

Alex Krainer: Russia Attacks Romania? Ukrainian False Flag or Russian Warning Shot?

Alex Krainer is a market analyst, author & former hedge fund manager. Krainer discusses the possibility of the drone hitting Ukraine being either a Ukrainian false flag attack, a Russian warning shot, or an accident. Overall, the EU is either deliberately or accidentally pushing for a direct war with Russia. Alex Krainer's substack: <https://alexkrainer.substack.com/> Alex Krainer podcast: <https://www.youtube.com/@kraineralex> Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennndiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glennndiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glennndiesen> 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 the great Alex Krainer, 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. Always good to join you, and greetings to everyone listening and watching.

#Glenn

So over the past four years, we've seen NATO incrementally escalating and, again, incrementally undermining the credibility of Russian deterrence. And we see that Russian restraint and caution tend to be interpreted as weakness. I mean, this is what all the newspaper headlines are saying — that, you know, Russia doesn't have any red lines, it doesn't dare to retaliate, essentially. It appears that Russia's patience might be over, and the pressure to retaliate seems to be becoming very overwhelming. Again, it's very hard to cut through propaganda and the information war, but we see now that the Russians are hitting Kiev pretty hard.

The Russians warned the Europeans and Americans to, well, to pull their diplomats out of Kiev. We see some Ukrainian drones have been coming down over Latvia. And most recently, the news is reporting that a Russian drone has smashed into an apartment building in Romania. Again, one can't be sure exactly what happened. I mean, was this a Russian warning shot, or was this a false flag

from the Ukrainian side? I wouldn't know. It could be both. But I was wondering, how are you assessing this event? Are we seeing a rapid escalation?

#Alex Krainer

Well, you know, we had, I think yesterday or the day before, Vladimir Zelensky send a letter to Trump, which sounded pretty desperate, begging him to send the Patriot PAC-3 air defense missiles because of these anticipated attacks on Kiev, which suggests that the Ukrainians are quite desperate, that they have no defenses, and that they understand that the Russian attack is going to wreak a great deal of damage to the Ukrainian government and to the administration of their society. And I would be very surprised if, given the circumstances, the Russians thought that it would be a great idea to slam a drone into an apartment building in Romania.

What purpose would that serve? That wouldn't serve any good purpose for the Russians. It would serve a lot of good purposes for the Ukrainians because they are, you know, I see Zelensky a little bit panicked, like he is seeing the writing on the wall and that it's very close to game over for him. And if right now Russia struck a NATO member country, then that could be the grounds to invoke Article 5, to unite NATO and to start a great big war and bail Ukraine out, or bail Zelensky's regime out. So if I were doing the investigation of this incident, my first suspect would be the Zelensky regime, not the Russians.

The Russians have been extremely careful not to give any NATO member country any pretext, any reason to invoke Article 5. Because first, the Russians don't want that war. They don't want a war against NATO united. Second of all, if they strike at any NATO member country, and I think that the first one on the list would have to be Great Britain, and then Germany. And then if they really decided to strike at Britain or Germany, they would probably be striking at military bases. They would be striking at armaments manufacturing companies. They might be striking at things like MI6 headquarters, not at an apartment building and not with a drone. It would probably be with something heavy like Kinzhal.

So I would presume that this will prove to be a false flag attack. It wouldn't be the first one by the Ukrainians. You know, first they had supposedly two Russian missiles fired at a farm in Poland. I forget when that was. It may have been 2022 or 2023, which turned out to be a false flag attack because the missiles were launched from Ukraine. Then we had also these Russian drones launched at, I think, Poland again, which turned out to be the recuperated Russian decoy drones, the styrofoam drones that are built to resemble Shahed drones to attract the anti-air defense missile fire from Ukraine.

And they were scotch-taped and then launched at Ukraine, another attempt to, you know, maybe trigger Article 5. And so a drone launched at an apartment building in Romania, I would expect, is another attempt to achieve the same goal. It would be very handy for Ukrainians to get the whole of NATO united on their side in this war, you know, sending the cavalry. But it would serve no purpose

for the Russians. And then also, you know, attacking any country, the effect will be that the political spectrum condenses and people, if they feel that they're attacked, they close ranks behind their leaders and they are much more willing to go to war.

