

Alex Krainer: Ceasefire in the US-Iran War Is Over — Trump Is Trapped & Defeated

Alex Krainer is a market analyst, author & former hedge fund manager. Krainer discusses how the U. S. does not have a path to either military victory or a negotiated settlement that preserves its hegemonic position in the region. Alex Krainer's substack: <https://alexkrainer.substack.com/> Alex Krainer podcast: <https://www.youtube.com/@kraineralex> Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennDiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glennDiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glennDiesen> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We are joined again by Alex Cranor, a market analyst, author, and former hedge fund manager. Thank you for coming back on the program.

#Alex Krainer

Thank you for the invite, Glenn. Good to be with you, and warm greetings to your audience.

#Glenn

So, you know, we're barely into this new project, Freedom of the United States, which was going to open the Strait of Hormuz by force. This was going to start on Monday. Well, it failed on the first day. On the second day, Trump said, well, we're going to put it on pause. And when he's asked to explain why, he now says, well, the Pakistanis asked us. And so this was apparently the reason. And now it seems that it might restart again as we see these American warships trying to go through the Strait of Hormuz. We also have Marco Rubio saying that Epic Fury has achieved its objectives. Well, it's come to a conclusion, in his words. But at the same time, he's insisting that the Strait of Hormuz has to be opened, that this is not acceptable. So that's kind of the main reason why they can't declare victory and go home. So how do you make sense of what's happening at this moment?

#Alex Krainer

Well, it's apparent that the administration has a very thoroughly thought-through strategy of making it up as they go along. And I think that they're just in reactive mode now. So as things change on the ground or as new opportunities open up, they act without thinking too many steps ahead. It's

clear that this is the war that never should have happened because it created the problems that they're trying to solve now. And I think that they're in a weak position to solve them. So they're reactive. And part of the problem is that Trump doesn't get to walk away with credit, with any ability to credibly announce victory.

So he still has to humiliate Iran, or he's trying to, because he needs some kind of tangible, visible proof that he has achieved his objectives, that he prevailed, that he won. I don't even understand why they're doing it this way, especially since next Thursday he's due to visit China. And I wonder if this isn't some kind of desperate attempt to go to China with better cards to play rather than going as a failed, defeated, lame-duck president. It's very hard to understand what the actual case is, but for sure we are very far from the situation stabilizing.

#Glenn

It seems to me that Trump, his goal was essentially trying to do a decapitation strike against Iran. Maybe he was helped or talked into this, that it had a high chance of success. But he always had the fallback option, essentially what he did in Yemen: go in, do a bit of bombing. If it doesn't work, you can always just pull out and declare victory. It appears that the main problem here is, of course, he can't leave and declare victory without the Strait of Hormuz, and this is something that Iran can't give up, as this is essentially the source of Iranian security.

He can't go back to crippling sanctions and forever threats of war while the U.S. has bases in its neighboring countries, so... if it controls the Strait of Hormuz, it can essentially pressure those countries to decouple from the U.S., possibly disband the military bases, stop trading in dollars, even pay reparations, punish those countries that still sanction Iran. I mean, there's a lot Iran can do to increase its own security and standing in the region if it doesn't give up on Hormuz. But this also means, with the Strait of Hormuz under Iranian control, that U.S.-Israeli dominance in the region is effectively over. So he can't go home. But the Iranians can't give this up. So what are we looking at here? How can this war possibly come to an end?

#Alex Krainer

Right. It does appear that we're going into another escalation, which is horribly unfortunate. You know, before the war started, in those last few days when even I realized that it was going to happen, I wondered if Trump wasn't going to maybe do another token round of bombings, kind of pre-agreed — okay, we're going to bomb you here, please excuse us and evacuate anything sensitive — to make it essentially a fake war for the domestic audiences, but light enough to where you could come back from it. Because previously, to 28 February, the United States was in a position to really negotiate with the Iranians.

And the Iranians were kind of forthcoming, and they decided to open up Iran to American businesses, which would have been a hugely important thing for Trump to have as maybe not a

spectacular Hollywood-style demonstrable victory, but a real victory in that you've just gained access to the fifth richest nation in the world in terms of natural resources, with a 92 million population, number five or six in the world in the number of engineers that they form and scientists. What a great entry that could have been. And you could have kept that door open if you went with, let's call it a token war. But instead, on day one, they go and commit a war crime of killing 20 volleyball players and 168 schoolgirls, and killing Iran's spiritual leader. And then Trump getting up on stage and saying, well, we killed him.

