

Alex Krainer: West's Legitimacy Crisis

Triggering World War III

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 today by Alex Cranor, an author, market analyst, and former hedge fund manager, to get some perspective on the political and economic changes in the world. Thank you for coming back on the program.

#Alex Krainer

Always a pleasure to join you, Glenn Diesen. Thank you for the invite.

#Glenn

I was thinking today, though, that it's quite easy to get consumed by all of these day-to-day events, as so much is happening in the world at breakneck speed. So we see the US-Iran memorandum of understanding, which I would argue represents a humiliating defeat for the United States. Quite a change in U.S. history. I would say that I haven't really seen this before, which can transform not just the region but the world will also be impacted. We see NATO participating increasingly directly in attacks on Russian territory, which will, in my opinion or expectation, in the not-too-distant future, unleash a response that would have unforeseeable and uncontrollable consequences.

So overall, I think, yeah, the shift in world order now is quite evident. That is, the former post-Cold War era, or, you know, the U.S.-led hegemonic era under the banner of liberal democracy, is evidently gone. And we have all of these other conflicts. I was just wondering, how do you see the interconnectedness of this war against Iran, the war against Russia, the economic war against China? How do you piece these conflicts together? Of course, they are separate battlefields, but they're also largely connected. Sorry, a very big question.

#Alex Krainer

No, no, that's a great, very important question. And not to sound like a broken record, but I think that we always have to regard all of these different conflicts around the world as the clash between two systems of governance. Yeah. This is, I think, clear, and this is what makes the war between the United States and Israel against Iran, and the war between Ukraine and Russia, and the internal strife in European countries, in the UK, in the United States, Canada, Australia, all parts of the same conflict. And the two systems of governance are basically the Western colonialist empire with its governing structures against everybody else. And I think that the farther this conflict goes, the more it becomes very clear that, in fact, the interconnections, as you mentioned, run very, very deep, much deeper than we knew. And so, you know, we've seen three days ago Robert Lowe publish his inquiry into the gang rapes in Great Britain.

And that's a story that has almost died, even though it's been going on for decades. Because as it turns out, practically the whole British governing establishment—from the police on the street, to social services, to the National Health Service, to councils, to ministries, the media, all the way up to the prime minister's office and the royal household—are all part of the conspiracy. And we can see that clearly now because what the report brought to light is probably the greatest crime ever committed in British history against the people of Britain. And the mainstream media said nothing about it. They're ignoring it. The royal household, they have—it's been three days now—they said nothing about it. They are completely silent. I think that speaks more than anything that they could say by this time, because if you really are there to represent your people, to—

#Alex Krainer

Let's say if you had a protective attitude towards your people, you would be out there outraged. But not a sound. And at the same time, the same King Charles only weeks ago was addressing the Joint Chamber of the U.S. Congress, calling for World War III. And his government has committed to sending 150,000 drones to Ukraine without even bothering to hide much that they will be used for strikes against Russia. Of course, I shouldn't single out Great Britain, even though they have been—they are probably, if we're going to use the Lord of the Rings metaphor—the Mordor of the whole Western colonialist empire.

But all of these—the rot has afflicted much of the world, but particularly the West—because, okay, if we just talk about the gang rapes, which may seem like it has nothing to do with the war in Iran and the MOU, but it's all interconnected. The same problems of the UK with these gang rapes also register in places like France and Belgium and Germany and Sweden and Norway and Iceland and Ireland. And the syndrome is practically identical. You have gangs of migrants committing rapes at industrial scale, and you have exactly the same response from the governments to these rapes:

accusing anybody who says anything of hate crime, responding in more and more draconian ways to suppress this supposed hate crime, punishing victims, being extremely lenient to perpetrators, protecting them, providing them anonymity.