And this is what Russians would certainly want to avoid, because they see that the European political class is disintegrating, that the parties that are in power now are losing support, and they continue to be losing it. So why would you give them this catalyzing event that would then reverse all this and make people more willing to go to war against Russia? So, you know, the whole event makes zero sense to me that it would be from Russia. And then, you know, if it was CNN that reported that it was a Russian drone, then you're better off believing the opposite, because it's very unlikely to be true.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, I was also thinking if the Russians would kind of send some warning shot, send a warning, and through some way it could have plausible deniability, one would nonetheless perhaps expect that the target would be like Latvia or Estonia. Romania does stand out a bit, so... I think some healthy skepticism is probably a good idea on this one. But also, again, a few hours ago, we saw Dmitry Medvedev, the former president of Russia. He also made a comment where he again speaks to the citizens of the EU. And he wrote here: "Citizens of EU countries, you should realize your authorities have unilaterally entered into war with Russia. So be vigilant and don't be surprised by anything. The peaceful sleep is over, but you know who to ask why." So again, he tends to play the bad cop to Putin's good cop.

But the comment, though, on the EU leaders having started a war with Russia... I'm assuming this is to a large extent about how the European leaders are speaking very openly about the goal of striking deep into Russia. They're talking about mass-producing these weapons. And, of course, the use of the Baltic territories to attack Russia, allegedly with Ukrainian drones. That this has all essentially now led to at least rhetoric that the EU has gone to war or attacked Russia directly. Do you, I guess, well, from the Kremlin's perspective, what do you think the Kremlin's perspective is? I mean, what actions by the European governments do you think crossed the line from indirect involvement to, to use Medvedev's language, they have entered into war with Russia — so suggesting a very direct war.

#Alex Krainer

Well, if we rewind the clock about four years, or three years even, we'll remember that there were careful deliberations about providing weapons to Ukraine. And there came a time when they were talking about providing them with F-16s. And then the discussion was, well, no, we cannot provide them with F-16s because F-16s can carry a nuclear warhead. And so if they carry a nuclear warhead and we provide them F-16s, then that's potentially a nuclear escalation. And the Russians would be in their right to respond against us. So we shouldn't be doing this. Right now, it seems that all those

holds have been removed. And now they're openly providing weapons to Ukrainians to strike into Russia.

I mean, the British are bragging about it practically. They're bragging about providing Storm Shadow missiles to Ukrainians to strike into Russia. It's well understood that you can't just provide those missiles. You also have to provide personnel that's going to manage these strikes. And so, I think Medvedev's statement can be interpreted in more than one way. So just to make it more intuitive: if you were shooting at your neighbor's house to kill your neighbor and destroy their house, and if I was bringing you bullets, I would be rightly perceived as a co-conspirator, as an accomplice. And then that makes me a legitimate target in the neighbor's defense and retaliation.

And nobody could say that I'm an innocent bystander here. So this is the position that the European Union has assumed, and NATO, vis-à-vis the conflict in Russia. Now, when it comes to warning shots, a warning shot would have to be a very smart kind of shot. For example, as the Iranians did a few days ago by striking a generator at a UAE nuclear power station. Because the warning was, look what we can do. We didn't want to damage your nuclear power station. We didn't want to cause an environmental disaster and destroy your power station. But we want to show you that we can strike you, that we can strike you very accurately, and that we can strike you at will.

So a smart warning shot would be this kind of shot that hits something delicate, something important, but doesn't cause massive damage and doesn't cause any casualties. Slamming a drone into an apartment building strikes me as a particularly dumb kind of shot, and then super dumb if it's intended as a warning shot. And if we look at the history of Russian warfare, we see that they've been extremely judicious and extremely cautious about choosing their targets, about what they strike and when. They've been exercising a great deal of restraint to not make the situation worse than it was. When they struck Kiev a few days ago, I think the reports varied, but there were between zero and two civilian casualties.

