

Are US-Russia Negotiations Dead?

New to streaming or looking to level up? Check out StreamYard and get \$10 discount!

<https://streamyard.com/pal/d/6539928065015808>

#Elizabeth Lane

Hello, everyone. And we are live. I see the chat. We already have Texas here. Hey, Texas. I love you guys. One of the real American states left here. So I've got very interesting guests. Glenn Diesen, Dmitry Polyansky, Ethan Levins are my guests today. I will give you a minute to introduce yourselves, guys. And I think all of you kind of know who they are, but still, for new viewers. So today we're talking about Russia-Ukraine, obviously, and these new developments. We're going to touch on CIA director's trip to Russia.

We're also going to touch on Witkoff's and Jared Kushner's trip because there are lots of rumors as to what happened during this meeting. And then we are going to dive into what happens next in this conflict. Are we going to see some kind of peace or chaos? Is it going to escalate? So first, I want to introduce Dmitry Polyansky. Dmitry represents Russia. He's a Russian diplomat. Dmitry, give us a little bit of background about you. I always call you a silent professional. You're so—well, you're an intellectual, you're smart, and you're always factual, fair. So tell me a little bit about you.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Thanks for introducing me this way, Elizabeth. I'm currently a Russian representative to the OSCE in Vienna. Previously, for eight years, I was working for the Russian mission to the UN. I was first deputy permanent representative and had a very vast experience at the UN. Previously, I was posted in a number of countries, including Poland, including the EU in Belgium, so a number of them. And my interest is, of course, international politics. I try to be useful. I try to bring the Russian view to those who need it, because now in the West, and especially in Europe, there is a new Iron Curtain being built, and it's very hard for people to get firsthand information about what's happening, because everything that is contrary to the views of the ruling elites is labeled Russian propaganda. So that's my mission.

#Elizabeth Lane

Absolutely. We'll get to all of that today. Glenn, maybe introduce yourself real quick as well, even though people know who you are. You're in Norway as well.

#Glenn Diesen

Well, I'm a professor of political economy. Initially, I researched a lot and wrote about the failures of establishing a mutually acceptable pan-European security architecture after the Cold War and the consequences of it. But since 2014, I shifted more towards addressing this Greater Eurasia project, in which Russia, China, India, Iran, and other countries are connecting more their economies in terms of industries, technologies, physical transportation corridors, financial instruments like banks and payment systems, and currencies. And yes, that's what I do there. I also host my own podcast on YouTube. So yeah, please make sure to follow me.

#Elizabeth Lane

Awesome. We will put down all the links below. I will put down your YouTube and X. Elizabeth, go on.

#Ethan Levins

Hi, I'm Ethan Levins. I am a geopolitical analyst. That's what I call myself. Also an independent journalist. I create short-form content across platforms on X, Instagram, TikTok, all of that. I talk about the Middle East. I talk about European politics, and I'm an American, so obviously I talk about American politics. I've been doing this for about a year and a half total, I think. Oops. In total, I think I have a little over 1.5 million followers. So I don't have other cool credentials as everyone else here. I am in the social media space, essentially. I talk about everything that's going on. I post multiple times a day. I also have, like, a breaking news Telegram channel, about 50,000 people in it. So that's what I do. And also, I want to point out that it's an honor to be with you three people. You guys are incredible and amazing, and hopefully I can provide some good insight as well with you guys, and also ask some pretty cool questions. So that's what I do.

#Elizabeth Lane

Amazing. Feel free to be my co-host today, Ethan. So, Chad, I see you. Paul, I see you. We'll get to you guys. Send your questions. And if you have any questions to Dimitri, Glenn, or Ethan, or me, please send it. We will read all of that. Let's start with real things right now. So, Witkoff and Jared Kushner went to Russia. I have a question for both of you, Glenn and Dimitri, whichever wants to go first. So, we saw the CIA director go there first. They gave us a bunch of different reasons. One was that, oh, poor Putin has no idea what's going on on the front lines.

That was The New York Times, by the way. And we went there to educate the guy about his own front lines, right? So that was the propaganda they tried to push. Obviously, it didn't work. It's for monkeys. It didn't work. And then they changed it and said, "Well, we were there to warn him that if he continues this war, it's not going to end well for him." Okay, so maybe, like, give us your take, Dimitri, and then Glenn, yours, on what they really were doing in Russia and what they were trying to get out of President Putin.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Well, I can say that we now live in a very specific and particular time when a visit from a representative of foreign services is considered to be a sensation, which was a normal routine for many years. And it's normal that countries like ours maintain communications in different ways. I believe that contacts between special services were not interrupted even during the hottest part of the Ukrainian crisis, unlike Europe, because with European counterparts, we don't have any hotlines now, we don't have any communications, and maybe they envy a little bit the fact that the director of the CIA can easily come down to Russia and he would be received by his counterparts, regardless of all the differences that we have.

I think this is normal, and that's the way it should be. As far as the speculations are concerned, well, frankly, I think it was a very important visit, and of course it was substantial. And it's part of quiet diplomacy. And I don't think it will be a revelation to you to tell you why the public will never know the total contents of this visit, because diplomacy likes when it is quiet. It's not megaphone diplomacy. He didn't come for propaganda reasons. He came to maintain contacts with his counterparts. And it's important for the maintenance of stability in the relations between two superpowers. I think it is important for the whole world. So I really encourage everyone to view these visits through these optics.

#Elizabeth Lane

Glenn, what's your take on this?

#Glenn Diesen

Well, I'm not sure how much I have to add. Again, as Dmitry Polyansky said, these meetings between intelligence chiefs, they're not broadcast in terms of their content. So to what extent it was of great importance or not, I think it will remain unclear. But what should be said, though, I think this is the first time a CIA director went to Russia since November of... So it's been a while. And so this could signify many things. It could be some of this semi-boycott of diplomacy. Again, it hasn't been boycotted between the intelligence agencies, but the fact that we go for a personal visit, I think it's quite important.

And that's been one of the big tragedies, I think, of this conflict that is happening. Diplomacy itself has been shut down, it's been criminalized, and it's become controversial, essentially, to talk to the other side. I was just watching a video today about Kaja Kallas bragging about how, well, they don't talk to Russia, and she's able to convince other countries not to do the same. It's a very strange time to be alive when diplomacy has become criminalized. But again, in terms of negotiating an end to the war, it usually wouldn't be, I guess, the intelligence services who would do this. But on the other

hand, it shouldn't be Kushner and Witkoff either. So it's a bit unusual times, I think. But that being said, the CIA has been front and center in this war since 2014. And we learned this from this New York Times post recently.

Back in February of 2014, that is, the day after Yanukovych had been toppled, the CIA and MI6 already established their contacts with the new authorities in Kiev to start this covert war against Russia, which manifested itself in all these CIA bases along the Russian border. And as we've also seen, the CIA remains quite active in Ukraine. I know Kushner and Witkoff present themselves as being mediators only. But again, this is a proxy war, and the U.S. is leading it. So they are providing the weapons. They are doing the logistics. They have to provide the targeting, the intelligence. They have the war planners there. So this is still a big job for the CIA. So again, that makes it even more important to keep contacts open. But again, I agree with what Dmitry said. We will probably never know what they talked about.

#Elizabeth Lane

Yes. So it's just, you know, these visits kind of coincided with each other. So first the CIA director goes over there, then Kushner and Jared—I mean, Jared Kushner and Witkoff—go over there. And really, nothing as far as the outcome goes, like nothing changes. So here's the problem I have. Witkoff and Kushner have been going on rounds and rounds of talks, and nothing ever happens. So as a diplomat, Dmitry, what are the requirements for any negotiation to actually, you know, have some type of results, right? Because if I keep coming to you with the same offer that, in this case, the United States has, you know, been doing for years now towards Russia, they are going over there saying, "We got to stop the war."

Okay, what are my guarantees that you're not going to do everything that you were doing before this war even started? And then the guarantees are, well, I don't know, you know, like, you know, we will just tell Zelensky to stop. Well, that's not good enough. So why don't you, like, maybe give us some kind of points, break down what Russia needs for this war to end, because right now they are in a position of strength. They are not going to stop. Why would anyone stop when the other side is not showing you anything in terms of, like, good faith? So, what are those points that we need to agree on?

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

I think it's very easy, and it will be obvious if you study our statements in the Security Council, if you study interviews of our president, foreign minister in the run-up to this crisis, during this crisis, today. Everything has been clear, and we repeat it many times. If I just try to put it in a very concise form, we want our good neighbor to be back.

We want to see Ukraine which is respecting human rights, which is respecting the rights of the Russian-speaking population, which represents the majority of the population of this country, despite

all the attempts to prove otherwise, that people are not discriminated there because of their religion, that there are no Nazi criminals which are being reburied with state services around and with the president being present there. So we want these very simple things. And that was the Ukraine with which we signed, which we acknowledged as a country after it claimed independence from the Soviet Union, with which we established diplomatic relations. And in our treaty, the basic treaty, there was a number of provisions which were of paramount importance to our relations, like Ukraine not being a member of any military bloc, for example, Ukraine respecting Russian language, which was part of the Constitution.

What we see today is gradually very much a perverse vision of a country which claims to be civilized and which claims to be part of a bigger family, a country which, from at least 2014, has in fact become a project anti-Russia, implemented by mostly European countries. To a certain extent, of course, the United States was participating, depending on different administrations. This was a clear anti-Russian project.

Glenn was absolutely right, citing this famous article from The New York Times, which revealed to us the real scope of American involvement and British involvement in the establishment of this anti-Russian project since 2014. So, we want very clear and simple things, and we were already almost there in 2022. You remember these infamous Istanbul talks, which ended in Ukraine initialing some kind of a draft agreement, and then Boris Johnson coming and saying that Ukraine has to fight and that the West will provide Ukraine with everything. And starting from then, Ukraine has become, in fact, a private military company which is being supplied with weapons from the West, with intelligence from the West, and Europeans are now fighting Russia there with the help of the Ukrainians. Ukrainians are dying, and Europeans are just sending them weapons and counting money that they gained from this war.