And it goes on and on. And it's very, very strange that this is happening not in one country, not under one government where you could say, like, oh, well, okay, something went off the rails in the UK. It's the whole system of governance that is being copy-pasted everywhere, and it has the same response. And basically, on all the critical issues, all these governments take practically identical positions. So when we had the pandemic, they were all complying, they were all enforcing compliance. When war with Russia and Ukraine broke out, same response, same side. Same tolerance for genocide in Gaza, West Bank, Lebanon. Same exact position, same response to organized crime at home, same response to war between the United States and Iran.

And now we are starting to see all this beginning to unravel a little bit. But the forces that are pushing the Western world, the Western system of governance in this direction, they are never, ever going to give up. They're never going to relent. They're going to continue trying to take control of the world—of Iran, Russia, China, Venezuela, Cuba, South American countries. And it's not about Trump. It's not even about any particular government. Like, it's not Keir Starmer. You know, the rape gangs have been going on since, as we found out, since the 1950s. The undying desire to destroy Russia goes back to—oh, it probably goes back centuries.

The desire to destroy the United States goes back to practically the beginnings of the American Republic. And then all these conflicts have their internal manifestations and they have their external manifestations. And I think that the rape gangs and organized crime, together with NGOs, dominance over the media, infiltration and co-opting of the government structures and so forth, those are the internal elements of this conflict. Colonialist wars, they're the external element of the struggle. But the struggle is always the same, and it's always two systems of governance. I didn't mention what the other system of governance is because it doesn't matter.

It's anybody who doesn't submit, anybody who fails to obey. And the ultimate objective is to create a one-world global order, or whatever we call it—rules-based global order, or Pax Judaica, or Pax Americana, or whatever it may be. But everybody has to submit, everybody has to comply, everybody has to obey. And whoever doesn't gets canceled, character-assassinated, physically assassinated, sanctioned, ostracized, demonized, or attacked militarily. And I think that the logic of this conflict today has reached a level where I don't think it's going to stop until the ultimate defeat of either one side or the other.

Because they really are not going to relent. And, you know, you can see the example of Iran. Iran has been in the crosshairs for decades. They keep trying. There's no point at which they say, like, okay, well, I guess, you know, that didn't work, so let's just make peace and be nice to the Iranians. And if they want to take advantage of their \$35 trillion of natural resources and, you know, the development of their economy and their society according to the way they like, well, we should leave

them to it, right? That never happens. Ronald Reagan was bombing Libya in 1986. Gaddafi survived. Gaddafi's government survived.

Did they give up trying to destroy Libya? No, they didn't. Ultimately, they ended up destroying Libya. The al-Assad dynasty in Syria survived decades of attacks in various forms—by proxy, by sabotage, assassination attempts, infiltration—until eventually they were taken out. They were taken out at the beginning of 2015. And same goes for Iran, same goes for Russia, same goes for any nation that won't submit to the Western colonialist empire. And the Chinese are aware that ultimately they are on the target list as well. So the world has no choice but to take this fight all the way to the end. And so Trump himself may have had enough.

In fact, he probably had enough. And I think that it will be difficult for them to push Trump to war against Iran once more, even though there's now information in the information universe that, in fact, the reason why Trump accepted this humiliating defeat of an MOU is because they just want to delay it, like with the Minsk agreements, until the next hurrah. Right. That's quite possible, but it's probably not going to be Trump. It's going to be somebody else because the continuity of the system of governance transcends any one administration. So right now we have reasons for limited optimism, but the conflict is not going to end.

#Glenn

Well, I agree this has been going on for quite some time. But it has to be said that in the 1990s and then onwards, the liberal hegemony seemed stable. That is, it had a stable concentration of power, which was uncontested. And also the liberal democratic regime—well, not values necessarily, but slogans—they also weren't really disputed. They were seen as providing essential legitimacy for the hegemon. And essentially, the idea would be that the collective West was ruling the world, but for the benefit of all. And this was kind of accepted, not just in the West, but also often outside the Western borders as well.

