk of any of these aggressive policy gambits.

#Nima

Alex, do you feel that, from what we've seen so far, this administration is destroying its opportunities or making new opportunities for itself?

#Alex

Oh, I'm sure that they're making some opportunities for themselves, but net-net, I would say that they have destroyed a lot more than they have created. And, you know, this colossal blunder of attacking Iran, I think, has set them back tremendously. You know, losing popular support is probably the worst thing you can do in exercising political power. And they have done that exactly. Not only that, but they have also lost a great deal of credit internationally. In February before the 28th, they had 16, 17 military bases in the Middle East. Now 13 or 14 of them have been completely destroyed. They had allies in the Middle East.

Now all of their allies have been destabilized and might not survive much longer. I don't know what to think of that, Nima, because, you know, Trump in his first administration wanted to withdraw from the Middle East. He wanted to withdraw from Syria, from Afghanistan. He even wanted to withdraw troops from Germany. Well, now he's doing all that, even though that's not what he intended. But all of that is actually happening. I don't know how we came about those developments, but we are. And we'll see what the effect of it will be. We don't know yet. I don't think it's possible to predict. We see that the Europeans are creating new military alliances. They're exercising.

They're starting to board Russian naval ships. They're forcing Russia to respond. Then they respond back. They say, "Oh, the Russians are increasing their incursions into our territorial waters." Very clearly, the British are trying to open a new front against Russia as they're running out of Ukrainians, but they're not ready for that. So they need, you know, they're planning the next war for 2029, 2030. Are they going to be ready by then? Who knows? I kind of doubt it, but I think that the people who are actually pulling the levers of power, they don't really care whether they win wars or not. I think that they need to achieve two objectives. They need to keep Russia weak and destabilized if possible.

So they have to keep Russia fighting wars continuously. And then also, you know, the aspect that is much less discussed, but I think it's very, very real, is that they need to get rid of a lot of military-aged men in their own populations. You know, kind of what they did to Ukraine, they need to do that in Germany and Poland and Britain and France and so forth. Because the economic crises that are going to result from all this are going to be, you know, once-in-a-century type crises. And, you know, if you have a lot of military-aged males who are completely disenfranchised and who blame you for what has happened to them, you might have a revolution on your hands.

You might have a civil war on your hands. And then, you know, the power, quote-unquote, elites, they could all end up under a guillotine or something like that. So they are very, very scared. And I

think that this is why they are ramping up, very aggressively ramping up attacks on their own populations, you know, with censorship, with sanctions that completely disenfranchise individuals, like your friend Colonel Jacques Pau, with planning new pandemics, you know, with declaring 15-minute cities where everybody has to be shut in and corralled into a small local area that can then be more easily controlled, bringing about the, how do you call it, electronic IDs, central bank digital currencies.

So it's like the matrix is tightening more and more and more around people, and they're making it easier and easier to destroy people and their lives and their families and so forth. And they're doing this and then bringing immigrants, integrating these immigrants into the police forces, on and on and on—it just isn't stopping. So these are the two great goals that they plan to achieve. Are they going to be successful? I wouldn't bet on it, Nima, you know, because we've seen that they had several hugely important projects over the past few years. One of them was the pandemic in 2019–2020. That failed because we were supposed to be living in the new normal forever, and we're not.

So that failed. Then, you know, Project Ukraine was meant to regime-change Russia, collapse its economy, and break Russia up into whatever, five entities or 27 entities, depending on who you ask. That failed. They were supposed to collapse Iran and take it over. That didn't work. And so I see that they have a lot of these very clever plans, but they're not really working out. And so I don't know if their World War III plan is going to work out—to draw Russia into a big conflict between the combined West against Russia, like a World War III scenario on the European continent. I don't know if that's going to succeed. I don't know if they're going to be able to take control of Iran.