As simple as this. So, we were ready to stop from day one. We were ready to implement the Minsk agreements, to see them implemented by Kiev and by the breakaway republics. And you know that the Minsk agreements were aimed at the re-establishment of Ukraine in its territory, as far as Donbass was concerned, provided there were certain measures taken to respect the special character of the population of these regions. And we were almost there. And if these agreements would have been implemented in good faith, then of course there would be no need for any special military operation or whatever. We were ready for this. We were open. But it was not us who destroyed trust and who destroyed every possibility to come to a peaceful solution. We want guarantees that there will be no discrimination in Ukraine against language or belief.

Is it too much? I think that this is normal for every country, to expect all of its citizens to be able to preserve their cultural identity, their beliefs. This is normal for every European country, but when it comes to Ukraine, European countries started to kind of disregard all the obvious breaches of basic human rights that are happening there, pretending that nothing happens in Ukraine, which is very detrimental to their values.

So I'm always asking them in the OSCE, when they make statements like, "We share common values with Ukraine," I ask them, "Is glorification of Nazi criminals your common value? Is forbidding a language your common value? Please show me where else in Europe these principles are the same as in Ukraine. And if not, why are you not doing anything? Why are you not calling a spade a spade, saying that there are very serious things that should be corrected in Ukraine?" So now the question is, to a very large extent, in my understanding, it boils down to the question of how the rest of Ukraine will look like if there is a peace agreement that would be acceptable to Russia, to Ukraine.

How will it look like? It's out of the question for us to see the continuation of this Kiev regime that is absolutely criminal in all senses, which is corrupt, which is a threat to its neighbors, not only Russia. It's absolutely out of the question for us to see it coming. So we want to see what will be the changes there in Ukraine, and we expect the West European countries to stand up for their values, to stand up for equality in terms of treatment of people with different special cultural identities. Very basic things. So we're not asking anything that is absolutely out of the question there, out of normal.

And you know that we came there to stop the war, which was ongoing from 2014. It was not provoked by anyone, but the Kiev regime decided, instead of speaking to its citizens, to launch a so-called anti-terrorist operation against these people. It started to kill its citizens. There were tragedies like Odessa. There were Nazi criminals who were imposed on others as heroes of Ukraine. So we want to see the stop of all of this. And we want to have a normal neighbor on our borders instead of the hornet's nest which we have right now. And I think it's in everybody's interest, not only in Russian interests. That's our basic approach.

#Elizabeth Lane

I absolutely agree with you. And one thing I want to say is... so we are literally aiding Israel in genocide. And it is a genocide. It's not Elizabeth's opinion. It has been declared a genocide in Palestine by multiple sources, by different countries, by different organizations, including some Israelis. And we're then turning back to Russians and saying, "How dare you invade Ukraine that has been killing Russians locally in, you know, Donbas for years?" So that is okay, but... you know, it's just like I can't have anything, and you say, like, you want, like, one tiny little, like, a little bit of a... and you can't have anything because you're Russia. So this Russophobia is real. This Russo-hatred is real in Europe.

And I agree with Dmitry. One thing I want to say is... they've been peddling this lie that Russia is so weak that Russia cannot take Ukraine or, you know, they've been losing on the battlefield. And then Zelensky is the one—the only one, I should say—constantly coming out and asking for more money, more weapons, because he's in serious trouble. And then the narrative changes: "Oh no, Russia is a big bad monster, and it is about to take Europe." So we've been hearing this two-sided narrative forever, and some idiots are still falling for it. So maybe, Dmitry, real quick, and then, Glenn, I want to get to you as well on this: tell us what the heck is going on on the front lines.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

On the front lines, the situation is very clear, and it's absolutely obvious that there is the last stronghold in Donbas, which we are about to take. Maybe it will take some time because we are trying to save manpower. We are trying to minimize the losses from the civilian population. But we will do it imminently. And this will signify the end of most of the most fortified regions of Ukraine that were constructed starting from 2014. Everybody understands this. Zelensky was mad about this, and he always asked his generals to keep these cities intact, not to surrender. A lot of people, a lot of Ukrainians died because of this. And this is not my opinion; this is the opinion of Ukrainians and Ukrainian public opinion.

Now they're making again this mistake because of propaganda reasons. They try to keep these cities, and there were a number of questions. So, you know, our position is that the whole of Donbass should be given to Russia because of the provisions of our constitution. And Zelensky, on the one hand, is saying that we will not give Donbass to Russia. On the other hand, there are a lot of statements from himself, from his aides, that are actually very condescending and belittling to these people of Donbass, saying that they should be re-educated, that they should be corrected because they are too sympathetic towards Russia, inclining towards Russia.

It means that actually they don't need people there; they just need the territory. And this, of course, shows the real intent of the Kyiv regime and the real attitude towards the Russian-speaking population. If I may just come back to one thing that you said, Elizabeth, about Gaza and about Ukraine. Actually, this is one thing that I always also point out to my interlocutors in the OSCE. When they start to accuse Russia of committing crimes, of indiscriminate shelling or whatever, I tell them, look, guys, let's put two pictures. One picture is of Gaza, another picture is of Kyiv.

Yes, now we intensified strikes on Kyiv because there was this definite and clear move towards escalation from Zelensky and threats to Russia. But Kyiv is still a functioning city. Shops are functioning. Public transport is functioning. Even nightclubs are open. Look at Gaza, nothing but ruins. And you can compare these two things. Do you think that we are really indiscriminate? Do you think that we are cruel? We try to minimize the losses as much as we can. How dare you compare what is happening there and what we are doing? This is a total insult to Gazans. This is an insult to Ukrainians, to whatever.

#Elizabeth Lane

No, I agree with that. And also, I remember it was one of your diplomats—I believe it was, I can't remember who said it—but initially, when the war started, that you guys gave Ukrainians a chance. This is where you come and sit down at the table with us and negotiate. You are in a weak position. They were already in a weak position. They needed propaganda to, you know, bamboozle Americans

into giving them more money, because I remember, you know, the Ghost of Kyiv and all this propaganda thing, like the heroes of the island that never gave up and died. All of this turned out to be a bunch of lies. And we now factually know this.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

So you guys... Sorry to interrupt you. In reality, after one month, we were on the outskirts of Kyiv, and we withdrew from there only as a gesture of goodwill, when Macron called Putin and said that, you know, you already obtained the results that you wanted. Ukrainians are ready to sign a peace treaty. Please make this gesture of goodwill. And we made it. And what did we get? The provocation of Bucha.

#Elizabeth Lane

Wait, wait, wait. This is good. I didn't know that Macron made that call. I thought that that was done by the British...

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

I think it was—no, it was publicly now revealed by Lavrov.

#Elizabeth Lane

Could you give us detail on that? So you're saying you were right up—could you give us detail on that? And then tie Bucha in, because this is important. My audience needs to know that I didn't know.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

There was a call from the French president. I think this now is openly stated by the Kremlin, by Sergei Lavrov, foreign minister, saying that, look, guys, as a gesture of goodwill, please withdraw your troops from Kyiv because now the war is over and there will be this peace treaty between Ukraine and Russia. So there is no need to keep your troops there, making Ukrainians too nervous. And we did it. We withdrew from these territories. We withdrew from a big territory in the north of Ukraine, which we came into after one month of fighting. After one month of fighting, it was already almost done. So the negotiations started in Istanbul, and the draft treaty was already initialed by Ukraine. And then after we withdrew, we withdrew also from the region of Bucha near Kyiv.

And after two days that we withdrew, all of a sudden, the mayor of this city, who was before that jubilating, saying that Bucha is back to Ukraine, not mentioning any problems, all of a sudden, after two days, there were revelations that allegedly there are troops—there are cadavers, bodies of killed Ukrainians, everywhere in the city. And there are a lot of discrepancies about this provocation. We

continue to ask for the list of the victims to conduct some kind of investigation. But this is a mere propaganda exercise. There are journalists, French journalist Bouquet, for example, who was present there and who says that this was a provocation which she saw in the making by the other journalists, by the foreign intelligence of the UK, first and foremost. So there are so many indications that this was a deliberate act to undermine the peaceful efforts that now I think there is absolutely no doubt about it.

#Ethan Levins

So I've got a question for both of you guys, Mr. Poliansky and Professor Diesen. So every few months we get a new phone call between President Trump, President Putin. They talk about the Ukraine crisis. They talk about relations between the U.S. and Russia. And I'm an American, full-blooded American, and I would definitely like to see things get de-escalated very quickly, because what's happening over there is a little scary, to be honest, to see the Europeans throwing threats at Russia. And, you know, they throw these threats, like Kaja Kallas, who's from Estonia. She throws these threats, runs behind Trump and the U.S. military, and throws her hands up like nothing happened. So I want to know from both of you, is there a real possibility under Trump's term?

Because under Biden, it was very aggressive between the U.S. and Russia. But under Trump's term, is it a real possibility we could see relations be somewhat—I mean, not really friendly, but somewhat improved between the two countries? We're now getting communications, at least, between the U.S. and Russia. But is there any room? Is it even possible to have any positive relations, moves going forward? Maybe something simple like Trump said last year in August about direct flights being resumed, or are we just so far down the line? Are we so far down the mountain at this point to where it's just not possible? Maybe I will let Glenn say something. Otherwise, there is an impression that I'm monopolizing this. Go ahead, go ahead, Glenn.

#Glenn Diesen

I was going to say, I think there's a natural incentive for both Russia and the United States to try to improve ties. That being said, the U.S. also sees an interest in trying to weaken Russia. Now, to do the first, I think, is because the U.S. is trying to grapple with this decline of this world order it established after the end of the Cold War based on hegemony. And during this time, the U.S. essentially tried to weaken all rising powers to maintain its dominance. But now that you have the rise of new centers of power, if the U.S. recognizes that this is the direction of the world, that it's becoming more multipolar, it has an interest in connecting more with Russia.