But what we're seeing now, though, as you suggest, the internal strife—I think this is an equally important component to the foreign wars because, you know, I'm just thinking how long this can go on. Because, as you said, this very basic ignoring of national interest, this is not sustainable. The economic crisis we see playing out, this isn't going to be a bump in the road. These are the economic fundamentals which are falling apart. We see the deindustrialization, the financial crisis, the coming failure of the dollar and other currencies. We see freedom of navigation having been replaced with the embrace of piracy without much problem, not disputed by the politicians or the media.

We see a very fanatical foreign policy. Everything is good versus evil. We're always fighting a new Hitler. We accept this state of permanent war. We have no problem, it seems, embracing ISIS in Syria. We can condemn or try to legitimize when these fanatics are slaughtering civilians. We can embrace fascists. We can have, openly, people making references favorable to Hitler, wearing fascist

symbols, and their first instinct is to excuse it. As you said, casually making calls for World War III from the British royalty, of none other. There's no fear of nuclear war anymore. This is just dismissed as, well, this is moral to ignore that fear because it's nuclear blackmail.

We can back a genocide, participate in genocide. No big deal. The trust in media is collapsing. The legitimacy of governments is also collapsing. I mean, Scholz is down at 15% approval rating. He's being trailed by Macron and Starmer on this downward trajectory. And, you know, across Europe, things aren't looking much better either. As you said, the opposition is criminalized, especially in Germany, where they went after AfD, which is the largest party, but nonetheless now deemed to be an extremist organization. In Romania, at least, they just canceled the election results. Again, you can go on.

The rule of law — they sanction their own citizens now. Dissent is crushed. This overwhelming, suffocating propaganda doesn't stop. It just seems that, you know, long... long story short, it's not just the hegemony, but as the legitimacy collapses as well, something's happening within society. If you were to assess the sustainability — again, your background is also largely in economics — how do you see this? What do you think would crack first? Is it the economic sustainability or the political aspect? I mean, this isn't going to work, or will this just result in a military defeat or outcome?

#Alex Krainer

The economic collapse is coming. It's a mathematical certainty. But it's not going to be like, you know, 1929 in the United States and the depression of the 1930s. It's more going to be a collapse of a stagflationary recession with accelerating levels of inflation, so money is going to become progressively more and more worthless. It's going to exacerbate the cost-of-living crisis throughout the Western world — not throughout the world, period, probably. And that's going to lead to social uprisings. And we don't know what's going to happen because we've never been in this situation before. In the past, always, the ruling establishments had the monopoly on the media, and they had it relatively easy to control the narratives.

Right now, this is not the case anymore because we have the internet, we have social media, we have these types of conversations, podcasts. There are so many people producing superb quality content, which is then galvanizing the public and pushing other people to investigate every little aspect of the crisis we're in. And we can see that the people in power are desperate to redirect this anger towards an external enemy. So the day before Rupert Lowe's inquiry was published, we had British SAS commandos board a Russian tanker in the English Channel, which was completely illegal. There's no way that you could square this with the rule of any kind of international law, law of the seas, UN conventions.

It was just a flat-out act of piracy. They dragged the ship into British territorial waters and then claimed jurisdiction over it. So that's a very clear provocation against the Russians. Then the Russians sent a frigate to the English Channel, and they ran a private speedboat that looked like it

was going to crash into the frigate. And, you know, if you were a Russian sailor or commander on that boat, your assumption would have to be that this is a drone boat that's going to crash into us and explode. Fortunately, the Russians were able to avoid a greater incident by firing flares first and then firing warning shots.

And then finally the boat diverted and there was no consequence. But the desire now, the burning desire of the British — you know, not British like Roger Waters or Jeremy Clarkson, I'm talking about the people in government — is to get a war going in earnest, to try to redirect people's grievances towards the external enemy, which obviously would be Russia. And so when nothing really happened in the English Channel or on the seas, well, then they had the Ukrainians orchestrate the largest ever drone attack on Moscow, and Moscow woke up on the morning of October — well, that was yesterday — to absolutely apocalyptic scenes.