I don't know if they'll be able to subdue China either. I doubt it, because they are weaker and weaker as time goes by. And I think they're more and more panicked, which means that they're taking steps before they're ready, and it ends up blowing up in their face. Like the recent situation in Mali—they wanted to regime-change Mali, that failed too. That's maybe not such a big project, but they desperately need collateral. They desperately need to reclaim their colonies and basically plunder their wealth to refill their money reserves, their coffers, their credit creation capability. And it's just not working.

#Nima

It's too difficult, Alex, for me to separate the United States today, as we see the United States in 2026, and the British Empire. I think the United States is a reincarnation of the British Empire because, in many ways—in many ways—look at the behavior of the American bases today. When you have, for 80 years for example, in Germany, Donald Trump talking about withdrawing the troops from Germany—what is the outcome? What is the main reason to have a base in Germany for 80 years? This is not a sovereign country in Europe. If you have some sort of sovereignty, you don't need American bases. Who's going to attack you? Who's going to attack you? And why is a nation

not able to defend itself and needs the United States to have a base there? It's all about sovereignty for the GCC countries as well, because I see all of them as the same sort of agenda. It's the continuation of colonialism.

#Alex

It absolutely is a continuation of colonialism, Nima. And, you know, like if you have an American military base on your territory, you're not a sovereign country. That's, you know, period. And we have seen, you know, the British have very actively been trying to regain control over their former colonies. And in some cases, they've been successful, you know, particularly in Africa. And then they, you know, I think that ultimately the reason why the Trump administration is at war in the Middle East traces back to Britain. And it's not transparent, it's not obvious how it does so. But the British have had their objective of regaining their own hegemony from Suez east. You know, that's been their agenda since, I think, 2015, 2016. And how this works exactly, I'm not sure, Nima.

But I know that, for example, during the first Gulf War in 1990, when the United States went and attacked Iraq, the determining influence on George Bush Sr. was exerted by Margaret Thatcher, because the official position of their government was that the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait had nothing to do with us, it's up to you. And then Margaret Thatcher traveled to the United States and she spent four days with George H. W. Bush. And at the end of that time together with Margaret Thatcher, the American policy position changed completely. And then they went to war against Iraq. How could Great Britain have such influence over the United States?

I don't know how to answer that question exactly, but I know that both nations are enthralled to their banking oligarchies. And their banking oligarchies are two sides of the same coin. Wall Street and the City of London, they work in tandem. And so do the French bankers in Paris, and so do the German bankers in Frankfurt, and the Swedish bankers in Stockholm, and so forth. Canada... of course, yeah, Canada, which is just a subchapter of the UK banking cartel. They all ultimately work together, but they don't necessarily work together in any legal way that you could open the books, discern it, audit it, and understand what's going on. This is basically done in mafia style. And a lot of what they do is plain illegal. But, you know, it doesn't matter. They plunder what they can, where they can.

And a lot of what they do is plain illegal activities. You know, the drug cartels in Mexico and in Canada couldn't function without money laundering services by the banks. And then all over Europe we have organized criminal groups like these Pakistani and Bangladeshi grooming gangs, people smugglers, child trafficking, illegal drug trafficking. This is very, very reminiscent of the Opium Wars of the 19th century, which brought down China completely. And so I think that those means and methods are still being employed. And then they exercise decisive control over the intelligence agencies like MI6, Mossad, the CIA, German intelligence, French intelligence, and so forth.

So I think that ultimately these are the structures of power—illegitimate, illegal, but nevertheless decisive—that actually determine the foreign policy conduct of powers. You know, when John F. Kennedy wanted to dismantle the CIA, he was assassinated. And we were never told exactly who assassinated him. None of those investigations went full cycle and got any definitive answers, but they clearly do this. And so I assume that the same people who got away with assassinating U.S. presidents and were never held accountable for it, let alone punished, have only consolidated their hold on power. They were not disenfranchised. They consolidated their hold on power, and they became probably more powerful.