And for the same reason, Russia has an interest in enhancing its connectivity with the United States, because the U.S. doesn't want Russia to develop excessive dependence on China, because the fear would be that the U.S. would then—sorry, the Russians would then go along with everything the Chinese said. That is, if you have excessive dependence, that can be converted into a lot of political influence. I mean, this is kind of common logic. Before 2022, this is kind of what the Germans and

the French were saying as well: let's not push the Russians too far to China. That's what the Japanese were saying as well.

We should try to maintain good relations with the Russians and also have more economic connectivity, because if they can diversify their ties, then they will be able to have a more neutral political position in any dispute between China and Japan. So this was kind of common sense. But then I think the political West went into full mode of trying just to break Russia instead. That's more or less what you heard from Biden, Keith Kellogg, Trump, Mitt Romney, all of these people saying the same thing: that, oh, this is great statesmanship. We can use Ukrainians to break Russia, knock it out of the ranks of the great powers, and then we can focus our resources on countering China.

This is more or less paraphrasing Keith Kellogg here. But anyways, it's not working, and it would be logical for the U.S. to try now to reach out to Russia. And indeed, it is also in the interest of Russia. Russia actually wants to diversify. If all things are equal, the Russians would like to have good ties with all centers of power because it's important not to put all their eggs in one basket. So I think there's a natural incentive on both sides. And this is kind of some of the signals that the Trump administration initially gave when it first came—well, came back to power again in the second administration. The problem is the U.S. deviated from this initiative.

Again, if you will remember the first time we heard Hegseth, he was making the point, okay, we're going to have a deal with the Russians. You know, there will be no NATO expansion. There will be no security guarantees. And Ukraine knows it has to give up some of the disputed territories now. All of this, you know, we don't hear anymore. And I think the U.S. still has some of these goals of, you know, we can weaken the Russians nonetheless. So Trump kind of got on board with this. He made it his war as well. And again, if he wanted to put an end to it, he had every opportunity. Why he didn't, I'm not sure. Whether or not he's in full control or he changed his mind, I don't want to speculate. But the main actor now helping to manage the Ukrainian attacks on Russia is the United States.

So I know the U.S. now puts on a different hat, playing the mediator. You know, we just want to bridge the Ukrainians and the Russians. And Trump says the real reason for all this conflict now, why it's so difficult, is because, you know, Putin and Zelensky just really, really hate each other. I mean, that's a very strange simplification. The U.S. has been deeply involved ever since 2014, and it remains so today. If the U.S. wanted actually to put an end to this, they could have pulled the plug on their intelligence services operating within Ukraine, but they didn't. And even after Alaska in August of last year, I understand the Americans proposed a deal, the Russians accepted their concessions, and they were waiting for the Americans to get back to them, and nothing happened.

And it seems as if they thought, okay, well, we can bleed the Russians a little bit more, and they get a more favorable deal, similar to what they're doing now with the Iranians. And so I'm thinking that Trump's sitting on two chairs. So, yes, I agree with this. There are opportunities for Russia and the U.S. to chart a different relationship. Maybe Trump is leaning more in that direction now that he sees

the war is being lost. But again, I think the lack of a clear position is one of the main problems here in putting an end to the war, but also improving Russia-U.S. relations. Because as long as this war goes on and they stand on opposite sides, it's going to be very difficult to do anything else. So I think it's necessary to put an end to the war before these relations can develop further.

#Elizabeth Lane

I agree. So as far as Trump goes, I don't think that he's given the right information. It's funny, like, you know, guys like these people project a lot. So, for example, when the New York Times, and I think it was the New York Times, came out with this bullshit article that we are there to educate Putin about his own front lines. So Vladimir Putin is more educated than most leaders, and he knows exactly what's happening on his front lines, unlike our president, by the way, who's on a need-to-know basis. Let me explain this. Our president is on a need-to-know basis on so many things, which is crazy to me, but it's true. So I don't believe that Trump is given the right information.

I think that he looks at Europe and he gets, like, the exact same hawkish narrative from there as, like, neocons back home. You guys know what Lindsey Graham was, and he was very active in deluding Trump into these wars, but Lindsey Graham was not the only person. So I guess the question I have now to both of you, and maybe Ethan, you as well, I feel like there's an attempt to take the United States out of the game. So I think there's an attempt to, by the way, by the powers here—I'm not talking about by Russia or other places—but the powers here in Britain and similar, including Israel, of course, one of the leading parties here, to kind of dethrone the United States as the hegemon of the world.

We see that with the dollar. We see what's happening here with inflation. We are seeing that our allied countries in the Middle East are absolutely against us right now and mad at us because we couldn't protect them. Our bases are destroyed. So it's almost like some powers within the United States, who are also very hostile to Russia, are destroying this country. As a Russian diplomat, Dimitri, seeing things from there, do you see that at all? That there's some type of attempt to kind of secretly destroy the United States while also going at Russia and trying to, you know, get Russia a bloody nose.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Okay, I'm unmuted now.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Well, you know, Elizabeth, being a diplomat here in Vienna and working for the Russian representation to the OSCE, I have the privilege not to think too much about internal U.S. politics. So I would save my comments about internal U.S. matters. Right now, I have enough on my plate in terms of European security. And of course, I can comment on what you want from the Russian

perspective of how we view this situation. First of all, I don't think that when people speak about Russian-American rapprochement, they are speaking about a honeymoon. This is far from being a honeymoon. We understand that we are on different pages on many issues, starting from Iran, where we are absolutely vocal in condemning what the U.S. is doing.

Going back to Ukraine, on the one hand, Americans are the only ones displaying some kind of realism as far as the Ukrainian crisis is concerned. And I think that my personal opinion is that the timing of Witkoff and Kushner coming to Moscow is not something, you know, that you should take out of the picture, because Zelensky has started to feel our pressure very much. He declared some kind of a very allegedly successful air campaign against Russia, but instead he received intensification of strikes in Ukraine. He started to hit our civilian infrastructure. He started to hit marketplaces. He got our hits on marketplaces instead. And that's why he's now in a very desperate situation.

A lot of people, even in Europe, admit that the Ukrainian situation at the front is very desperate right now. So, of course, they rushed there to kind of try to negotiate how it can end. But our position is very consistent from day one. Again, you know what we want. If you are ready to give us what we want, if you are ready to make our neighbor normal again, you are welcome. If not, we will continue to fight because, unfortunately, otherwise we can't make our case. And we think that this is a fair case, and we are fighting for the truth. We are fighting for our future, for the future of our children. And that's why we will not stop. We will get what we want this way or another. So there are no illusions about different positions in the United States, about Russia.

We know about the sanctions draft that is being discussed right now and that is being used as kind of a leverage in relations with Russia. But on the other hand, there is a pragmatic approach from the Trump administration. There is a desire to listen. The Trump administration acknowledges that there were certain things that happened before the start of our special military operation that seriously influenced our decision to do so. And it's the only party right now in the West which says that we need to discuss the root causes, that we need to make certain arrangements that would address our concerns as far as the Russian-speaking population, Russian language, Orthodox Church, and the heroization of Nazism are concerned.

Not to mention, of course, the expansion of NATO, which is from day one part of the picture. So that's why, of course, we maintain contacts. We are ready to speak to everyone. We never said that we will not speak to Europeans, but Europeans didn't want to speak with us. We were not the ones who cut contacts. It was Europe who did so. That's why we would be ready to resume them when Europe becomes normal and comes back to the reasonable positions which we can at least discuss. We are not yet there. But the United States made certain proposals which we decided to accept. Anchorage in Alaska was already mentioned at this point. So we made certain commitments.

Americans made certain commitments. And it was then their turn to deliver, but it looks like they failed at a certain stage because of the pressure of the Europeans, because of the maneuvering of

Zelensky. And then maybe there are some voices, Elizabeth, that you say that people were playing this game of wait and see, and some people thought that the situation for Russia is becoming worse, and maybe Ukrainians will have better negotiating positions. These were things that I heard openly in the OSCE chamber from my European counterparts, saying that Ukraine has to fight because Russia is losing, because inevitably they will have to make concessions.

So they were believing in things like this. I am very curious to listen to what they will say when we have our first meeting of the Permanent Council after the summer break, because the situation has changed drastically at the front. So, again, coming back to the Trump administration, coming back to our contacts with them, I think we will maintain them. We will respectfully engage in diplomacy. But, of course, we will be very mindful of our interests. It will not mean that we will make any concessions, any principal concessions, on what we need and on what it was all about. I think everybody should understand this. And it looks like the Trump administration is totally aware of this.

#Elizabeth Lane

Absolutely agree. Ethan, you wanted to ask something?

#Ethan Levins

Yes, I want to chime in on that real quick about what, Elizabeth, you said earlier about: is there internal forces within D.C.? Which way is the U.S. going? Is the U.S. being eaten from the inside? I think this is just exactly what the Trump administration, what the deep state in the U.S., wants. This is the perfect scenario. I reject the idea that the U.S. is controlled by Israel. Whether they're influenced? Okay, they're completely influenced, by the way. But the U.S. knows what they're doing in the Middle East. They want Israel to do exactly what they're doing. Israel blows up the ceasefires with Lebanon. It forces the U.S. to basically use the Israeli card, to use their, essentially, proxies at this point.

Saudi Arabia to attack Yemen. It's always just been about, you know, rejecting this multipolar world, which is developing right now. Venezuela was never a threat to the U.S. Venezuela was essentially—it was an ally of China, Russia, that entire, I guess, Eastern bloc. You could call it essentially kind of neutral at that point. But it had nothing to do with defense or national security. It never does. And it's never about doing the right thing. I mean, look at Syria. Syria is the number one example of America doesn't care what's right, what's wrong. I mean, Syria, the people in charge there, it's an absolute disaster. It's just been about projecting power. They need to project power in Europe through Ukraine.