He was one of the most evil people in history, which is complete nonsense, very dishonorable. And so now you cannot go back. It seems to me a particularly idiotic way to paint yourself into a corner where you no longer have choices. So now you have the choice of victory or defeat. That is, you have the choice of pursuing victory or defeat. So if you ask me how this ends, my only answer can be that it ends in the defeat of the United States, because they cannot win militarily. Militarily, they cannot win. But at the same time, they have given themselves two mutually exclusive choices — no, nothing in between, no gray zone. So I think in the end, you know, they might — apparently they've already been bombing Iran overnight, a few hours ago — and obviously Iran is going to retaliate. So we're now into a new escalation. And in the end, you know, it's going to be the United States who is defeated.

They can talk about the most powerful military in the world all they want. But, you know, their most powerful military in the world is spread thinly across the whole world — in Europe, across 700 or 800 military bases, everything. They've been waging wars nonstop for the last quarter of a century. They've depleted their arsenals. They've exhausted their troops. And they are halfway around the world, where they have to have very robust logistic chains to even maintain these war operations. And so it's just, you know, Iran was due for a regime change since 2006, according to the, you know, neocon plans. And nobody dared to do it up until now. And there's a reason why they didn't — because it was a dumb thing to do.

It was a dumb thing to attempt. And it had to wait for Donald Trump. Why he decided to do this... uh, I cannot imagine, because, you know, I watched about 10 days, two weeks ago, um, Tucker Carlson's monologue, and Tucker Carlson said that he's been talking to Trump about this for the last 10 years, and that he was convinced that they were on the same page, that Trump perfectly well understood that this would have been a dumb thing to do, that going to Iran was wrong, that he was perfectly aware of the risks of going to Iran. He went and did it anyway, and he did it in a way that gives him no face-saving way out. He himself made it so that he has no way out.

And then he climbed up on the stage and owned it fully. So I think that ultimately it's going to be a defeat of the United States. I can't imagine that the American troops are very thrilled about being sent into some sort of a meat grinder that they largely understand to be done for the sake of Israel, which is not — that was not the deal. It's not what the American people voted for. So there's no

public support for this either. So the whole thing is, I think, a very tragic, catastrophic blunder on his part. And then, combined with his inability to concede defeat, to admit failure, and to walk away, means that it's going to be the ultimate eviction of the United States from the region.

#Glenn

It's a good point. I mean, the United States does have the most powerful army in the world, but as you said, when it's still organized as if it would still be a collective hegemon, that is, it has to be in every single part of the world, it's stretched thin. This is the problem, I think, that in a multipolar world, you can't be everywhere. You have to make adjustments. And if you don't prioritize anything, then, well, you do have to prioritize something. Otherwise, you prioritize nothing. And I think this is the problem it's put itself in. But besides this thinned-out army, though, it's also the very specific, I guess, dynamic of this war against Iran. That is, opening up the Strait of Hormuz, for example — Iran doesn't need a matching army to the United States.

The weapons it uses, be it mines or underwater drones or the regular flying drones, I mean, these are cheap to make. They're easy. They can easily boost their industrial potential to build more underground. And because the Strait is so narrow, they don't need more advanced weapons to stop the U.S. ships. I mean, a few drones and missiles and it's blocked, so you can't really completely prevent Iran from having this capability. Furthermore, Iran sees this, I think quite reasonably, as an existential threat. I mean, the goal here is not just regime change, it's the destruction of Iran. So they'll be willing to absorb any pain that America brings at them because the alternative is so much worse. But this begs the question, what could they possibly do in such a scenario?

And I keep thinking that if the U.S. gets desperate enough, it might either escalate into much more powerful weapons — at least Israel could drop a nuke. But even if the alternative is to de-escalate, find some kind of way of declaring victory and going home, it's not even the Strait of Hormuz only. It's also solving the presence in the Gulf states and also the relationship with Israel. I mean, I can't imagine Israel is permitting the U.S. from getting disentangled from this conflict. And I guess that's my other question to you: is it possible even to extend the ceasefire? Because Lebanon was supposed to be included in this. I can't imagine the Israelis accepting that they should pull out of southern Lebanon. So how do you see — I mean, forget about peace — but even extending a ceasefire, do you think there's any potential here?

