

Why has the US had to beg for peace with Iran?

Published: April 10, 2026, 6:03 am

The United States want to start peace negotiations with Iran because diplomacy prevailed. It did so because it had no choice. It is running out of weapons. In the course of a few weeks, the US military has used somewhere between eight and ten years' worth of Tomahawk missile production. The United States can manufacture approximately one hundred Tomahawk missiles per year. It has fired many hundreds, and possibly a thousand, in this conflict alone. Those stocks cannot be replenished quickly. They cannot be replenished at all in the near term. And without them, and other critical weapon supplies, the USA has no credible capacity to restart a war with Iran.

This is not a temporary logistics problem. It is a structural failure, and neoliberalism created that. The US military, like the US economy, has been run on just-in-time principles:

- * minimal stockholding,
- * maximum efficiency,
- * profits prioritised over resilience.

In addition, more than half of every US missile is manufactured outside the United States, across global supply chains that are now disrupted by the very conflict those missiles were used to fight. Aluminium, a critical component, is, for example, in short supply precisely because the closure of the Strait of Hormuz has constrained the materials needed to make the weapons that were supposed to open it.

The damage goes beyond missiles. Maybe three complex radar systems have been destroyed in the Middle East, each taking up to seven years to replace. The B-52 bombers flying missions from the UK are operating well beyond their operational lifespan. So are the refuelling tankers that support them.

As a result, the Financial Times is reporting that Trump himself appealed for peace via Pakistan, a reality that Pete Hegseth and the White House press operation will never publicly acknowledge.

Meanwhile, Iran's military model, based on low-cost, simple, rapidly replicable weapons, has proved devastatingly effective against the world's most expensive and over-engineered military power. Low-tech warfare has beaten the neoliberal military. Now, as a result, time favours Iran. It can replenish its arsenal quickly. The USA cannot.

The conclusion is stark: US military hegemony has been structurally weakened, and not just temporarily set back. It will take years, and possibly a decade, to rebuild. And in that window, the United States cannot threaten, coerce, or intervene with the credibility it once had. The world has changed. This video explains exactly how and why neoliberalism is the ideology that brought the world's biggest military power to its knees.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jwi4VCmr-7Q?si=pT2sjaHlagyr7QhO>

This is the audio version:

https://www.podbean.com/player-v2/?i=gi9fm-1a94ac5-pb&from=pb6admin&share=1&download=1&rtl=0&fonts=Arial&skin=f6f6f6&font-color=auto&logo_link=episode_page&btn-skin=c73a3a

This is the transcript:

I want to talk about something which I think is a fact, and that is that, right now, the USA cannot keep fighting Iran.

What we know is that there is a supposed negotiation going on at present around a peace deal. Maybe there is, maybe there isn't. No one knows what that peace deal is.

But what I am suggesting to you is something quite different, and that is that the USA has no choice but to pretend that there is a negotiation on a peace deal at present because it cannot afford to continue its war with Iran. And when I talk about afford, I am not talking about money. What I'm talking about is the fact that the USA has not got the physical resources to carry on fighting Iran.

Once upon a time, wars were won based on the ability of a country to keep feeding its troops at the front line, wherever it was. The argument was that wars were won on full stomachs. Now they're won on the ability to keep the missile supply replenished, and

the USA is losing that war. In fact, it's losing it so badly that right now, the USA probably has no capacity to restart its war with Iran. That is how desperate its situation is in these peace negotiations.

What we are talking about here is capability and not rhetoric. Let's ignore what the US is saying. We know it is claiming that it has scored a victory in the war over Iran. We know that Karoline Leavitt, the White House Press Secretary, has said that there is a peace negotiation on a different set of 10 principles to the one that we've all seen, but all of that feels like complete and utter nonsense. What I actually want to do is talk about what is really happening, because war has exposed the reality of the US military. When claims meet facts, the facts are now beginning to bite, and the US is failing badly.

The scale of its munitions depletion is quite extraordinary. Hundreds of Tomahawk missiles have been used over the last few weeks, maybe a thousand, and that is running down the stocks of available missiles used in this war to a point where the US has virtually none left available for use.

We also know that this is true with regard to standoff missiles used by US aircraft to try to deflect incoming fire against them. We know that those are in short supply as well. That's why planes probably got shut down in the last week of this war. Both are indicators of a massive shortage of supply with regard to missiles, and the US is being crippled as a consequence.

The replenishment rate for missiles is incredibly slow. This is the military reality that I'm discussing here. The US can only build about a hundred Tomahawk missiles a year. It has therefore used between eight and 10 years of supplies in the course of the last few weeks, and it is going to take a decade to replace those. It cannot be done in months. It cannot be done in years. Time is now the real constraint on what the US military can do.

So the US is facing a hard choice. It can run stocks of missiles dangerously low to the point where it can't take on any new military campaigns for years to come, or it can stop using those weapons now. The choice is win now or survive later. There are no good options left to the US military in this situation. Its strategic weakness has been critically exposed by this war in Iran, and it's coming out of the assessment very badly indeed.

And this is not just about one weapon: it applies right across all the ordnance that the US is using. All missile systems are being badly affected, and all consumables are running down. The depth of inventory that is now missing is extraordinary, and system-wide shortages are becoming apparent across the range. This is the consequence of having an industrial system that cannot respond to what is happening.