Like, Moscow looked like it was subjected to Allied firebombings. And so there are clear attempts to orchestrate a war because it's the best possible way to divert from an internal crisis. When the money collapses, when there's no food on the shelves, when there's no medicines in the pharmacies, when people cannot get a doctor's appointment and so on, well, you blame everything on Russia. And you bang the drums of patriotism to get all the young men, rather than staging a revolution at home, you orchestrate a large-scale slaughter of them on the Eastern Front. This was done in World War I, and my conviction is that this was deliberate because it's become a kind of meme to —

#Alex Krainer

To mock the World War I generals for incompetence. You know, it's practically a cultural fact. You see it in sitcoms, in movies, everywhere. Generals who didn't understand that the world had changed, that the enemy had machine guns and so forth, who were sending wave after wave after wave of men to a certain death for no discernible reason. But nobody asked themselves the question, was this deliberate? And if you examine the life and work of General Sir Douglas Haig, you realize that it was almost certainly deliberate. The man knew exactly what he was doing, but he himself was responsible for up to 2 million dead British soldiers — military-aged men. It's easier to get rid of them on a... on a foreign battlefield than to get them home starting to ask questions. Hey, how come our daughters and women are being raped and nobody's doing anything about it?

How come the police are taking part in the fun, right? How come the newspapers are covering it up? How come the media, how come the royal family? You know, like when they start asking these questions, you have a collapse of the legitimacy of the system. And once the legitimacy of the system collapses, you're moving almost inevitably to revolution or a civil war. And we had, you know, the King's College professor David Betts, who has written and spoken about this extensively, who said that the civil war is now inevitable not just in the UK but in much of Western Europe, and that all the conditions for a civil war, as you know, based on historical precedent, are not only satisfied, but he said that the continent was explosively configured for a breakout of a civil war. And about a year ago, he was saying that this would happen within five years.

So that would mean that now it's within four years. That's very close. So for the people in power, it's: do we risk guillotines, or do we do anything we can to provoke a war against Russia, and then mobilize the whole society so that all the men go and fight the Russians and hopefully never come back? So that's where we are. And the foundation of all this is the economic crisis, because the inflation is going to continue galloping. People are going to have more and more difficulty making ends meet. The discontent is going to escalate, and it's going to be spilling out into the streets.

And with this inquiry that came out two days ago, Glenn, there's no more denying it — the ruling establishment is the enemy. Up until now, they were maintaining this narrative that, oh, if you talk about grooming gangs, you're racist. Most rapes are done by white men. They were actually saying this for real. Right now, I think that dam has broken. That dam has broken. And I think that the people's anger is now being processed, and it's going to flood the UK like a tsunami. And not just the UK, because the same thing, at maybe a somewhat lesser scale, is going on in Norway, in Sweden, in Belgium, in France, in Germany — in many countries. And so we're looking at a near future of deep, profound discontent.

#Glenn

It is interesting, though, that throughout history you always see when there's a massive legitimacy crisis in a political system, it almost always results in the frustrations being redirected against an external enemy and thus starting a war. Yet, when it happens in the present time, it's usually dismissed as a conspiracy theory or some right-wing lunacy. It is... again, if you take a step back and look at what's happening in the wider historical context. As you said, I interviewed David Betts as well on this channel, and he's following the history of civil wars, tracking what happens within society, and you can say, well, this is obviously happening here.

And the first reaction is always, especially by the political media establishment, well, how dare you? Now you're inciting it, you're encouraging it, because by saying that the authorities are illegitimate, you're spreading that idea. So it's just wild that there is no room to actually discuss what is happening in society because, again, as you're saying, you can't deny this anymore. The economic crisis, the legitimacy crisis, the poor governance, the reckless foreign policies, I mean... The lies in terms of why they went to war with Iran, Russia, also probably China as well in the future — it's all exposed, yet there's no room for recognizing the criticism.