#Alex Krainer

It seems that the ceasefire has already been broken. If what I'm reading in the news today is correct, it's already off the table because the United States went and bombed several — I think they bombed the Qeshm Islands, and I think another one. I forget exactly, but you know, just scanning the news before we connected today, it seems to me that the ceasefire is already off the table. They

might reestablish it in the future. With regards to Israel, I don't even know how to comment on it because it doesn't seem that we're dealing on a rational basis at all. It apparently isn't capable of functioning without being at war.

So it doesn't matter what makes rational sense to do. They might even accept a ceasefire under duress but completely disregard it and just continue like they didn't agree to a ceasefire. They're still bombing people in Gaza. They're still bombing people in Lebanon. They're still brutalizing Palestinians in the West Bank. They're still talking about going to war against Turkey. They're still talking about Greater Israel. And it doesn't seem to me that any political faction is emerging that would say, wait, stop, we can't continue this way, we're going to destroy ourselves. They're all harder, more, faster, and it seems to me like a psychotic nation pressing on the accelerator of their own destruction.

And by now, even Israeli-owned press is saying that everything's already been destroyed, that the country is over, that there's a ghost, there's an appearance, a Potemkin version of the country still there, but it's been gutted. A very recent piece in Haaretz is talking about it in the sense that all the decisions, all the developments are already completed, the country is no longer. And so, you know, it's only a question of when they get completely exhausted or when their neighbors finally come together and go to a total war against Israel. I mean, not just an exchange of missiles, but an actual ground war. And we've already seen the first step, because Hezbollah has taken certain areas and villages in northern Israel from the Israelis.

And then when it comes to, you know, going back to the relative strength of American military power, you would have thought, Glenn, that they learned something in Afghanistan, or that they learned something about their 10 years of trying to destroy Ansar Allah in Yemen. You know, in Afghanistan, they were at war for 20 years, the most powerful military in the world, which was arguably a lot more powerful 25 years ago than they are today when they went into Afghanistan. And they spent 20 years there, lost 4,000, 5,000 troops, destroyed the country completely, and then they had to withdraw and turn it back over to the same Taliban that they wanted to take down. And then the same thing with the Houthis in Yemen.

You would think that boasting about the biggest military power in the world could take that reality check of saying, yes, this all on paper looks very, very big, but there are problems. There are logistical problems. You can't easily fight wars on the other side of the world when you have no popular support in the nation that you're trying to control. And now you're taking on Iran, which is orders of magnitude more powerful than either Ansar Allah or the Taliban in Afghanistan. It's a huge country, 92 million people, very powerful army.

Whatever you think you did with your bombing, I mean, imagine that you hit 10,000 or 15,000 targets across Western Europe. What is that? It's a drop in the bucket. So whatever you think you destroyed is probably far from breaking the country and defeating it. So it's not going to happen. You know, many policy papers, many intelligence reports have been written on this subject, and

they virtually all came to the same conclusion: this is a dumb thing to do. And then in Trump's administration, there were advisors around him who told him this is a dumb thing to do. So what did he do? He fired them. He removed them.

And now it's a ship with a handful of officers determining what happens. And that means that anything is possible. I think maybe a nuclear strike is not possible from the United States, but it's possible from Iran—sorry, from Israel. So I think that we're in some kind of a chaotic stage of developments, and anything is possible from day to day. But I think that the one thing I would take off the table as a possibility is that Trump is just going to walk away, and that he's going to accept that Iran is now the new regional hegemon, and that the United States has to accept Iran's terms to conclude this conflict.

#Glenn

I think that would be the wisest thing. And also, it would be consistent with the objectives, at least that the U.S. set out last year, which is adjusting to a new international distribution of power. Because, you know, if we take a step back, it does appear that most of the wars which are breaking out all over the world have a common denominator. That is, I guess, a struggle between two different world orders because we're shifting. That is, you have the unipolar world order where you have the global dominance of the U.S., in which one doesn't have to make compromises, doesn't have to take into consideration the security concerns of others, and the U.S. can impose itself.

And the other, where we are now, which is an actual international distribution of power, which has many centers of power, in which the unipolar world policies no longer work. It just seems like this is a common theme because, well, for example, with Iran, this is the U.S. now—if it wants to solve this crisis, it can't try to fix it within that limited scope of still having unipolarity, because there's no pathway anymore. So I think they have to, you know, take a step back and accept that there's a wider shift in the world. And, you know, you can say the same with the Israelis, that this whole clean break strategy they had for the past 30 years was largely built around the idea that, you know, we don't have to make compromises with countries.