They want to project power in the Middle East through Israel, through Saudi Arabia, through the military bases all throughout the Gulf. The regime change with Maduro is just simply about projecting power in Venezuela, grabbing the oil. It's kind of maddening as an American to see this because I want us to do the right thing. It's not a lot to ask for. I just want us to be on the right side

with the good guys, essentially, and to stop trying to just project power everywhere, because what's going on in Lebanon, what's going on in Gaza, what's going on in Europe right now? The tensions are flaring up, and there's just no calm head in D.C. Trump's not doing it. No one's coming out saying, "Let's calm the tensions in Europe."

I mean, for Christ's sake, we're in North America. We're not even in Europe. We're not even in the Middle East. We're completely isolated with the oceans around us. And essentially, Americans feel completely safe, like none of this affects them. And the reason that these wars break out is because in the Middle East, we're attacking people. Because in Europe, the U.S. overthrew the Ukrainian government. Because in Venezuela, understand, it was like, what, a 30-minute conflict at that point? But you just kidnapped the president in the middle of the night. I don't think there is, you know, an Israeli—of course there's an Israeli influence, but it's not like Israel's controlling America.

I feel like that's a scapegoat that a lot of Americans use. They say everything that's happening in the Middle East, it's because Israel controls us. We have no control over it. I mean, guys, it's our military. Our military is a thousand times stronger than the Israelis'. We are the ones that are allowing them to just massacre and occupy Lebanon and Gaza. We are the ones that bombed Iran, what, like six hours ago, yet again, against the southern coast. We are the ones that are giving Saudi Arabia the bombs to attack the Houthis in Yemen. Every base in Iraq—I mean, literally Iraq 2003, Syria 2011. We can go to Afghanistan, Libya. We can go far back to Serbia if we want to. Now with Ukraine, Venezuela, the list goes on and on.

I just want to point that out, that for everyone listening, I fully—and I could be wrong—I fully reject this idea that Trump is being influenced by the Israelis to that extent, to where we've walked into a trap, essentially. There goes my lights. I think this is essentially just exactly what the U.S. wants. They want to reject any multipolar world as possible. That's by using Ukraine to weaken Russia. That's why using Israel, in my opinion, to make sure Iran does not emerge as a global or just a regional power throughout the Middle East. They want to attack the proxies, using Israel to do so. And if Israel is strong in the Middle East, America is strong in the Middle East.

If Ukraine is this monstrous state that's being used, every weapon they want to test out, they give it to Ukrainians and say, "I don't know, just fire it that way and see what happens." Slams into a bus full of children. "Oh, it's a Ukrainian missile, not ours." And that's essentially what's going on. And now they're going to pivot to China. That's the next target in the next few years. Hopefully never. Hopefully never. I mean, that's going to be really bad. But whether it's going to be remilitarizing Japan, whether it's going to be poking North Korea, or obviously it might boil down to Taiwan, and U. S. weapons are just going to funnel right in there as the tensions flare up.

But I have a question for Professor Diesen and Mr. Poliansky, whoever wants to answer this right now. You know, I don't want to, like, reiterate, you know, try to get you guys to defend my position type of thing. But you guys probably—you've been in this a lot longer than I am. You guys are exposed to a lot more than I am. I just want to know, is it totally out of the realm of possibility that,

you know, this is what America wants? And, you know, sadly, as an American, me saying this, is it kind of going to be this way forever? Because this is the ultimate American goal, to suppress any country from being stronger. Professor Diesen, you can answer that first.

#Glenn Diesen

Well, in terms of the U.S. having a hegemonic policy, then yes, it does have to prevent the rise of rivals. And this was even built into the U.S. security strategy very explicitly, at least in 2002. That is, prevent one state or a group of states from ever having the opportunity to even challenge the United States. This goes all the way back to the Wolfowitz Doctrine after the Cold War, when the United States even viewed with some concern—that is, only a few months after the Soviet Union had collapsed—Japan or Germany becoming too powerful. Again, it's not about intentions; it's about capabilities. There can only be one center of power.

And this is seen as being the source of hegemonic peace. Now, when you say America, I think within the United States there's some divisions in terms of what they see being the main path forward. I think many people, they want to revive the hegemonic era, and this has to be achieved by defeating rivals, while others see this as being a very problematic proposition, that is, the U.S. risks the republic itself if it continues to try to develop the empire. But again, the main challenge, I think, for the United States, and to understand why it's difficult for the U.S., we can say, well, they have to just transition from this hegemonic peace towards multipolarity.

Well, it has completely different assumptions about what creates peace. If you have a multipolar world, peace is created by having the great powers come together and manage the security competition. That is, if the U.S. has more security, there's more insecurity for China, and vice versa. So essentially, in a multipolar world, you have to manage the security competition. Then, to do this, you have to put yourself in the shoes of the opponent. You have to understand, well, what are the security concerns of the Russians? What do they fear? If we do this, how would they react? How can we find different pathways to indivisible security in which we elevate security on both sides?

This is what you would do in a multipolar system. But this is very different from hegemonic peace. As I said, in a hegemonic peace, you don't have to care about what the other side says or how worried they are. And this is kind of what you heard from William Perry, the Secretary of Defense under Clinton. He made the point that everyone in the Clinton administration knew that expanding NATO would alienate the Russians, but kind of the logic was, who cares? They're weak then. Well, that was in the '90s, and they're getting weaker. We just have to manage their decline. But this is hegemonic peace.

Peace depends on only being one center of power. Be so dominant that it doesn't matter what other states say. So it's a completely different idea about what creates peace. And also, it's supplemented by an ideology that this hegemonic peace isn't even seen as being aggressive or authoritarian or confrontational. It's linked up to liberal hegemony. That is, by having the U.S. and the political West

dominate the world, they genuinely believe that they would elevate the role of liberal democratic values, and we would transition away from this chaotic world of the past towards this liberal democratic order under U.S. leadership. And we have a whole political class across the West who's been raised in this, and they genuinely believe in this.

They think that it's not possible for order and peace in the world unless the West dominates. And so it's a very difficult thing for the U.S. to simply recognize, okay, well, the distribution of power has shifted now. We're no longer dominant. I guess we have to go to a multipolar world. So for this reason, I think it's quite natural that within the U.S. there's going to be a lot of divisions. But I think there's political groups, which are often represented by the likes of, well, Tucker Carlson, for example, that are growing very much in strength because they recognize they have to adjust to new realities, which is that the hegemonic peace approach to security will destroy the United States, and they see it as a necessity to move in the other direction.

And this, I think, is kind of new for the U.S., this recognition that, well, maybe the hegemony didn't serve our interests. Look at the '90s, what kind of position the U.S. was in. And this was a common thing people warned about in the '90s. If you're going to go for this hegemonic peace, most likely the U.S. will exhaust its resources from within. That's going to cause massive economic problems. It's going to manifest itself in social and political polarization and difficulties. And meanwhile, trying to keep the other rising powers of the world down would incentivize them to come together to collectively balance the United States. And, well, you're seeing all of the above.

So this was predictable. So many now are arguing, okay, obviously this path is not sustainable. Let's chart a new course. And this is for the United States to pull a bit back and build up its strength and not have this dominant position. But I think you have this infighting within the U.S., and that's kind of evident also by how the America First camp has suddenly broken into a very different interpretation. Is America First to restore American dominance, or is America First to adjust to new realities? That is, make peace with the Russians, reduce the presence in the Middle East, adjust to the actual distribution of power? I'll stop going on now, because...

#Elizabeth Lane

No, no, you're right. You're absolutely right. And you see this division with MAGA and America First, because I'm America First. I'm joking. I'm a Tucker Carlson type of person who supports these people and Thomas Massie. And we thought, and Ethan can agree here, we thought that MAGA was America First. We thought that America is going to come back to its people. But all of a sudden, MAGA ended up Israel first. Now, I also agree with Ethan. I don't think a tiny little country of Israel can control anything unless people here domestically allow it. Because no other country—I mean, look at Russia. Go control Russia when you're Italy or France, or, yeah, you're gonna fail.

You're gonna fail because the Russian president will tell you to fuck off, you know, because it's not your business. Well, we are not telling that to Israel, and Ethan is right. We are using Israel and

Ukraine because when you go into wars like this and when you create constant conflict in the world, you need a fall guy. And Israel was created as that fall guy in the beginning. Who created Israel? It was the British Empire. And then they outsourced feeding Israel to us. So we'll create it, don't worry, guys, we will create it, but you feed the monster for us because you can, because America was always the, you know, this, uh, milk cow for them, right? So that has ended.

It came to an end, and they are panicking. They don't know what to do anymore because Americans can't support these regime changes and constant wars anymore. Their economy is feeling it. Our economy is feeling it. Europe is gone completely. So I agree with Ethan. Yes, there is this attempt: let's use Israel. And if Israel goes down with all of this, we don't care. You know, at least we'll destroy half of the Muslim world, at least at some level. They are committing genocide in Gaza, and they are trying to completely destabilize Lebanon. And, you know, Ukraine will be another sacrificial pig for us against Russia. That's what's going on here. And there are two empires behind this.

That's British Empire and American Empire. Now, what we need to really work on in the United States is identifying these very bad-faith players in politics, like Lindsey Grahams of the world. He's not alive anymore, so I'm going to not talk about Lindsey Graham anymore, but similar people like him. So, and it's very interesting that the president of the United States comes out and says, "No, it's not Israel. It's my decisions. I'm doing it." Trump did it countless times, came out and said, "No one controls me. I know what I'm doing." And then you have Marco Rubio coming out, "Well, Israel started this. We went in." Remember that speech of Marco Rubio, who said, "No, it was Israel"? So Marco Rubio has always been a neocon. He has always been this warmonger. So if the warmongers are blaming Israel, but the president of the United States comes out and says, "No, no, I'm pretty aware of what's going on."