So that's not just, let's randomly strike Kiev and then whatever gets blown up gets blown up. This was obviously very carefully targeted. So I would expect that this was a Ukrainian attempt at creating a false flag scenario, probably out of some sort of panic, because if you wanted a well-planned false flag scenario, it would have to be something that doesn't elicit doubts. Instead, it elicits a strong emotional reaction. So there would have to be a strong emotional reaction in Romania and in the rest of Europe. So it would have to be, you know, like 9/11 — 3,000 Americans get killed as a result. That's a proper false flag. This is not a proper false flag. This is maybe even a mistake.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, it should be noted that President Putin was asked about the drone, and his first comment was, "Well, who said that this was a Russian drone?" So, essentially dismissing it. So, you know, again, one can't take anything at face value. But nonetheless, it is still worth noting that the

Russians are saying it wasn't them. And as you said, there's been some precedent, so one shouldn't jump to conclusions. Another issue, though, in terms of a possible escalation, has been the comments coming out of Kiev that Belarus might be planning to join the war, and for this reason, the Ukrainians have been making comments that they might strike first. Last I saw, there were some comments that they already picked hundreds of targets in Belarus, which are already decided on if someone would go forth with this.

How are you assessing this, though? I mean, if it happens, this would be a very dangerous area of escalation, because if the Ukrainians were to attack Belarus, or if what Zelensky said might be true — that the Belarusians would get involved — I find that doubtful at this point, but it could be true. It sounds like a very crazy escalation, because the Europeans would probably get even more directly involved in an attack on Belarus, even though it has a nuclear deterrent there by Russia. So, I don't know. How do you assess these comments from Ukraine?

#Alex Krainer

I did see some reports that said there are troops grouping in Belarus to the north of Ukraine for an eventual assault on Kiev. But these are not Belarusian troops. These are Russian troops in Belarus. And I think that the Ukrainians are very concerned that the Russians are preparing to deliver a final assault to finish this war, and that the danger is that there is going to be an assault from the north, like at the very beginning of the special military operation, and that they will go straight for Kiev.

So I think they're not worried for nothing, but my understanding is that this is not Belarus's own army, that this is the Russian troops that are based inside Belarus. Ukrainians might be panicking a little bit, and I don't know what purpose, even from their own point of view, it would serve to attack targets in Belarus, because then that brings Belarus into the war. Now you're fighting two enemies on two fronts instead of just staging a defense of Kiev. But I think that maybe this is just a result of them panicking a little bit. I really don't see what purpose it would serve other than just lashing out, just lashing out and blowing things up.

#Glenn

How about the Baltic region, though? To what extent do you think this could become a flashpoint? Because there are two things that worry me. I think the first would be all these reports now, which are verified, that Ukrainian drones are attacking through the Baltic states. But the second is that the Baltic Sea is quite important for Russian energy exports, and the EU has made several comments that reducing or targeting Russian energy exports would be a key strategy, or something that could, as they say, weaken or reduce the money that Russia has to spend for war. Do you see any flashpoint there? Do you think the Russians sent some signals, the EU is pulling a bit back, or where do you see this going?

#Alex Krainer

I think that there's no doubt about the fact that the Baltic region is being rigged as the next front in the war against Russia. Because we have to keep in mind, this is not just a war between Russia and Ukraine over their local disputes. This war has been orchestrated by Western powers in order to weaken, destabilize, and regime-change Russia. And there was—I think there was full expectation that Russia would be defeated, that it would collapse not just from military conflict. The idea is like drawing the Soviet Union into a war in Afghanistan.

But also because then they—so the war started in February 2022. But then in March 2022, the West had all these advance-prepared sanctions that were the biggest package of sanctions ever imposed upon any nation in history. And they fully expected that the Russian economy would collapse, and that this would lead to maybe a social uprising in Russia, that the people would protest the war and the economic conditions, and that could take down Vladimir Putin's government. But that didn't happen. And so they're losing the war, and it's very clear that they have no way of reversing that defeat. So we know that they've already been trying to rig the Baltic region as the second front, but that kind of fell apart since Donald Trump came into the White House.