We don't have to make deals. We'll just, with the Americans behind us, impose ourselves and dictate to others—essentially, you know, peace through force, or, you know, as NATO would say, peace through strength. But that also applies to the Europeans. I mean, if we want to solve a crisis with the Russians, they only want to look at it within this prism of preserving the unipolar moment, which is, well, the Russians have to bow, the Russians have to capitulate, pay reparations.

Essentially, NATO has to continue rolling forward toward Russian borders, and Russia should just accept that this is a force for good. So again, I think none of these conflicts can be resolved unless we recognize that the distribution of power no longer permits this. I don't care if people think it was

a good time or a bad time. It's just not possible anymore. The West is not dominant. It's not going to happen. It's just the way the world is. But I think this is the problem—they keep looking at it in this narrow way, that this is the only framework acceptable.

The idea, for example, in Europe, that we would have a collective security architecture that also recognizes the security of the largest state in Europe—this is blasphemy. It's treasonous to even suggest that in Europe. You will be smeared, canceled. I mean, there's no appetite. But I guess what I'm getting at is, back in December of 2025, the United States recognized with its new security strategy that the world is becoming multipolar. Europe is declining. You know, also recognizing the U. S. can't be everywhere. It should focus on the Western Hemisphere, possibly also East Asia.

But... but at least that would widen it. It would recognize the world we actually live in, and then suddenly there would be many more opportunities to find a new status quo, which actually delivers peace, and which, you know, one doesn't simply need to overwhelm an adversary that can't be overwhelmed. But... what do you think happened to Trump? Because it looked like in 2025 he was leaning a bit in this direction, at least before June. He was going to get out of Ukraine. He wasn't going to get involved in any more stupid Middle Eastern war. And now we're here. They're not getting out of Ukraine. They're sending more weapons. They're not getting out of Iran. They're going up the escalation ladder. So what do you think happened in America?

#Alex Krainer

I genuinely don't know, Glenn. I'm mystified. The opinions about what happened cover practically the whole range of possibilities. Some people say that Trump was always like this, he was just hiding his game, he just came out of the closet as this globalist arch-Zionist. So I don't know if that's true or not. Some people say that he's been had in some way, you know, that somebody somehow got to him. I think that can't be excluded either because, you know, we know that these globalist forces, which I... Okay, so here's one thing that kind of mystifies me: this drive to take total control of the Middle East and to take down Iran goes back to at least the first Bush administration.

And we remember Wesley Clark's whole revelation that in 2001, they were going to take seven countries down in five years, and that Iran was last on that list. So it means that Iran was due for regime change by 2006. Okay, they never got there, but the pressure on administrations to go to war against Iran was coming from somewhere. And it seemed like it was coming from Israel. But we know that in 2019, the pressure on Trump to go to war against Iran was coming from the British side, from the British embassy and their ambassador, Sir Kim Darroch. And that turned into a whole diplomatic incident, which ended up with the Foreign Office in London having to recall Sir Kim Darroch and nominate a different ambassador.

And this time around, the pressure is coming from Netanyahu and from the Zionist cabal in the United States. So we have, you know, two different sources of power pushing for the same agenda, which to me suggests that there's a higher level of power that has decisive influence over both of

those, meaning over Israel and over the British government, and then ultimately over Trump as well in some way. So part of this equation probably has to do with the fact that Israel, one of these sources of pressure, is the creation of the other source of pressure, the British establishment.

Israel was created by the British Empire as the bridgehead intended to help them control the Middle East, its energy resources, and the trade routes that were essential to control. So it seems to me that the big power we're talking about, again, is the banking cabal, the high-level banking cartel. And that they, since they have a very powerful satellite on Wall Street, when push comes to shove, are able to exert such powerful influence that whether Trump was on board with this or not — and, you know, let's remember, in 2019, he was not on board.

And, you know, if you read Sir Kim Darroch's cables with the Foreign Office from 2019, they were extremely annoyed with him. But they also suggested that they would continue to exert pressure to flood the zone around Trump with Trump whisperers, and that next time some pretext happens — Iran does something that they could create outrage about — they will be able to then tip Trump over. And so maybe this is what happened, but I wouldn't exclude the possibility that this included threatening Trump or his family. And if anybody thinks that that's a bridge too far, let's remember that somebody assassinated John F. Kennedy and somebody assassinated Robert F. Kennedy.