The US industrial system is neoliberal to its very core. It works on 'just-in-time' delivery schedules. It works on the basis of supposed efficiency. There is no capacity within it to create a surge in production. That is not possible. There is no slack in the system. There

is no resilience built in. In fact, it's been designed in the interest of profit maximisation to avoid the chance of short-term expansion of capacity. There is no investment to deliver that, and there is also no labour that is available to build the missing missiles. The capacity is simply not there.

At the same time, the US missile systems rely on complex supply chains. More than half of every US missile is built outside the USA. The components are sourced globally, and material supply is also constrained. Aluminium is one of the things in short supply as a result of this conflict and the closure of the Strait of Hormuz. There are bottlenecks everywhere, and there is no quick scaling that is possible. Lead times are now measured in years, and this is not a temporary gap. It is a structural lag. There is no rapid recovery path for the US military, and as a consequence, the US government's choices are now severely restricted, and this isn't only with regard to weapons, I should stress.

Other systems are also at risk. At least three complex radar systems have been knocked out in the Middle East so far, and apparently each of them will take up to seven years to replace, whilst ageing aircraft are also under strain, as a consequence of this conflict. The B52s are flying well beyond their sell-by dates. So are the refuelling tankers. These platforms are ageing fast, and some of the losses that are being incurred with regard to them are permanent. Apparently, the ability to repair some of these systems simply does not exist. The machinery that is required is no longer in existence. As a consequence, there is a real risk of US military capability actually shrinking at this moment, so severe is the problem that it faces.

This is neoliberalism at work. It's quite extraordinary. Neoliberalism is, in fact, undermining the military power of the country that is most likely to try to defend it. Efficiency is being given higher value than resilience, and we have a 'just-in-time' military now, except that's not how war works. The military is working on minimal stockholding, just as business does, and cost-saving logic has been applied to it in a way that is undermining every chance it has of staging a successful war. The same applies in the UK, by the way, as well.

The reality of war has been ignored in modern military design. The culture of wartime management has been displaced by neoliberal thinking, and as a consequence, military leadership has no idea what it's doing in the West. The war is exposing that failure. There is no spare capacity. There is no redundancy built into systems, when that is something that is essential inside a wartime economy. There are no margins for error when, by necessity, military thinking requires you to think about duality of strategies to deal with such things. Systems are breaking under stress, exactly as expected, but without the ability to put in place the alternatives that are required so that the US military can continue to fight this battle.

At the same time, let's be clear. Iran's military model is the exact opposite of that of the USA. It is using simpler systems. It is producing weapons that are easier to innovate. It

is producing weapons that are easier to replace. This is a low-cost approach to war, and sustained supply is therefore possible, and we're seeing that. A fortnight's break with regard to a ceasefire negotiation is, as far as Iran is concerned, probably enough time to replenish all its available missile supplies. So the balance of power has shifted in this war. The US knows it cannot sustain this war anymore. Iran also knows that, whilst Iran knows it can continue this war. Time is favouring Iran, and I suspect the US knows that too.

Everything about replenishment and systems design is, in fact, running in Iran's favour right now, and as a result, it has the upper hand in this conflict. That's why Trump did need a ceasefire in this conflict with Iran. Sure, he wanted to get out of the mess he had created for himself with regard to a threat of genocide, but that wasn't the only reason why he backed off. He knew he needed to break the war because his stocks of weapons were too low. His capability had been too reduced, and peace was becoming essential.

When he said at the outset that this war would last for four to six weeks, what he knew was that that was all the weaponry that he had. That weaponry has nearly run out. He had to appeal for peace, and the Financial Times is saying very strongly at the moment that he did actually appeal for peace. He went to Pakistan and asked them to broker the peace with Iran. It was not the other way around, as people like Pete Hegseth would claim. So we know the US knows how constrained it is now.

We can expect that there will be a lot of misinformation supplied about this. The illusion of progress in peace talks will be maintained. We will get extended deadlines. They will probably be extended one after another. We will get used to the idea that the claim will be made, that another two weeks are required, but that narrative of progress is built upon the reality that the US cannot go back to war.

There are deeper implications to all of this. US military power has been seriously weakened by a few weeks of war. It's not been temporarily weakened; it has been structurally weakened. Years will be required to rebuild the capability that has now been lost, and US global power has been reduced as a result. Its capacity to intervene anywhere else in the world has become minimal or non-existent as a result. Its hegemony has been cruelly exposed as a consequence.

The conclusion is unavoidable. The US cannot now return to war with Iran. It cannot do so now. It cannot do so soon. It cannot do so without rebuilding its military, and that will take years. In all practical senses, this war is therefore over. The fact is that low-tech warfare has won over neoliberal failure, which has designed a weaponry system that has failed to deliver a modern military that the US can use to engage in actual warfare.

This is an extraordinary failure based upon the thinking that has brought the world economy to its knees, the world's politics to its knees, and now the world's biggest military power to its knees. Neoliberalism is a recipe for disaster. The US is now seeing the consequences. Iran is beating it using a different method of thinking. We need to

reappraise how we think about everything in this world as a consequence. Neoliberalism is no longer the answer to anything, and this war has cruelly exposed that fact.

That's what I think. What do you think? There's a poll down below. Let us know your comments. Please share this video if you like it, and subscribe to our channel if that's something that you want to do. If you also want to make a donation, we'd be truly grateful because these videos have a cost to make.

Poll

[poll id="365"]