I'm doing this myself. Like, you know, you see the division right there. And these guys cannot even agree who started what. Then you have Joe Kent, who has to resign because the situation is so bad. And when I asked Joe Kent, "Joe, you were there as one of the high-level, you know, intel officers, right? You were in intelligence. Who controls this country? Who runs this country?" And Joe's answer was, "I don't know." Like, you know, that says everything. So anyway, yeah, I agree with Glenn. And we have a quick question here that I want to, guys, send to—I'll get to it. ADN, our girl, is sending a question saying, "What is the difference between Ukraine versus Russia culture?" So I guess this is for Dmitry. What would you, Dmitry, say is the difference between these two cultures? Ethan, take over for a second. I'll be right back. But yes, go ahead.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Well...

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

I think that for some people, it's really a problem to understand the similarities between Ukrainian and Russian culture. And many people base their assumption that these are two absolutely different historical nations and that they have their own values, they have their own way of life. But this is not how we view it in Russia, because historically, Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians were three elements of one and the same people, and that happened for many centuries. Yes, there were divergences, some linguistic divergences, some cultural divergences, which are easily explained throughout history, because this part of Russian people was historically, for many centuries, influenced by Lithuanians, by Poles, then by Austrians, and of course, it had a certain bearing on this population.

But in a sense, it still remained part of the same people. That's why in the Russian Empire, there was no such notion as Ukraine. There was a notion of Little Russia, Great Russia, and White Russia. So for us, still, we see and we feel that a lot of differences that are being highlighted between Russia and Ukraine are very much superficial. Even the linguistic things—it's not a secret, it's not a revelation—that the majority of the Ukrainian population still speaks Russian as their mother tongue, be them Ukrainians or Russians, whatever.

Even during the last scandal, when there was this fighting between two Ukrainian special services, I think it was very much publicized in different media, many people noticed that they were speaking Russian to each other because that's their native language. It was too hard for them to use Ukrainian when it was about, you know, a very emotional thing. So they switched to Russian. And this is the real proof that Russian culture in Ukraine is still very much present. And it's very deplorable that people start to make their political capital on the assumption that Russian culture should be wiped off from Ukraine, that Ukrainian culture should be put instead. It's a bit artificial.

I'm not saying this to kind of belittle Ukrainian heritage, Ukrainian identity. And also, it's very important to say that you will never find in any statements of our politicians that we want to do away with Ukrainian identity. We always respected from day one, from the independence of Ukraine, that there is a Ukrainian identity. I remember there was always a Ukrainian cultural center right in the heart of Moscow, in Arbat Street, where you could get books in Ukrainian. There were Ukrainian subjects taught in Russian schools. No problem about this. We still have Ukrainian names, top names in Moscow. We have Kievskaya metro station. We have a lot of things related to Ukraine. Nobody is thinking that we should rename them because this is still part of our culture.

So I think that this should be respected, and people should be given the possibility to remain who they are without any imposition on them of a different identity, without making Ukrainians out of Russians. And it's not a political problem. They were living in a different state, and we were quite happy about it. We were okay about this until the moment when this project "anti-Russia" started to be implemented in Ukraine. That was the start of all the problems that we have right now. And we

want the situation back to the moment when Ukraine was normal, when Ukraine was respecting Russian culture, when Ukraine was not a threat for us. We are very happy with the situation, and we would be very much looking forward to it returning back.

#Elizabeth Lane

Amazing. So we've got a few more questions. I want to see if you have something as well that you want to add on. Can you hear me? Oh, I don't know. Yeah, there we go. So we have a few more questions. What does Russia believe Washington's ultimate objective in Ukraine is, or has been? That's for Dimitri, I'm guessing, as well.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Well, I don't think that we are looking through rosy glasses at what is happening and what was happening. And again, the revelations, one of which Glenn mentioned, revelations of the New York Times, clearly show the impression. Everyone remembers Victoria Nuland, her revelations about how much money was invested in Ukraine. But the question is, what kind of US is being meant in your question? Because the US is very different, and sometimes it's very difficult to understand who really calls the shots in American politics. The US is very mercurial. So one day it's one position, another day it's another position. So we should be speaking maybe about different administrations. It was quite clear what the Biden administration, Obama administration was wanting in Ukraine.

No doubts about it. And I think that it's not a problem to formulate what they wanted. So they wanted to create problems for Russia. They wanted to kind of weaken Russia, to involve Russia into some kind of conflict, and they succeeded to a large extent in doing so, unfortunately. What Trump administration wants from Ukraine—there are different opinions about this. Again, we engage with them because they really offer certain solutions that might lead us to peaceful negotiations, to the situation when we will be able to stop our special military operation because its goals would be achieved otherwise. It's the preference that we voiced from day one. That's why we're engaging.

But again, we don't have any rosy glasses there. We understand that at the same time, the United States is still providing weapons to Ukraine. The United States is still providing information, intelligence information. Elon Musk is still providing Starlink internet communication, which is very crucial for the Ukrainian army. So we have absolutely no illusions about this. We understand these are the things that are on the table, and I'm quite sure that my leaders, when they speak to Americans, they are also very mindful about these things. They are not trying to see the situation through much better optics than they are. But, well, coming back to your point, by the way, Elizabeth, you are speaking about a multipolar world, and I think that we are still at the very initial stage of this process, which might be lengthy, which might be difficult, which might create a lot of problems.

And the United States, whether someone wants it or not, looks to still be one of the poles of this world. And I don't think that it makes any problems for Russia that we will have to deal with the United States. We will have to acknowledge that the United States is a great country, is a great power, like China, like India, like Brazil, like others. It's not a problem for us, but sometimes it looks like this is a problem for the United States because there are very controversial statements. On the one hand, we don't want to be world policemen and come to help every time when needed. On the other hand, we see that still there is a lot of inertia in the United States in what concerns the multipolar world, and still there is a big and clear longing for this Pax Americana, which was the source of a lot of problems for the world and is still a source of a lot of problems right now. So we analyze the whole picture in all this complexity, and we are not naive people, I can assure you.

#Elizabeth Lane

Amazing. One more question here, guys. We probably will go another 15 minutes, so send your questions if you want it to be read. So, Dmitry, can you tell us more about Bucha? Ukraine claims Russia committed war crimes. Yeah, this has been a big thing. Okay, this Bucha thing, because they propagandize Bucha so badly that, oh my gosh, Russia committed genocide, killed all these people. So maybe explain to us what happened. And then, just so that people don't think that we are biased here, Dmitry is never biased, even though he's a representative of one country. He tries to be. He tries to be very fair, like he says what he believes. But I'm going to go to Ethan and Glenn Diesen on Bucha as well. So go ahead, Dmitry, you first.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

I try to be always open-minded, and I try to base my assumptions on the basis of facts. That's what I'm doing. Before I start with Bucha, I can tell you that there are a number of provocations against Russia which are based on some very doubtful assumptions, to put it mildly. One of them is, by the way, this recent provocation in Leipzig, because also there are some claims, no proof, and there is already a verdict that Russia is to blame, and measures are taken against Russia. It's very similar to Bucha in this sense. So, just a number of facts that I put on the table.

First, Russia and Ukraine agree on a certain basic draft treaty, which is being initialed by the Ukrainian delegation and which has the green light of Zelensky. I think this is common knowledge already. Then comes this call from President Macron saying that you guys have already achieved what you want. So, as a gesture of goodwill, please withdraw from this territory. This will make the situation much better, create a much better context. We said, okay, no problem. We're doing this. So one of the places we withdrew from is Bucha. This is a suburb of Kyiv, very close to the capital, to the Ukrainian capital. And look at the facts. We withdraw.

Immediately after we withdraw, there is a video showing the mayor of the city, very jubilant, saying that it is back to Ukraine, that there are no Russians there. "I congratulate all my compatriots with

this. It's a big day for Ukraine." Okay, can you imagine a mayor of the city being jubilant and not mentioning that there are bodies in the street at the same time when Russians withdrew from the city? Those were the claims that appeared two days after this video from the mayor of the city. It's very hard to imagine such things. Well, there are a lot of discrepancies in the coverage of these bodies. They are being placed in a kind of very clear order, I would say, like chess order.

So it's very strange for them to be there, not in a chaotic way, but in a strange situation like this. The state of their clothes, the decomposition of the bodies, which never occurred despite the fact that allegedly they should have stayed there for a number of days, it's also very suspicious, to put it mildly, and it is being pointed out by a number of experts. It's only several facts from a long list of discrepancies that are very obvious about Bucha. I remember myself vividly this situation because immediately when this provocation happened, I was at the United Nations. It was Sunday, I remember. And we immediately asked for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. And Britain was president of the Security Council in April of 2022. And they absolutely disregarded our request.

As simple as this, they were supposed to call for a meeting. The moment we asked for them, they simply disregarded. They said, "We don't think that this is necessary to discuss this situation." Can you imagine? And of course, it reveals to a certain extent their attitude towards this situation. Again, as I mentioned before, there are a number of witnesses. One of them is a French journalist, Mr. Bouquet, who was brought there by Ukrainians as part of this propaganda team and who witnessed himself this propaganda thing in the making. And because of this thing, I think he was not able to live with this, and he decided to reveal that this was totally made by the British intelligence together with Ukrainian intelligence.

So again, you shouldn't be a biased person or an unbiased person just to get all the facts together and to see that this is at least very suspicious. And what we did after that, first of all, of course, we never accepted any wrongdoing in Bucha. Secondly, we from the outset insisted that Ukraine should give to the international community, not necessarily to us, but to the United Nations, for example, the list of the names of people whose bodies were in Bucha, for everybody to be able to check where these people came from. Ukrainians never did this, despite all our approaches to the United Nations Secretary-General. I think it was a dozen of them.

The Secretary is saying that he is unable to get this list from Ukrainians. This also shows that they have a lot of secrets to conceal here. But one thing is for sure: what Bucha is. Bucha has become this turning point. It was very important for the United Kingdom, for the Kiev regime, for the others, to kind of convince the public opinion that Russia is evil, that everybody should fight Russia. Because this coincided with this turning point when the Brits talked the Ukrainian Zelensky regime out of making peace with Russia. And it was also necessary to prove this necessity to European public opinion, which was still a little bit reluctant at this time.