And we know that both John F. Kennedy and Robert F. Kennedy were not exactly Zionists, that they had a very adversarial relationship with Israel. And also, John F. Kennedy wanted to destroy the CIA and so forth. So I think that obviously nobody was held accountable for that other than the lone gunman. So what happened instead is that these structures of power got away scot-free for assassinating the president and his brother, who was the next presidential candidate. And they didn't lose power. They consolidated power. They became more powerful. So their ability to assassinate presidents didn't go away. But, you know, maybe they don't have to assassinate presidents.

Maybe they can tell him, look, if you're not on board with us on this, we're going to start killing your family members. See how you like that. I don't know. I think that as a possibility cannot be eliminated. And then, you know, if Trump is pushed into that — as the commander in chief and the president of the United States, he has to own it. He can't say, oh, well, you know, I'm the president of the United States, but somebody else is pulling the levers and I'm just along for the ride. I don't think we know the answer to any of these questions, but whatever it is, it's not Trump — meaning he's their errand boy, that's for sure, and he owns this mess.

But ultimately, I think whoever has been pushing this during the Clinton administration, the George W. Bush administration, the Obama administration, the Biden administration, the first Trump administration, and now again, is not the person the American people elected by mistake. It's a structure of power that's above the U.S. president and the political class, above the British prime minister and British political class, and above Benjamin Netanyahu as well. And I think that we can narrow it down — that it goes back to the City of London, to the people who control the City of London, and who have created the state of Israel.

And we know that, you know, back about 100 years ago, when we had the Balfour Declaration, that even before the Balfour Declaration, the establishment of the state of Israel was being discussed, and that the alumni of Milner's — Alfred Milner's — Round Table were giving statements to the media and saying, well, if the British Empire is going to continue as a dominant maritime empire around the world, we are going to have to cede that region, by which they were meaning the Eastern Mediterranean, Palestine, with a particularly patriotic stock.

And so that's what they did. And I don't think that they ever relinquished control of Israel. And I think that these are the same forces that, for the same reason as they haven't been able to give up on the Middle East for over 120 years, will not be able to give up now. So, you know, ceasefire, no ceasefire, this is going to have to go to the ultimate and total defeat of one side or the other. And I think that this time around, it's going to be the imperial forces who are going to be defeated.

#Glenn

I was going to say, one doesn't even need to threaten to kill Trump. The Epstein files essentially take care of much of this. But that's interesting — you know, if you look at Trump's statements over the past 40 years, there's a contradiction in there, though. He kept making the point that all of these forever wars were a big mistake. We should stay out of them. We should stop financing other people's wars. On the other hand, he's also arguing that America was always weak — we shouldn't allow Iran to do this, why are we allowing them to do that? So how do you kind of square the circle? And it seems that he often finds the solution as being, well, those leaders were simply weak. You can achieve it by simply showing strength.

And that's kind of his main... that is, he does the maximum pressure, and this is often what got him what he needed. My concern was always what happens when the maximum pressure meets another great power, or a large power at least, that fears for its existence. Because you can do maximum pressure against Russia, but Trump noticed it doesn't mean anything, because if Russia sees itself faced with an existential threat, they're going to go all the way. What happens when they do maximum pressure against the Iranians? Well, they face an existential threat as well. They're going to go all the way. So he kind of hit a wall. And then, so what do you do? Do you change the recipe for how you achieve success, or do you go to war?

And I guess, you know, as you said, if he has enough Trump whisperers around him saying how great he is and how everyone will back away when his mighty army shows up, then perhaps he has the narcissistic tendencies to buy into such an argument. I want to ask you a last question, which is how this Iran war is now affecting Europe's war, or NATO's war, or the NATO-Russia war in Ukraine. The Iranian war has obviously taken a lot of resources away from Ukraine. The Americans are still sending weapons, but there's much talk about delays or simply weapons being diverted. So if the U.

S. has less capability and even intention to commit to the war against Russia in Ukraine, it seems that the Europeans are then, unless they're going to have peace with Russia, which isn't on the table, they're going to have to escalate.

And we do see some cases of this. And this is happening, of course, at a very sensitive time when the US protection of Europe is going away. And also, Russia seems now determined to restore its deterrence by hitting back. So it's a very strange and dangerous time to escalate. And this is when we see now the Europeans, at least some European countries—the UK plus nine northern countries—forming this new naval bloc to confront Russia. I was wondering, how do you read this situation? Because if we are going to end up in a massive war with Russia, with the Russians possibly launching a limited nuclear strike to restore their deterrence, I think this is going to be the most likely pathway now.