And no, it's quite crazy. But how do you see, though, because what you mentioned about the bombing of Moscow, this is another thing I just can't get over. That is, we have all these Western countries bragging, showing off every day how many drones they're producing, how they're assisting with the intelligence, finding strikes, encouraging deeper strikes in Russia. This is their goal. They're going to have more long-range strikes. They're going to mass-produce these weapons to strike Russia. Yet, if you make the point that, well, where exactly is this heading? How is this not making us a participant?

You know, how will the Russians not be able to retaliate against the West? Because, you know, this doesn't work. There's nothing. You'll usually have some chants about how Russia deserves it, or they should have thought about this, you know, get out of Ukraine. But no one will address the question, that is, how is this not making us a participant? And to what extent does it become impossible for Russia not to retaliate? I just find it—the survival instinct—I mean, we're getting close to zero here. It seems there's no common sense, just emotional sloganeering. And, you know, everyone should unify around the hatred. It's, uh, I don't know. Um...

#Alex Krainer

Yeah, but you see, I think that they're doing this deliberately because they want to make it as difficult as possible for the Russians not to respond. They're desperate for Russia to respond because they're losing legitimacy at home. And if they could get a war against Russia going, it doesn't matter whether they would win it or not. They know that they won't win it. But it would have the rally-around-the-flag effect, you know. Because right now, without a war, look at what the British royalty is. They had three days to say something about the industrial-scale rape of English girls on British territory, and they said nothing at all.

And imagine if now suddenly Russia strikes at the United Kingdom, then there will be a lot of people who would be like, for king and country, and they will be ready to go to war. And so the ruling establishment is desperate to get this war going. And Vladimir Putin knows not to give them this gift because it would be the most beautiful Christmas gift they could wish for. And so they no longer even bother to deny their involvement. You know, back in 2022 and 2023, everybody was really careful because, oh, you know, we can't give them these weapons because, you know, then Ukrainians could strike deep into Russia, and we would be seen as complicit, and that would put us at risk of war against Russia.

So, you know, there was a lot of hesitation, for example, to give them the F-16 fighter jets because they are nuclear-capable. So, you know, they were very, very hesitant. There were many voices who were, you know, even though they supported Ukraine, they were very strongly against this. Now it's the kitchen sink moment. Everything out. It doesn't matter. They're practically advertising, "It's us, it's us. Look, we are doing it. The Ukrainians are just pulling the triggers, but we're doing it. We're planning it." The United Kingdom—Keir Starmer went to Ukraine in January of 2025, just before Donald Trump was inaugurated—and he signed a 100-year partnership agreement with Ukraine. And part of the partnership agreement specified British support for Ukraine in developing drone warfare.

So it's out there. And now they announced that they will—in fact, you tweeted it this morning or yesterday—that they're supplying 150,000 drones to Ukraine, to Ukraine, with the obvious intent of Ukraine using them to strike at Russia. So, you know, if I'm shooting at somebody and you're bringing me the bullets and everything I need to kill them, you're completely complicit. So, if you're a normal person, you're going to try to conceal this. But if you are desperate for war, if you're desperate for an escalation, you will not only not try to conceal it, you will practically advertise it.

And this is where we're at. And so this is creating a problem because Vladimir Putin understands the game, and he's not going to give them this gift.

But at the same time, political pressures at home are building to the point where Vladimir Putin might not be able to hold this back—the avalanche that's coming. Because there's a lot of people saying, "We need to teach them a lesson. We're going to nuke Germany," you know, like Karaganov is suggesting. And this is what the West is desperately hoping for. And they might be able to force Putin's hand in this sense, because if these drone attacks like we saw yesterday are repeated again and again and again, Russia cannot do nothing about this. And so we are in a very, very dangerous situation right now. The war, the escalation to World War III, is being instigated by our own leaders—the Merz's and Macron's and the Starmer's of this world, and Mark Carney's. Let's not leave him out either.