And the way they exercise power is probably more subtle and more sophisticated than it was 60 years ago. And so I think that every analysis of what's going on today has to take that into account, which of course is very difficult because we know very little. We don't know enough, but Jeffrey Epstein was part of that. And for some reason, we're not allowed to know. Ghislaine Maxwell was convicted of child trafficking, but exactly zero of her clients faced any accountability. So that's all where it's at. That's where the real enemy is. This is who is pushing us into these forever wars. And I think it might take a revolution to actually get to the bottom of this.

But even, you know, revolutions are always very, very susceptible to being infiltrated and misguided, you know, like the French Revolution. You know, the French people still think that that was a victory of the people over the decadent nobility, but the revolution was stage-managed from London. And then the amazing thing is that the enormous debts that the French state was burdened with—which those debts were taken on by the nobility—the revolutionary governments honored those debts when they were in a perfect position to say, no, we will default, this is not our debt. Goodbye, you lent money to the nobility, too bad for you, we're starting from a blank slate. No, they honored the debt to the bankers. So what's the conclusion?

#Nima

Alex, for both conflicts in Ukraine and in the Middle East, with the case of the Strait of Hormuz, we know the difficulties for Europeans. With the case of Ukraine, we've seen what has happened in the last four years. I think somehow, for Europeans, they need to grow up. They need to talk their way out of these sorts of problems. Is that happening in Europe without the United States? They have to find some sort of solution for themselves without anybody being part of it. Do you see that happening for Europe?

#Alex

Well, it appears to be happening in some countries, particularly Eastern European countries. You know, the Eastern Europeans have the advantage that they have experienced life both under Western liberal democracies and under the communist dictatorships. So it's harder to brainwash them and to sell them a bill of goods. And so we see that in places like the Czech Republic, Slovakia,

Romania, Bulgaria, to an extent also Croatia and Poland, people have their own position and they are not buying the narrative. In the West, places like Western Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Great Britain, it seems to me that people are more brainwashed by the system.

And it seems to me that they're also more frightened of their systems because, you know, in Germany, literally when people talk to you about anything controversial, they whisper, you know, like we're in Stasi-era Eastern Germany. They whisper or they prefer not to say anything. They're genuinely afraid. In France, I can't really tell because I have limited contacts with French people, but let's say that the potential reaction to me seems more centered around the military, around the gendarmes, the kind of semi-military police organization, and maybe structures like the firefighters, farmers. But the general public, ordinary people on the street, I can't get a sense of whether they understand what is being done to them and by whom.

They're confused. They're not necessarily brainwashed, but they buy the stories that it's the Russians, it's the Muslims, and so forth. Well, Muslims, yeah, a little bit. But it seems to me that the reaction could come from the people connected to the structures of the system, which then implies that any reaction could actually turn into a civil war rather than a revolution. Same for Great Britain. But, you know, I think time will tell. You know, in Britain, they're trying to arrest everybody who says anything about anything. They're trying to corral people into 15-minute cities, and they're really ramping up that agenda. They have something insane in Britain, which will be obviously implemented everywhere — the so-called absolute zero agenda.

They're already sending letters to farmers telling them that they have to reduce their herds of animals — you know, red meat animals like sheep and cattle and goats — by 2030, and that they have to plan to eliminate them completely by 2050. Which is exactly what, I think, it was in 2007 or 2008, 2009, something like that. There was a document drafted by seven leading British universities, and the title of the document — people can look this up — is called **Absolute Zero**. And exactly, it says, we want to phase out consumption of red meat by 2050 completely. And they also want to phase out air travel completely by 2050. And now we see, you know, they're taking advantage of this energy crisis to start — you know, airlines are going bankrupt, they're reducing routes. And I think the next thing is going to be they're going to be shutting down airports.

#Nima

Yeah, I don't know how they can reduce people's desire for red meat.

#Alex

No, no, they can. But, you know, they're trying the alternatives — lab-grown meats, insects. Yeah. I don't know if it's going to work. I can tell you for sure in some places it's not going to work, because if you ask Italians, for example, to eat lab-grown meat or insects, you're going to have a revolution tomorrow. In the UK, I don't know.