And so I think that the next second front would be the North Sea, the Baltic Sea, the Baltic states, but not only the Baltic states, because the United Kingdom has created this new alliance called the Joint Expeditionary Force, uniting the navies of ten North European states, including countries like the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, the Baltic states, and the UK itself. And the whole alliance functions together from a London-based headquarters under British command. And then if you read their declarations and the documents that were signed, it's clearly done with a view of confronting Russia. Now, the timeframe they set is 2029–2030 because the big job is to synchronize their systems, because every navy in this group has different systems, different ammunition, different weaponry.

And so the big work is to put it all to the same standards so that they can all use the same systems, that they can coordinate and cooperate and use the same ammunition and the same spare parts and so forth, so that they are a more viable fighting force. But that cannot be done overnight. So I think that the idea is to provoke Russia into a conflict by maybe blockading its trade towards the Atlantic Ocean, restricting the flow of Russian ships and so forth. But I think that cannot be done right now. So I think that if they provoked Russia into a conflict in the Baltic states, it would be premature for them, and then maybe that would even destroy their alliance.

I mean, you know, like if Russia marched into the Baltic states and took down Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, I think that the Finnish people would have second thoughts about going to war against Russia. I see that they're preparing this, but I don't think that they will be ready in the near term. And if you do start a war before you're ready to fight it, then all the pieces you're putting in place might end up wasted. So I think that it's not in the near term, this conflict. But who knows? I could

be wrong. I think that this overarching panic that is spreading among NATO members could—I'm sure that there are voices in there who are saying, like, no, no, let's just get it started. Let's just get it started. We'll make things up as we go along.

#Glenn

Well, you mentioned the sanctions which were supposed to bring down Russia. And I remember I always made the point from the first day that this would be deeply problematic because, well, the Russians had the ability to diversify their exports. The Europeans did not have the ability to diversify their imports. So for this reason, yeah, the Russians would do well and the Europeans would not. And actually, on that, I find the whole scenario so absurd because I keep hearing European politicians talk about, well, now we have energy security because we cut ourselves off from Russia completely.

I mean, energy security is usually defined as an affordable and reliable supply of energy. And usually then you want many suppliers, so it becomes a buyer's market. You drive the price down, and if anyone tries to put pressure, political conditionality, any of that sort, you can then just pivot to another supplier. But the European leaders, they seem to believe that cutting yourself off from your main supplier, this is energy security. And as a result, yeah, we would have the Europeans de-industrialize, become weaker, would fuel socioeconomic problems at home. You would have a political legitimacy crisis as the political leadership would lose all their support.

Then the emergence of untested populist alternatives, again, all this fueling instability. Meanwhile, the Russian gas would then be sent to the East. Then they would fuel the Chinese economy and other economies in the East vis-à-vis the Europeans. European companies would have to follow the cheap Russian gas by relocating to China if they want to stay competitive. I mean, the foolishness of this seems to be quite profound, though. But again, you're the market analyst guy, so... to what extent does Europe severing its economic ties with Russia, to what extent has it fueled or reduced industrial competitiveness?

#Alex Krainer

Oh, to a massive extent, to an absolutely massive extent. I mean, if you look at the trend of industrial output of Germany, it has just turned around. The curve went like this, and then after 2022, it started going like this. And you have month after month, quarter after quarter of declining European, I mean, German industrial output. And companies are announcing layoffs practically every month. And I think that this month, I think the layoff announcements were close to half a million jobs. That's absolutely catastrophic for Germany. And it doesn't seem that there's any intent, desire, or willingness to try to reverse this, to say, we made a mistake, we need to reverse this, we need to go and speak with the Russians, and we need to restart Nord Stream 2 pipelines, whatever is left of them, one out of four tubes.

The Russians have said one of the four tubes is still intact—say the word and the gas will flow. But to them now, that would be a defeat. That would be an admission of failure. So they would rather sacrifice hundreds of thousands more jobs in Germany and elsewhere in Europe than admit they made a mistake. And the whole rest of the continent is hostage to these people. And it's not just the quantities of energy that are available; it's also, obviously, the price, which makes European manufacturing completely uncompetitive. The trend is intact. The trend is entrenched. There's no reversal in sight. And I think that it will continue.