And historical precedent would favor them because it's much easier to escalate than to maintain restraint. And I think that it's for us to push back, the public, because if the public shows the leaders that we see where you're going, we see what you're doing, we see that you want to sacrifice our men, our children in a big war. And then what, you're going to leave our children and our women vulnerable to your immigrants, at the mercy of your immigrants? So military-aged men need to be aware of what's going on, and they need to refuse to fight, which is very hard because Ukrainians didn't want to fight either. They were forced to. So I think it's really potentially revolutionary times ahead of us.

#Glenn

Well, that's a good point. That is, you know, the population, while now it doesn't want to fight, for example, against Russia or China, Iran or anyone, this can shift as soon as the Russian retaliation comes, I think. I mean, as you said... with Ukrainians. People often forget that, you know, from '91 all the way up to 2014, it was a very small minority of Ukrainians who ever wanted to be a part of NATO. In every poll, they showed if they had an opportunity to choose a security partnership, which would you choose?

You would choose, they would go with Russia, or ideally, they wouldn't have to be part of any bloc, but it was leaning towards Russia. But of course, once one topples Yanukovich, puts these extremist elements into place, and then the Russians respond, yeah, you can then build on this, build up the Ukrainian army, make sure you sabotage every single pathway to peace, arm them to the teeth, and then what was, I would say, unthinkable 20 years ago is now, you know, this massive war between them. So why wouldn't you be able to get Europeans as well, European men, to line up to fight and die?

#Alex Krainer

Yeah, exactly, exactly.

#Glenn

I wanted to ask one last question, not on Russia, but how—well, not unrelated—but how do you see Iran playing into this? It's hard to believe that a permanent surrender has been accepted by the Americans. Do you see this simply as regrouping, or do you think it's just that they have come to terms that you can't defeat Iran here? So, are they accepting reality, or how are you assessing this memorandum of understanding?

#Alex Krainer

I think there's no question that they will try to regroup. But it's not necessarily Trump. It's just that this will not stop. You know, in the same way that they never gave up on destroying Syria, they never gave up on destroying Libya, Iraq, and so forth. And, you know, even after they withdrew from Afghanistan, there's been a lot of commentary from the, you know, ruling establishment that, you know, we are going to have to go back to Afghanistan. And even Trump, you know, suggested earlier in his term that, oh, he wants the Bagram base back. And in the immediate aftermath of the withdrawal, there was Leon Panetta who went on television and gave an interview to, I forget, 60 Minutes or somebody like that, and said, like, at some point we're going to have to go back to Afghanistan.

So there's no question that they're going to regroup, and maybe it's not going to happen on Trump's watch. But whatever the force in society, whatever the mechanism is that in the end co-opts the government and obliges it to work for the banking cartels, to mobilize society for colonial wars—that mechanism is still there. So, you know, okay, for example, specifically with respect to Iran, we saw that Iran has been in the crosshairs for regime change since the 9/11 attacks, right? So Wesley Clark said in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks at the Pentagon, they were talking about taking down seven countries in five years. That was 2001, meaning they already planned to have the Iran regime changed by 2006. That didn't happen. They had a lot of difficulty with Libya. They had a lot of difficulty with Syria.

But it never—the juggernaut never stopped. It never relented. And now it took on Iran. The first war lost doesn't mean that they're not going to start—maybe, you know, maybe for the time being war is off the table, but they still have their sabotage, assassinations, regime change wars, color revolutions, sanctions—and none of this is going to go away. And I think that the Iranians are not naive; they know that this is coming their way. But ultimately, the battle will be decided in the economic sphere, because the government of Bashar al-Assad survived the war between 2015 and 2019. They survived the war. They prevailed.