#Alex Krainer

Yeah, that's a very interesting situation, Glenn. So this just happened days ago, on the 23rd of April, that the British representatives and the naval chiefs of 10 European nations signed the protocols for the formation of the Joint Expeditionary Force, which is really interesting because 10 northern European nations are voluntarily putting their navies under British command, obviously with the intent to create a new military alliance aimed against Russia. So they intend to basically cut Russia off from its northern maritime routes and to harass Russia. They're already doing it—aggressive boarding of Russian ships and inspections of ships suspected of circumventing sanctions or espionage or whatever.

And so that is forcing the Russians to respond. So they're sending—apparently, they're putting FSB-linked security personnel on high-value tankers, or they're sending submarines or frigates to accompany them. And then, in turn, the British are saying, oh, the Russian incursions into our waters have been increasing. Well, yeah, because you're harassing them. So the Russians are obliged to send military escorts with their cargo ships. And so then you say, oh, look, they're making incursions into our waters. And so it's like an escalation escalator that is obviously coming and instigating from London again. You know, this is a thing too.

So it seems to me that all roads always end up leading to London, because this new Joint Expeditionary Force, obviously crafted to antagonize Russia, is again a brainchild of the British governing establishment, with headquarters in London, with operational control in London, with a British general who is the top commander of this structure. They're not there yet, because they have given themselves about four years to completely—how do you say—to bring these forces in sync, meaning they still have different equipment, different electronic standards, and different types of weaponry. So they want to harmonize all this so that they can operate as one military unit. And that's going to be a process and an investment.

But again, the mysterious aspect to this that needs to be explained is why would ten European nations agree to put themselves at risk of war with a nuclear power and submit their navies to the control of a London-based command and control center? Why did they agree to be led by a power that obviously has aggressive designs towards Russia? Why wouldn't any of these nations say, well, maybe it better serves our interests to find a way of cooperating with Russia, to have peaceful coexistence, so that everybody could be safe and everybody could trade with one another and we can focus on developing our economies? And instead of that, they all sign up to an agenda that has very high risks of bringing them to a devastating war against a nuclear power. That is really difficult to explain.

Furthermore, all 10 of these nations are NATO members. They're already in a military alliance. Why do they need a new military alliance? Well, they say it. And they say that, well, you know, we need to be more agile. We need to have, you know, basically, they don't want to deal with the whole NATO baggage and the bureaucracy that might inhibit their freedom to act. So they created a new alliance. But if that alliance gets into trouble against Russia, then they're going to say, like, oh, we're NATO member nations, Article 5, everybody has to now unite and go to war against Russia. So it's basically a tripwire. But it's being done deliberately. And it's taking the whole world to the precipice of World War III. And, you know, if you follow the breadcrumbs, it always ends up in London. So I think that, you know, we have to take that situation seriously.

And they're also saying, you know, we need this because we need to bring the focus back from the Middle East to Russia. Because, you know, the Middle East may be Trump's obsession, but London is still primarily obsessed with Ukraine and Russia. And they're losing there. So they need a second front. And, you know, it was meant to be the Balkans — the war drive in the Balkans since Trump came into the White House. So now they're instigating it in the Baltics. But it's this cabal that is pushing us into World War III. And for the reasons that we discussed, their designs are essentially hegemonic. They will not give up. They will never give up. They've been trying to take control of Russia for more than 200 years, and they never stopped. And so they will not stop again until one side or the other is completely defeated and destroyed.

#Glenn

I think possibly the reason why they're willing to essentially risk their own countries instead of pursuing basic national interests by adjusting to this new balance of powers is because this is not simply a war about whether or not Kramatorsk should be a part of Russia or Ukraine. This is a war about: do we have a multipolar system or a unipolar one with collective hegemony? And I think if they can push back the Russians, then they'll have this powerful Ukrainian shield in front of them. The Americans will return, standing behind them. And this is the formula for collective hegemony. And if they begin to pursue common sense and trade and accept a new status quo, that means, yeah, a new distribution of power.

That means a multipolar system. It's not that different, actually, from Iran. It's not that different from the Americans ending the economic war against China, where they could both prosper if they cooperated. But that means they have to live next to China as an equal. And I don't think there's—again, I think this major struggle, like what kind of world order—we're not really past this yet. My prediction is it's going to end, you know, this new world will be born in blood and fire, and not diplomacy. Unfortunately so. I hope I'm wrong, though. Blood and fire and viruses, Glenn. That's coming. Interesting times. Extremely, yes. Thanks a lot for coming on, Alex. I appreciate it. Thank you for the invite, Glenn. Take care. Bye-bye.