But when they saw these alleged Russian crimes in Bucha, when they kind of succumbed to these attempts to make animals out of Russian soldiers, it was easier for these ruling elites to convince

Europe that it should be behind Ukraine, that everybody should fight Russians, because Russians are not human. This was the start of all this Russophobia campaign. And this was a very wrong start, the start from a provocation, the start from a clear made-up and false flag operation, which hasn't been proven otherwise despite all our efforts at this point.

#Elizabeth Lane

Great answer, and thank you so much for a detailed answer. So, I have to ask this because, you know, there are people who actually understand what's really going on with Russia-Ukraine. They don't side with Ukraine, they don't care, but they still want to know: what is the relationship between Vladimir Putin and Israel? Because people are so angry at Israel for what they're doing right now. And Russia has condemned Israel on multiple occasions. But they still claim that there's some type of secret relationship between Zionists and Vladimir Putin. So I'll go with Glenn first. Like, Glenn, have you ever heard of this? And if so, what causes all of this?

#Glenn Diesen

Well, I think they always had a bit of a close relationship. I remember in 2018, I got to talk a bit with Ehud Olmert, the former prime minister, in Kazakhstan, and he was making the point that Israel and Russia would always have close ties because of the Russians liberating Auschwitz and all of this history, and also because from the Russian side, there's a lot of Russian speakers from the Soviet Union who reside now in Israel, who are Israelis. So, you know, all of these things are often cited for having close relations. It's interesting, though, that they often find each other on opposing sides, such as they did in Syria.

But nonetheless, they both have been able, seemingly, to hold a well, professional relationship. That is, even though you're on the opposite side, you can still have the diplomacy and manage these differences. I think some things began to crack a bit over the past few years. That is, as well, one, the Israelis began to provide a lot of weapons and all assistance to Zelenskyy. This was seen as being very problematic. And then, of course, I think the Russian geopolitical position has shifted. That is, after 2014, it began to link its economy—well, even before, but especially since 2014—Russia began to link its economy more towards the East.

And then it looked towards China, India, but also, to a lesser extent, Iran. And I know that during the war in Syria, the Russians were able to work with Iran, deal with some historical differences that were already being resolved. And the Russians had an objective to transition a bit from this very limited cooperation over Syria, to widen it and anchor it in something more sustainable. So, essentially what we're seeing today. So I think that for this reason, Russia and the Israelis have drifted a bit further away from each other. But again, we should probably ask our Russian colleague here, who probably has a much better grasp on this than me.

#Elizabeth Lane

David, before you answer, someone here also says, isn't Putin close to Chabad-Lubavitch also? So this Chabad-Lubavitch thing has been going on forever. So I'll tell you what the conspiracy is, and maybe you can enlighten us. So the conspiracy is that Putin is a planted opposition in the globalist circles. And this comes from the fact that Putin tried to be part of, like, European countries, World Economic Forum thing, and Klaus Schwab mentioned him as one of the young leaders. I guess Putin is not young, but according to him, Putin was young back then.

So he mentioned Putin a few times. So Americans are very much into these conspiracies that Putin might be a planted opposition, and he's allowing this too. And he's allowing this war in Ukraine and Russia. Now, again, this is a conspiracy. Whether we like it or not, it exists, so might as well address it. And Chabad leaders, this Chabad-Lubavitch and stuff like that, they are all over this. So the idea is that, correct me if I'm wrong, Ethan, the idea is that Jews control everything.

#Ethan Levins

Yeah, let me jump in on that because it's freaking maddening to see the people online trying to, like, connect dots. They find, like, a photo of Putin around some rabbis or something. They lose their minds, like, "Oh, look, Putin is one of them," or whatever. You know, it's kind of crazy how shocked these people are that the prime minister of Israel and the president of Russia, two nuclear powers—it's just like people can't fathom. They can't wrap their heads around that nuclear countries kind of want to have decent relations.

I want every country with a nuclear weapon to at least talk to each other and have decent relations. That's kind of how the world should work. And also, if Putin is some secret Israeli spy that some of these people like to throw out there, I would like to say that he's the worst one ever, if he is, because I would like to look at Iran. I would like to look at Syria. Who were the Russians fighting in Syria? Oh yeah, they were fighting alongside Bashar al-Assad against ISIS, al-Qaeda, and essentially everyone, all those freaking animals that the Israelis were battling.

#Elizabeth Lane

Ethan, all these organizations that happen to never attack Israel. Like, they are just terrorist organizations that happen to never attack Israel. Of course. And then you have Israeli intel officers coming out and, you know, telling us that we are all in a Truman Show that they created. And then when we say, okay, then it's your fault, they're like, wait, wait, wait, we didn't do it. We didn't do anything. No, no, are you this powerful or are you not? Like, you decide. Right.

#Ethan Levins

Yeah, because if you accuse them of being too powerful, then they just lose their minds. Oh, no, no, they are not. I know. To wrap up the thing on Putin, because I get a lot of people that message me and comment stuff on my posts like that, and it's just maddening. And I just point to the simple fact

that if he is some Mr. Poliansky, if Putin is some secret Israeli spy, let us know. But I don't, you know, I think we're all in agreement that if he was, he would be the worst one ever, because the Russians continuously condemn what happened in Gaza. They continuously condemn what's happening in Lebanon, continuously condemn what's happening across the Middle East. Yet they condemn the Israeli wars, the American wars on Iran.

You know, if there's some weird back channel going on between Israel and Russia, that's kind of a good thing, guys. They both have nuclear weapons. Let's make sure that something doesn't spark out over Syria, and nothing did, thankfully. But Russia has interests in the Middle East, and a lot of the times, especially very recently over the past decade, they have directly conflicted with Israel, whether it was in Syria, especially whether it is in Iran right now. The Russians and Iranians, they develop technology together. They're not as close as Israel and America, obviously. But this weird internet conspiracy that they like to point out, that like, oh, Putin's friends with Jewish leaders. That's kind of what a president of a country has to do.

Russia does have a historic Jewish population. You know, Russia, in the Constitution, guarantees religious freedom. There's Orthodox Christians in South Russia. There's a lot of Muslims. And, you know, shocker to everyone, the third most spoken language in Israel is Russian. So the president of Russia is going to have moderate relations with the prime ministers of Israel. You know, just to shut that down for anyone watching that likes to put that out there. You know, someone literally paid money to say that. That's crazy. I want to point out. But Russia has their own interests in the Middle East. They conflict a lot with the United States, obviously. And in doing so, they conflict with Israel. And we can see what happened in Syria. We can see what happened in Iran.

Russia and Israel are just not on the same side. So if Putin is some sort of backchannel Mossad agent that people like to shout online, he does a very poor job at that. And also, just saying that, it just shows that you know nothing about—you know, I don't want to be mean to people—but it's a very lack of knowledge of geopolitics if someone just assumes the presidents are just somehow secret Mossad agents that are working with certain religious groups. It's absolutely bonkers, and it makes all of us look kind of crazy whenever we are—I'm anti-Israel. I'm sure a lot of people here might be, but I think the Israelis do some very bad things across the Middle East. They like to project their power alongside the U.S., and it isn't like Russia is directly opposing the Israelis.

You know, there's not some shadow war going on throughout the Middle East. I don't think so. I think Russia simply looked at what was happening in Syria and said, "Our interests are under attack. We're going to defend our interests." And now it's going on in Iran. It's the same point in time. Russia is not going to get directly involved. There's going to be, you know, none of that going on. But Russia is going to defend their interests, defend countries that are allied with them. And in doing so, it should be quite clear that Russia and Israel are not on the same side, I guess you would say, in this global conspiracy-type of network. I don't think what I'm saying is a conspiracy in itself.

I think I'm just pointing out the obvious facts on this, that Israel wants to expand in the Middle East. Russia would not like to see Israel expand in the Middle East, like the majority of the world as well. Every power in Europe is kind of on that same diplomatic standpoint, that the West Bank settlements are bad, the occupation of Lebanon is bad, the war in Gaza is bad. Russia is fully agreeing with that, just like the majority of the world. The U.S. and Israel are kind of the sole countries at the U.N. that are rejecting ceasefires. They're rejecting settlements. They're rejecting any agreement that could, you know, kind of resolve this Iranian issue completely of nuclear weapons that they've been, what, allegedly building for 47 years.

So obviously Iran doesn't—I'm ranting—but obviously Iran doesn't want a nuclear weapon, or they would have made one by now. Or either they're the worst scientists in the world at producing a nuclear weapon, because it's been decades. They're obviously hedging, but if you're enriching uranium and not creating a bomb, that doesn't mean that you're allowed to get attacked and your leader assassinated. That's just not how the world works. We can see what's going on in Ukraine. Like the Russians said the other day, I believe they said this. Somebody asked a question, or either an analyst responded: why haven't the Russians taken out Zelensky or the government offices?

You've got to have someone to negotiate with. You just have to have someone to talk with in these types of conflicts. And with the Iranians, you see, when you take out a leader, the country really rallies around that. And it's a really bad idea to do so. And the U.S. is stuck in the quagmire now in Iran. And everything that the Russians did is essentially what the Americans didn't do. The U.S. went in and said, well, assassinate the leaders. We're going to just kind of throw our hands up. Whatever happens in the region is going to explode. The Russians went in with a plan in Ukraine. I promise, it's pretty simple.

I'm sure you guys understand this, that a few missiles can pretty much level the entire capital city. It's not hard to do. I promise the Russian military is a lot stronger than the Israeli military, but the Russians haven't done that. And that is where I'm going to really rant now. I'm going to let you guys talk, but I really wanted to point out the hypocrisy of that, that the European leaders are going to sit there and, yeah, they condemn Israel and they condemn the Americas—the United States—but they're essentially participating, if not supporting, what's going on in Iran. They want to condemn the Iranians. They want to condemn all these groups across the Middle East. Well, what Israel's doing to Gaza is what the Russians could do to Ukraine in about a week.