They won with the help of the Russians. But the country was crushed by economic sanctions. The economy was destroyed. And so now the society becomes very vulnerable and porous to foreign interests who can infiltrate with bags of cash. Some judge or police chief or military general is taking home \$50 a month, and some MI6 guy turns up with stacks of \$100 bills. That can make things go

very far, and they can subvert the government system and make it so weak that then a little bit of pressure brings it down. And so this is—I think even the uber-hawk Ghalibaf in Iran was saying we have to turn our attention to issues of economy.

Fortunately, today I think that the struggle is overt enough and critical enough that the Chinese and the Russians understand all this, and that they will help Iran in every way they can to make sure that the Iranian economy breathes, that it develops, that the people live okay, in order to prevent the fall of the Iranian government into the hands of the Western colonialist empire. But the stakeholders of this colonialist empire—their fight, this struggle—is existential for them too. They don't know how to do anything else other than colonizing parts of the world, turning their wealth into financial flows towards their big giant banks on Wall Street and in the City of London and in Paris, and manipulating the political systems of all the Western countries into fighting these wars. So that's not going to stop.

#Alex Krainer

I'm optimistic that Iran will prevail, that the Iranian government is going to survive this, that most probably the Trump administration has lost taste for war. And they might, you know, do this. What I see is that they're probably going to sabotage the implementation of any deal. You know, they're going to say like, oh yes, you know, the 300 billion fund for reconstruction and redevelopment of Iran. Well, there are all these snags and legal problems, and we can't just suspend sanctions just like that, you know, so they're basically going to be stringing them along as much as possible. Meanwhile, the conflict between Iran and Israel is probably going to continue. The United States is going to continue to support Israel, if not overtly, then covertly.

The British are going to continue to support Israel. But I think that in this interim period, the balance of forces is going to be in favor of Iran and against Israel. The ultimate outcome of the game is going to depend on questions of economics, and it's going to depend on whether Iranians are going to be able to develop their economy and provide a reasonable degree of prosperity to their people in spite of the sanctions that are going to continue. They will lift some, but sometimes Western jurisdictions even suspend sanctions against certain countries, but the institutions that are tasked with implementing the sanctions continue to implement them.

The Iranians are still going to find it very difficult to export oil anywhere other than China and countries that accept payment in yuan, Chinese yuan. So that's going to continue. And so the outcome is largely going to depend on the ability of China, Russia, and other BRICS nations to trade with Iran and to allow the Iranian economy to develop. As far as the Western jurisdictions are concerned, I think there's no question that they will continue with their aggressive colonialist approach to governing the world, and they will try to regroup, maybe build up courage and determination by taking on weaker targets like Cuba. So this is going to be a generational conflict, that's for sure.

#Glenn

Yeah, final thought. What you said about Wesley Clark, I thought, yeah, that's a great point. I mean, he was a retired four-star general in the US Army. He was NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. I mean, he was the main guy. He can sit on the stage and tell the audience that he had a document from the Pentagon arguing that, yes, the plan is to knock out seven countries in five years. That is, they were going to go after Iraq, which they did, Libya, Syria, Lebanon, Somalia, Sudan, and finish off with Iran. And now we know the Americans went after all those countries. And yet, when you go to our political media establishment, what do they say? Well, all of these wars were separate. They had nothing in common. It was just all about humanitarian concerns.

We have weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Oh, the humanitarian concerns we had in Libya because, you know, our political elites really just have bleeding hearts for the Libyans or the Syrians. I mean, or now, you know, poor girls in Iran who have to be liberated from the, you know, from the regime. I mean, it's just, it's all there, open in your face, and yet it doesn't impact the narrative in any way. And I think it's the same with the Ukraine war. I mean, you can have the CIA Director, William Burns, not just having, you know, this leaked cable, but also publishing it in his own book, how he warned exactly what would happen happened. That is, he warned, if you try—that is, if NATO tries—to pull Ukraine into its orbit, the predictable thing will happen.