But I also suspect that this might partly be by design—or not partly, this might be by design completely—because you can't really get a population to fight a war if they're affluent, if people see a bright future, if they have good career prospects. You need to immiserate people. You need to create very high levels of youth unemployment. And then you offer young men a military career, and you say, hey, join the army and you'll be fine. You'll get a job, a pension, health insurance, all these perks. But you're going to have to go kill the Russians for us. And, you know, when people are desperate, then a military career might make sense.

#Glenn

No, I often think that the massive corruption in Ukraine is not necessarily something the European leaders would get rid of, because if you didn't have this massive corruption, all this money that's being pumped in does help to steer the government in a direction it would otherwise not have taken. It's hard to believe that the Ukrainian authorities would have continued this war to this extent without engaging in serious diplomacy with the Russians earlier. I mean, four and a half years into this and still nothing—well, almost four and a half years. But if the Europeans were to enter this war against Russia and it doesn't escalate into a nuclear exchange, how prepared do you see the Europeans being for a long confrontation without U.S. support?

#Alex Krainer

They're not prepared at all. They have nothing. They have pitifully small armies that cannot fight a ground war. Without the Americans, they don't have the critical logistical facilities that would be required for such a war. You know, questionable access to satellite intelligence information. And then, you know, when it comes to air defenses, they have largely disarmed themselves. They have something, but not nearly enough to counter Russia, because it's not anymore a question of intercepting some big, expensive ballistic missiles.

It's now hundreds, if not thousands, of cheap drones that are extremely effective and extremely destructive. And then many more thousands of even cheaper decoys, you know, drones that look like the real thing, that fly like the real thing and sound like the real thing, but they're just styrofoam mock-ups. And you have to use like a \$1 to \$4 million missile to shoot at that. The Russians can

send wave after wave after wave of this until there's zero air defenses left. So Europe is not prepared at all. But it's not the European people who desire this war. It's people sitting in Wall Street banks and City of London banks and elsewhere in Sweden, in France, Germany, who want this war.

And it is urgent enough for them that they will happily sacrifice Europe and many more million men for this war rather than just give up and decide to explore a different business model. Remember, they don't need to defeat Russia. That's not the idea. It's enough to bleed Russia, to weaken her, to destabilize the current government, and to try to bring in a Juan Guaidó, you know, Volodymyr Zelensky, Boris Yeltsin, like their own puppet president, who will then open the gates of Troy wide to Western banks and Western corporations, so that they can take advantage of Russian wealth, of Russian resources, and of the Russian labor force. That's always the driving motivation behind all these wars. And so Russia is the richest country in the world in terms of natural resources, and 144, 150 million.

#Alex Krainer

Labor power that is the most highly educated population in the world, according to the OECD. And so, you know, that's the big glittering prize for them. They will never give up on it. So they will continue trying to invent wars, because for as long as these wars are continuing, there's a chance that somehow you'll be able to overthrow Vladimir Putin, install your own puppet in there, and then loot Russia to the bone.

#Glenn

Well, in this war against Russia, though, some of the usual suspects would have been quite predictable. That is, as you often point out, the British — they always seem to be on the front lines in any campaign against Russia. And of course, the Baltic states and Poland, one can argue, you know, from historical grievances, they also tend to be beating the war drums extra hard. The Baltic states appear a great deal more irrational than Poland, I would have to add. But the one that has surprised me to a large extent has been Germany. They really seem to have gone all the way on this. And it does surprise me that Germany would go down this path yet again. How do you make sense of this, though — the German component?

Because this is, I mean, I still think about all those German generals who appeared on TV gloating when they saw German tanks entering Kursk, you know, invading Mother Russia herself. And they were making references to World War II, that, you know, this was going to be humiliating because this is where, you know, they defeated the Germans last time, and now the German tanks are back. I mean, this is kind of remarkable stuff. How do you explain the German position, this goal of becoming the largest military in Europe? They want to lead the campaign against Russia. I mean, I feel like I've seen this movie before, you know, more than once. And it's kind of strange to see the Germans wanting to take on this role again.