But the Russians have decided not to exterminate Ukraine as a country, like the Israelis have done to southern Lebanon, to Gaza, to the West Bank, to the Golan Heights, like the United States wants to do to southern Iran. I just want to point that out there to everyone listening, that the reason that a lot of people, the entire world, is against Israel right now is because they have essentially taken every international law, taken every, you know, drop of humanity in that region and essentially disregarded it and said, "We want this land. If you're in the way, we're going to kill you." I've been to Lebanon. I've seen the homes. I've seen the shops. There was a hospital the other day that was

blown up in the south of the country. There was a school in Abatea, in Lebanon, that this morning was destroyed.

You know, if Russia wanted to destroy Kharkiv, they wanted to destroy Kyiv. They were on the doorsteps of that in 2022. And last time I checked, there's concerts happening in these cities. And it's just maddening, just to wrap it all up. It's maddening to see these online conspiracies that are just solely incorrect, that don't listen to people like Professor Diesen and Mr. Polyansky, who know a lot more than they do. But they like to shout at the moon, especially these European politicians. They like to shout at the moon that Russia is some genocidal bear. Look, if Russia wanted to do it, they could do it. They have decided not to. And the European leaders have got to understand that the reason that they still exist—Mrs. Kaja Kallas in Estonia, what a strong army you have, what, like 15,000 people?

Okay, I've got more people in my county than you do. These people, these leaders, need to understand that essentially, by the grace of God, what's happening in Ukraine is still limited. It's still what could be described as a military operation. And if they want to keep escalating—I'm wrapping it up now, I'm sorry, guys—if they want to keep escalating across Europe, Russia can show them what escalation is. And once we hit that tipping point they're so excited to get to for some weird reason, there's going to be no turning back. And like we've seen in the Middle East, this is an escalation, and people are dying. Thousands of people are dying. If a single drone hit Antwerp, Belgium, they would have no idea how to handle the situation. But apparently that's what they want. And I'm done with my rant, but I had to get that out there.

#Elizabeth Lane

It was an important rant, so thank you, Ethan. Important rant for policy here. So the person that sent the question also sent this, and people are understanding this now. Like, Americans are getting smarter. Europeans—well, only European people, not the politicians—are getting smarter. And as far as European politicians go, I honestly believe they live in a different reality. So they are handpicked for their jobs. And look at Merz. Merz could not believe what happened with the far-right party, or right conservative party. So he couldn't believe it. He was, like, you know, seriously shocked. It's not like he pretended to be. No, no, he was shocked, and he cannot understand what caused this. What caused this is the fact that when your pipelines were blown up by us, and then Ukraine got blamed, of course, because Ukraine is the bad guy now.

Like I said, the scapegoat, you did nothing. When Germans told you that they have a hard time in Germany to even survive and live, and they are leaving the country, you did nothing. You told your own citizens that they are not important and you're going to support Ukraine. And now, you know, things are changing, things are happening, and they're, like, shocked. How is this even possible? You made it possible. So it's crazy. But I see Alyssa's question real quick. And then five minutes, we got

to wrap up. During an academic symposium, a Finnish military chaplain shared that the bodies from Bucha were reburied last year. I think they will have to be researched for a long time. I'm not sure what she's referring to. Dmitry, do you know what she's referring to?

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

I think she's referring to the fact that there is no more evidence to study, and actually it will be very hard to determine the real circumstances of this Bucha provocation, and that's exactly what the Kiev regime and its sponsors were aiming at from day one. But it doesn't convince anybody. I think that open-minded people totally understand that this thing is fishy, to put it mildly, and there has not been any proof of Russia's involvement, and that's where we are. Coming back to what was discussed previously, frankly, I am a little bit at a loss what you expect me to comment, because this was an emotional conversation. A number of topics were raised, but being a diplomat, I have this privilege of not commenting on conspiracy theories, and I don't think you expect me to do so.

I just want to mention that we have traditional relations with Israel, and there are special reasons for that, for our bonds, because, as Glenn rightly said, a big part of the Israeli population has come from Russia and Russian-speaking countries of the former Soviet Union. We share the same approach towards the results of the Second World War and towards the glorification of Nazism by Ukrainians. And this is one of the very difficult points in Israel-Ukrainian relations: how to view these Nazi criminals and what they did. But having said this, if you analyze our statements at the Security Council, my statements, Ambassador Nebenzia's statements during the course of this Gaza crisis, you will see that we were absolutely calling a spade a spade.

Unlike very many others who were trying to sugarcoat all the messages to Israel, to the others, we believe that Israel has the right to be in the Middle East. It has its own interests, including security interests, but of course it shouldn't be done at the expense of Palestinians, of Arabs. And there is an international framework, which we respect: Israel and Palestine as independent states, Israel in the borders of 1967. I can claim no longer to be a Middle Eastern expert, working for already nine months here in Vienna, but still I can tell you that Russia has a very principled position. Russia has friends in Arabic countries, and we never betrayed our friends.

We also have special relations with Israel. We keep these relations, but we call a spade a spade all the time, with Americans, with Israelis, with anybody else. And one little comment also to what Ethan said about Russia not making things in Ukraine similar to what Israel did in Gaza. You should bear in mind that these are also our people, and we also have to be mindful of that, that these are our brothers and sisters, regardless of what others will say. Many people in my country call what is happening a civil war, and there is a lot of reasoning to this because there are two parts of the same people fighting each other, and this is a big tragedy for us, for everybody.

And you shouldn't also forget that more than 7 million Ukrainians found refuge in Russia after what happened in Ukraine in 2014. These people, they are Ukrainians. They want to come back to their

country, but at the same time, they consider Russia to be their second motherland. And they are very much welcome in Russia. So it wouldn't be possible if our people hated each other, as some people in Europe or elsewhere would claim. So you shouldn't forget about this, that we can't conduct this military operation not being mindful of the fact that these are also our people, and we're very much kind of trying to save as many lives as possible and, at the same time, to make peace, to make fair peace, and to prove that our positions, our approaches are right for the benefit of Russia, for the benefit of Ukraine, and for the benefit of everybody in Europe as well.

#Elizabeth Lane

Thank you, Dimitri. Glenn, I'll give you a moment to kind of comment and wrap it up, but I want to do something kind of hilarious and show you guys why so many Russian-speaking people are in Israel, because I don't know if any of you dived into Epstein files, but I have extensively. It's very important when you have this pedophile going around, like, you know, having close relationships with British royalty, CIA, MI6, and all these people. I mean, we are, of course, ignoring that in America because let's not talk about Epstein, right? Especially it was a hoax. So, but I posted an interesting video in which Ehud Barak, former prime minister of Israel, is talking about Russians. And he's discussing this with Epstein. It's very funny, guys.

He says that he wants to import one million Russians into Israel because Russians are pretty and Israelis are not, you know. I'm sorry, just very funny. And he wants to mix the... He says that now that Israel gets to choose what kind of immigration they can carry out, they're going to pick one million Russians because they look good. And Jerusalem Post doesn't have a problem with him speaking with a pedophile with these plans, like these serious plans, like we're talking about his country and one million foreigners, right? So Israeli posts didn't have any problems with that. They had a problem that he said that Israelis are ugly and Russians are pretty. That's the problem they had. Nothing else. Not the fact that he was speaking with a pedophile, making future plans for Israel. So I want to play this really quick for you guys. This is real.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

And then we have, I believe, we have to break the monopoly of the Orthodox rabbinate on marriage and funerals and whatever, and the definition of a Jew, and accept, open, in a sophisticated, subtle manner, open the gates for massive conversion into Judaism. It's a successful concept. Many will apply at the beginning without making it a precondition, but under the social pressure, the need, especially of the second generation to adapt, it will happen. And we can control the quality much more effectively than our ancestors or the founding fathers of Israel could deal with the wave that was a kind of salvation wave from North Africa, from the Arabs, from whatever. They took whatever came just to save people. Now we can be selective.

#Elizabeth Lane

So, guys, now they can be selective, okay? And they can control the quality. Talking about eugenics and Hitler, I'm just saying. So, Ehud Barak, Dmitry, they want to be selective, and they want to, you know, import one million Russians to better their genes, I guess. Not my words. Don't get mad at me. Ehud Barak is talking about this, okay? It was not me. It was Ehud Barak who said this. So, why do you think he wants to better his genes with your people? I'm sorry. It's just very funny.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Very strange questions indeed, one that I didn't expect at all in this show. But I can tell you for sure there are beautiful Russians and ugly Russians. There are beautiful Israelis and ugly Israelis. I think that this is a matter of taste. And again... ask him.

#Elizabeth Lane

Right, exactly. I don't know. He would not come to my show. I mean, he's invited if he wants to. But isn't it weird that we are talking about something like that with an Israeli prime minister who openly said, "Let's control the quality." Quality of what? People? People? So then you have the same guys, like Ehud Barak, similar to Ehud Barak, in power, Bibi Netanyahu, calling, you know, Arabs Amalek, and it's almost like they kind of hate, you know, Semites and brown people in the Middle East, but they're also brown. So it's like, I don't know, like a self-hatred thing, or like what's going on.

I don't know. Maybe Glenn or Ethan can chime in and help me here, because I honestly don't know what the hell he was talking about. Like, I don't know. It just—it's real. The conversation is real. And there are many Russians, and he was trying to—later in the conversation, he says, "I want to convince Vladimir Putin to get one million Russians here." Obviously, he mentioned the agenda. He also wants to put Orthodox Jews in the minority because they don't like him. So that's another intention. Any comments on this, Ethan, Glenn?

#Ethan Levins

They just know that it's just a demographic thing. The Israelis have a perpetual fear of a Muslim-majority country, or something along those lines. It's a perpetual fear of just losing the demographic chokehold in Israel. That's why they don't give citizenship out to people in the West Bank. They don't want to give citizenship out to a lot of Muslims within the borders of Israel itself. So I think it's just one of those off-the-record remarks about, you know, let's bring the Russians in. You know, some of them can be Jews. I guess they're white type of thing. They're not Muslim. So I guess that's what it goes for. But I would want to throw a quick question relating back to Ukraine, back to Ukraine, to Professor Diesen.