#Nima

Here in Brazil, it's the same way.

#Alex

Yeah, but that's exactly part of the problem — these plans and agendas that are formulated in these think tanks and ivory towers, they're so divorced from reality that it's not going to work. But I think that's part of the reason why they actually really want to get rid of a large chunk of the population. Well, you know, like the Epstein files, where they say, like, hey, how do we get rid of poor people? You know, that's the reason — they're afraid of the poor people. They made them poor first, they made them poor, and now they're like, oh, you know, these poor people might be a little bit unhappy with us. So how do we get rid of them? But they actually really are planning to get rid of them.

One way is wars, one way is pandemics, and the treatments that they have. One way is maybe provoking conflicts between groups, maybe immigrant Muslims against local populations. Who knows? There are all kinds of ways that they can try. But we'll see. You know, I think that social media and the Internet radically changed the equation of how people interact and what happens in society. And I think that people are much cleverer now than they were when World War I started, and World War II, and even, you know, Korea, Vietnam, and so forth. So I don't think we can actually predict how things will evolve and where we go from here.

#Nima

Alex, before I open up, do you think that with the new escalations — we know that Ukrainians are making drones in their homes to attack Russia — and this is the new thing, you remember, they were talking about it in the United Kingdom before. The whole agenda was, if they don't have the manpower, let's, you know, produce more drones to attack Russia, because you don't need that much of it. You know, a little kid can sit there and control the drone attacking Russia. And do you see, with the escalation that is happening, do you see Russia finally getting Odessa? Because Odessa would be the final point, in my opinion. They don't need to go that far to Kiev. You get Odessa — that's the end for Ukraine.

#Alex

I want to say yes, Nima. But I think, you know, if you take control of the central government in Kiev, then you don't really have to take Odessa militarily. Because, you know, in war, you're always wanting to take control of the administration of a society. Either you want to take it for yourself or you want to take it away from your enemies. And so one way of doing that is for the military with

guns to go into government buildings and purge them and staff them with people who are loyal to your side. You can get the same exact effect if you take control of the central government and you purge the local governments and administrations through the central government.

In Odessa, I think that there's a high likelihood of some kind of resistance movement coalescing and gaining strength, because we already see that people in Odessa are becoming more organized in resisting these press gangs that are abducting people from the streets to send them to the front lines. And I wouldn't be surprised if they had some kind of help from the Russians to organize them, to embolden them, to provide them with intelligence and so forth. So there's also a chance that the government of Odessa, the local government and administration, ends up toppled from within.

So, you know, doing it the military way, doing it by military conquest, is probably the hardest and most expensive way to do it, which is why the Russians probably don't want to do it that way. Or at least, you know, Putin and his, you know, Russian public might want to see that. But Vladimir Putin's government probably wants to avoid that for the reason that it can be done in a different way, but it takes more time. It takes a whole lot more patience to do it. But when you spoke about drones, this is part of that 100-year agreement that Keir Starmer signed in Kiev with Zelensky. I think it was in January of 2025, just before Donald Trump took the White House.

And part of the document, of that 100-year partnership between Ukraine and the United Kingdom, was exactly about developing drone technologies together to continue to wage war against Russia. And for that, I think you need the port because you need to supply the parts, the drones, the computers, whatever they need to use. So you need control over the points of entry — at the very least, the airports, but preferably the port, because you might want to be supplying the missiles and the ammunition and all kinds of other material and technology. So you absolutely need the port, which is why Odessa will be extremely important. And the Russians will 100% want to take control of Odessa. I just wouldn't dare predict how exactly they're going to go about it.

#Nima

Thank you so much, Alex, for being with us today. Always a pleasure, Nima.

#Alex

Thank you for the invite, and until the next one. See you soon. Bye-bye. Take care. Bye.