#Alex Krainer

I think that we're primarily talking about the German, quote-unquote, elites, not the ordinary German people. We have to keep in mind that Germany has been an occupied country since World War II, and it's been occupied by the United States, Britain, NATO in general. And one of the things that happens to occupied countries is that their police, their secret police, their intelligence apparatus, is all very, very tightly controlled. And so Germany is perhaps, of all European countries, under the most rigid censorship regime. And I know that their secret police and their intelligence agencies deal extremely harshly with dissidents. And as a result, German people are generally afraid to speak. You know, I live in Monaco. It's in the south of France. You can always get a good conversation out of a French person. You can have a good conversation with an Italian person, in Croatia, and so forth.

But I was, you know, when I'm in Germany, I'm struck by how very afraid people are to talk. And then when they do talk, it doesn't matter where you are, they immediately go into whispering. You know, if they have anything half controversial to say, they practically whisper and look around. And so I think that among German people, there's generally a fear of the authorities, and so they are very, very silent, while the governing circles, the pro-war side of German society, they're very loud, they're very boisterous. So they give the impression that Germany wants to go back to the 1930s. But I don't think that's really true, except if the people are quiet, if the people don't push back, then they risk becoming Ukraine, you know, and they risk really having to sacrifice their youth to this war machine, as has already happened.

#Glenn

Yeah, I think that's probably fair. I mean, that is Germany. Well, in Germany, Merz is now probably the most unpopular leader in the world. So to assign these ideas to all Germans is probably not reasonable. So yeah, that's probably fair enough. Well, I just want to ask a last question. Do you see any possible off-ramp at this point or any diplomatic breakthrough? Because the whole EU strategy of restarting diplomacy, that appears to be going nowhere. That is, first they would have to agree to talk to Russia. Then they would have to agree on who should represent the EU. And then, of course, they would have to agree on what the conditions will be. And so far, you know, what we've heard from people like Kaja Kallas is, you know, who in the past have argued for Russia to be broken into smaller countries.

You know, she says there's no point in talking to Russia because she doesn't talk to dictators anymore. And, yeah, so she has outlined that she would like to see Russia not just pulling back from all territories, but also accepting that Ukraine should be allowed to join NATO if they want. And also, yeah, of course, Russia should pay reparations and they should reduce the size of their army. I mean, it sounds as if the terms are unilateral capitulation on the side of Russia. That's what she's

looking for, which is a strange thing to demand when you're losing a war — that is, the EU losing the war. So given that the ability to do diplomacy is so damaged, do you see an off-ramp? Because I feel we're going up an escalation ladder here, which could be very dangerous.

#Alex Krainer

Unfortunately, Glenn, I do not see an off-ramp because this wasn't some kind of great misunderstanding. The war in Ukraine was the result of an agenda that has been afoot for many, many decades. And if you go back to World War II, before World War II ended, the British had already produced this thing called Operation Unthinkable, where, when they realized that Germany had lost—Germany, which they had incubated and built up, militarized and Nazified to become the bludgeon to wield against the Soviet Union—when they realized that the war was lost, they then proposed to FDR to...

#Alex Krainer

I'm thinking whether it was FDR or if it was Truman already, but basically this happened before World War II ended, in April of 1945. Operation Unthinkable was proposed, and the idea was to use the rest of the German troops, American and British troops, and Polish troops to mount a surprise attack against the Soviet Union. And then, you know, if you read the document, they knew that this was a bit of a long shot, that it wasn't likely. But then, if they couldn't subjugate and destroy the Soviet Union by a very rapid surprise attack by an array of all these forces, then the alternative would be a very, very long-term process of preparing for the next assault on Russia. They don't specify the time, but the gist is kind of in terms of decades. So, you know, immediately, a year later, 1946, after the Allies beat Nazi Germany, right?

Soviet Union, United States, France, Britain. And they should have been—they were allies, right? Right. In 1946, Winston Churchill declares the Soviet Union as the enemy of the West. 1948 starts the formation of NATO, and then it keeps expanding. And then after the end of the Cold War, it expands, but all towards the east, all in the direction of Russia. And they move NATO more than 1,000 kilometers towards Russia. Not only do they move the borders of NATO towards Russia, they also concentrate the troops and the arsenals of NATO in the east, in the vicinity of Russia. And then almost immediately after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, NATO goes into Ukraine and into Georgia. And Ukraine already signs a treaty on... It's not a treaty. It's a declaration of a distinctive partnership between NATO and Ukraine.