So I read something the other day that Russian drones—this could have been happening routinely, but very recently it's come to my attention—that Russian drones are now essentially Geran drones flying around the capital, Kyiv, running reconnaissance before missile strikes. And these are drones

that are flying over the capital for 30 minutes to one hour. They're picking out targets and then essentially flying wherever they want to after that point. So would you think that, going into this winter, the Russians are preparing targets to strike the capital? Are they looking for, you know, targets from striking government structures, or is it still going to be like last year, where they want to hit more energy plants to try to force Ukraine into submission?

Is it something along those lines? Because the missile strikes, the airstrikes, are escalating. There's a lot of warehouses on fire in Ukraine. There's a lot of gas stations that are out of service as well. That's limiting Ukraine's ability to launch drones of their own when you're out of gas, obviously. So do you think we could see a very severe escalation going into this winter in Ukraine due to Russian airstrikes?

#Glenn Diesen

No, I think so, because, well, for a variety of reasons. For one, as was mentioned earlier, on this new strategy of trying to improve the negotiation position, which, you know, Marco Rubio kind of hailed recently as well, which was this 40 days of deep strikes into Russia, knocking out not just refineries, but, as the Finnish president pointed out, it was a great strategy to target civilian targets deep inside Russia because this would make the Russians feel the war, and they would then put pressure on the Kremlin to put an end to the whole thing. And, um, to some extent that's happened. But when you say put an end to the war, it's not through capitulation.

I think instead, uh, they're accepting that Russia must, uh, also escalate now. So I think a consequence of this 40-day, um, period of, uh, striking by Ukraine, backed by NATO, deep inside Russia has, uh, led to the Russians now, you know, taking the gloves off and, uh, retaliating in kind. This is a controversial statement to make. Now there's a full blockade on the ports of Ukraine, which creates a massive problem for importing more weapons and general exports and trade. And also Russia's now hitting the targets it didn't hit before, that is, more aggressively hitting Kyiv as well as the other cities.

So not just energy facilities, but warehouses, everything tied up to logistics facilities, all the way down to the actual petrol stations. So I think it has many, many, many purposes. And I think you will see it for another reason, because as the position of Ukraine becomes more and more difficult now, and I would say it becomes more difficult if you measure it on the front lines, that is, there's bigger and bigger cracks along the front lines. You know, the whole drone wall doesn't work if you can't actually man the front line. You see the Russians are getting closer to Sumy, to Kharkov. Slavyansk and Kramatorsk are also now semi-encircled.

Well, not encircled yet, but it's getting there. Orekhov will probably fall over the next week or two. And then, of course, Zaporizhzhia is wide open. So you have all these things happening on the front line. The economy is a horrible mess. You're having social upheaval now because of all this aggressive activity. And in the West, you see the Europeans are running out of money. They don't

really have the weapons anymore. Ukraine's running out of air defenses. So on all measurable indicators in a war of attrition, be it the social, economic, military, political, Ukraine is in a very difficult spot. So as everything begins to crack, I would assume that Russia will probably put pressure at all these different levers. So yes, no, I expect a lot of attacks coming now, especially then on the energy facilities as well.

So no, it's going to be a very messy few months ahead, which is why I kind of—I was hoping at least that some of this revival of diplomacy could lead somewhere, because the way it looks now, if Russia doesn't get what it wants, which is restoring Ukraine's neutrality and also bringing back the basic rights of Russian speakers inside Ukraine, essentially ending this project of making Ukraine a frontline state, if it doesn't get what it wants through diplomacy, I think the approach will be to take the strategic territories. It can't afford to end up with NATO, and the rest might become a very dysfunctional rump state. So I think that's the direction it's headed. So I think I keep telling the Europeans, this is not in our interest. We're going to end up destroying a nation, and it's going to sow instability between the Europeans and the Russians for decades to come. This is a horrible path we have chosen, so we should change our path.

#Elizabeth Lane

Thank you, Glenn. And my final question—I asked this to my previous guest, Stanislav Krapivnik. So, who should lead the world? So we are reshuffling the powers in the world. And, you know, as Glenn said, a multipolar world is emerging. Well, the United States wants to be the hegemon. And, you know, Trump is trying to keep it that way. Well, at least he's the only one probably trying to keep it that way. He thinks that the actions lead to what he intends, but I think he's absolutely controlled by the deep state in there. So it's actually going to backfire. But there is no doubt that this multipolar world is emerging, but at any moment it can be destroyed. And, you know, at any moment, some country somewhere might change the order again. The question is, who should lead the world? Which country is capable morally and physically to lead the world? Let's start with Glenn.

#Ethan Levins

I'll keep this answer pretty short because everyone here is probably really busy. We're running over a lot. But everyone should lead the world. It should be a united front together on security, stability, and economic prosperity. I guess that's like the ideal, perfect answer, perfect world. Going forward, essentially the U.S. has to recognize that there is a multipolar world forming, where Russia essentially survived this attack via Ukraine from the West. So Russia is going to be there. The Chinese, economically, are obviously going to be there. And just to bubble it up in the Middle East, the Israelis are going to have to live in a world and accept—we're going to have to hope they accept—that regional powers in the Middle East are also going to exist.

#Elizabeth Lane

Glenn?

#Glenn Diesen

Well, I think by definition, a multipolar world means that it's going to be more decentralized, and also states will have to take more responsibility for their own governance. Because when you say the word hegemonic order, what it means is that a lot of the governance of the world has been outsourced to the United States. That is, the U.S. has absorbed functions that usually belong to other states. Its military dominance means that it can form military alliances, which allows it to absorb the security decisions of other states.

Its former economic dominance allowed it to absorb other economic policies, that is, write the rules for international trade organizations, set the rules for the development banks, being able to monitor who trades with whom through the SWIFT system and if it should be allowed to. The U.S. can use the dollar. It has huge influence through its multinational corporations. It can set technological standards by being a technological leader. And the U.S. can even organize the civil society of other countries through this technology, government-funded NGOs which seek to manipulate the civil society of other countries. So we essentially outsourced our military, economy, and civil society to being managed by the U.S. government to a large extent.

Now, as a multipolar distribution of power emerges, I think the natural thing is that a lot of these things become then stripped from the U.S. It becomes decentralized, and more states will have to learn how to do their own governance. And for some of our countries, me speaking out of Europe, this is quite new because we outsourced a lot of these issues to the United States, and we just had technocrats on autopilot. And so learning how to govern again, I think it's going to be a big challenge, and it's not going to be a utopia either. But at least there has to be new institutions trying to manage how this new world should work.

#Elizabeth Lane

Dimitri?

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Well, I think the answer is rather easy to your question. From diplomatic theory, if there is a multipolar world, then there should be multilateral institutions agreed by everybody, which would allow countries to communicate and to conduct common actions. So, obviously, I have in mind the United Nations, of course. The United Nations was one of the pillars of the New World Order after the Second World War. Of course, it needs certain reform, including the Security Council, and the process is ongoing. There are other players like Africa, for example, which should be given more say in world affairs, but it is important to strengthen these multilateral institutions, to give them a new impetus and a new agenda, and it is in the interests of everybody.

No country should dominate this multipolar world, and they need to keep all the channels of communication open. Of course, there might be some surprises, there might be some misunderstandings, but there should be mechanisms and means to sort out all the difficulties in a peaceful way. And I believe, having served for eight years at the United Nations, I believe that the United Nations has all the capacity to be reborn as this cornerstone of this multipolar world, and everything is there. We just need to give it some new brush, maybe, and to kind of make tasks more clear, but the instruments are there. I don't think we should invent a bicycle in this situation.

#Elizabeth Lane

Great, great answer. We just have one more question. I have to read all the questions, guys. This is just how it works. A great panelist. Hey, Ryan, welcome back. Is Zelensky just prolonging and agitating the situation because he knows his days are numbered when it ends? Or is there a higher purpose and control? Who wants to take this question?

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Well, if I may, it's absolutely obvious that there are interests of Ukraine and there are interests of Zelensky and his clique. And this guy doesn't want to stop because he understands that his survival, maybe even in physical form, depends on whether the war continues or not. The moment when the war is over, he will have to be held accountable for what he did to Ukraine, for all the money he has embezzled, for all the crimes he has committed. There are a lot of political prisoners. So there's an avalanche of things that he will have to deal with. And not to mention, of course, that he's very unlikely to remain in power after free and fair elections.

That's why, of course, it's in his interest to continue as much as he can the war and the warfare, and creating more and more problems for his people, bringing them to the front in this forced conscription as cannon fodder. But unfortunately, he's not alone who is interested in continuing the war. And I think Glenn knows quite well that a number of representatives of European allies are also very much interested in this war to continue because they will also have to answer for what they were doing and to explain to the population what was the point of all these things that were done for the sake of Zelensky's regime. So, unfortunately, Zelensky is not alone. There are a lot of his, I would say, like-minded persons in Europe especially, which would do everything and which would be the last to let this war end and to see peace prevail in this crisis.

#Elizabeth Lane

Thank you so much, guys. Great panel. Thank you. Thank you, everyone in the chat. Thanks for sending your questions. So if you are not following Glenn Diesen, he's running this live with me. So you can just click on his channel and go follow him. If you're not following me, you can always click

Elizabeth Lane TV on YouTube and follow me. Ethan is on YouTube, and ask Ethan, give your credentials as well, like he's running the live as well. And Dmitry Polyansky is also on X, correct? He's not on YouTube, but he's on X, so you can follow him there.

#Dmitry Polyanskiy

Not yet, but I have certain plans, maybe a little bit. Oh, nice.

#Elizabeth Lane

Get on, get on YouTube. We want more YouTubers speaking the truth here. So thank you so much, guys. I really appreciate it. Everyone else, the links to all of these people will be down in the comments once the live ends. So go ahead and follow them. Thank you.