First, there will be a civil war, because most Ukrainians do not want to be in NATO, especially in the east. So you're going to have a civil war, which there was. And then he was making the point, at this point, the Russians will reluctantly intervene on behalf of Donbass and Ukrainians in the east. They do not want to, but they see no other possibility. Again, exactly what happened. Yet, you have that fact, and this is supported by a huge amount of political, military, and intelligence leaders across the West. How does that affect the narrative? Nothing. Everyone chants the same thing: this was completely unprovoked. Mr. Putin woke up one day, he just wanted to restore the Soviet Union. I mean, we really live in a post-reality world.

Reality, facts, they literally have zero impact on narratives anymore. I mean, and all of this is sold as “this is in our interest, this is what we have to fight and die for.” I mean, and of course, just the cherry on top is how this is all about helping Ukrainians, who were screwed over by NATO at every turn, ignored at every turn over the past, well, not just 12 years, but the past, I would say, 22 years. It's quite extraordinary. I mean, and yet, making this point, it's pushed into the realm of, you know, “Oh, this is Russian, Kremlin talking points, or conspiracy theory.” It's just, it's the propaganda I said before. It's suffocating. It's incredible that this is where we are now, I mean, for liberal, democratic, open societies. Anyways, do you have any final thoughts before we wrap up?

#Alex Krainer

Well, you know, you're absolutely right. And this is maybe exactly the crux of the problem. I think that Vladimir Putin was very much right to call the West the empire of lies, because it is an empire of

lies. Because, you know, the cases you mentioned are exactly the cases of it being very hard to persuade somebody when their paycheck depends on them not understanding something. And so we have the structures of government populated by people who are paid to not understand basic things. And so even if they understand it, they reject it, because they would not be able to continue serving this system if they accepted the truth. So they have to embrace lies. And we have even very concrete examples of this. Just before the outbreak of war in Ukraine, there were some kind of military exercises organized in India, and there were NATO officials there, and one of them was a German admiral of the Navy, Admiral Kay-Achim Schönbach.

And there's a video of this discussion at a large round table with other military brass, including Indians, and with regards to the crisis in Ukraine, which was just about to erupt into a war, he was saying the low-cost solution to this crisis is to simply acknowledge and respect Russia's security concerns, to address them, and to find a way to make an agreement with the Russians that addresses their own legitimate security concerns. His career ended that very day. He was immediately fired. He tried to backtrack—no, you're out. And so the person who is going to replace him is going to be somebody who's going to say yes to war, who's going to be a jingoist, who will perpetuate the lies and who will understand that if he makes the mistake of acknowledging the truth and reality, then he's out.

And so those types of decisions have been made thousands of times in every key decision-making node in our whole empire of lies. And so every key decision-making node is populated by people—these types of politicians, generals, judges, policemen, intelligence agents, and so forth. And so you end up having a president of the European Union who is Ursula von der Leyen. You have a foreign policy commissioner, Kaja Kallas, whose, I think, only qualification in life is rabid, incurable Russophobia. And our whole system is like that. But I think that the encouraging part is that this is a very, very thin crust on top, that below the surface people are waking up and people are understanding what is going on. And so it remains to be seen whether they will be able to do to European populations what they've done to Ukraine—you know, march military-aged men to war against their will.

And I think we have to push back against that with everything we have, because it's the difference between peace and war. It's the difference between having your sons alive at home or having them under the flag of your country, as so many hundreds of thousands, maybe more than a million Ukrainian parents now have. So that's what this conflict is about now, directly for every person living in the West, including the United States. You know, maybe Americans will not be participating in a war against Ukraine, but the same preparations are being made by the same structures of power to confront China eventually. Trump doesn't want to do it, but after Trump, somebody else will be in power—maybe some Antony Blinken or Jake Sullivan, somebody like that.