It was signed in Madrid in 1997. And from then on starts the gradual process of NATO slowly militarizing, weaponizing Ukraine in the same way they'd done with Germany in the 1930s. So I think we shouldn't be looking for answers among our elected leaders, among our diplomats. We shouldn't expect them to show any reason. We need to trace whatever incentives are guiding this ceaseless, relentless movement of hostility towards Russia to where it actually originates. And you already know what I'm going to say. It originates with the international banking cartel, because what they

see in Russia is collateral—collateral on the basis of which they can generate a massive credit impulse and create all these assets that directly enrich them, that directly suck wealth from wherever it's produced to their own banking systems.

And then, you know, they buy media, they pay the think tanks, they buy the politicians, they co-opt the military generals, and so forth. So you have this great big machinery that is buzzing nonstop, creating this psychosis of war—that we have to go to war, we have to go defeat Russia, we have to dismember Russia, balkanize it into five different parts or 27 different parts, depending on who you ask. And so it's... it's not down to who we elect or whether our foreign diplomats are complete morons or intelligent people. It's down to these incentives that are driving the whole system forward. In the case of the Trump administration in the United States, you saw that it kind of started off in a promising way. And you had Tulsi Gabbard there, and you had Joe Kent there.

And you had a whole number of people who were genuinely MAGA and wanted to change the course of U.S. policy. But when push came to shove, these banking money interests prevailed. And they shook out all these, let's call them, patriotic MAGA members of the cabinet. And so what happens? Joe Kent leaves because he disagrees with war on Iran. Who takes his place? It's Sebastian Gorka. Sebastian Gorka, who's like a certifiable British agent and an arch-Zionist. So there's been a purge of the, let's call it, nationalistic, patriotic element in the government, replaced with Anglo-Zionist globalists. And so we have to assume that that can happen to any democracy in Europe particularly. So even if they get defeated in Ukraine, they will not stop preparing the next war. And it's always going to be to try to destroy Russia.

And we also have to keep in mind that if they remove Russia from the map, then their next target is China. And then they will very likely use Russia—its weaponry, its troops, its very powerful military—to destroy China for them, in the same way as they used Ukraine's military as they built it up to try to destroy Russia. This juggernaut will never stop until it's completely destroyed. Now, if parties like the AfD in Germany, Rassemblement National in France, and other patriotic movements in different nations come to power, that's going to complicate things very badly for them. But they will not stop trying. And then again, their main asset in Europe is Germany. So they will fight for political control of Germany the hardest. Germany alone will not be able to go to war against Russia.

Then you'll have to be creating alliances again, which will be complicated because Germany is not in good relations with Poland, nor with France, nor with its northern neighbors. So it's all politically going to be extremely complicated. So the pressure is to keep Ukraine fighting to keep NATO and the European Union intact somehow in order to then try to prepare the next stage of the war by the end of this decade. We'll see if they succeed. To me, it looks like things are disintegrating faster than they can scotch them back up together. But they will not give up. That's my answer. It's not going to be an off-ramp where somebody is going to be reasonable and say, well, it looks like we lost here, so maybe we need to have a peace agreement with Russia, an armistice, turn a new page, cooperate, be friendly neighbors, and do business to mutual benefit. I don't think that's coming so soon.

#Glenn

No, I think the way the whole path to peace, or that peace platform, was dismantled at such great speed, I think it's awoken a lot of people. As you said, the fact that they got Tulsi Gabbard and Joe Kent both now out of the Trump administration, which is good for fighting the Iranians, and also how quickly Trump went from being able, you know, pushing to end the war—you know, the lecture he gave Zelensky in the Oval Office—to where he's now essentially, you know, almost identical to Biden. It's, yeah, it shouldn't be shocking. But yeah, to some extent it is. Anyways, Alex, thank you so much, as always, for taking the time.

#Alex Krainer

Thank you for having me, Glenn Diesen. And until next time, have a good weekend.