

Alex Christoforou: Massive Attack on Moscow - EU Prepares for War

Alex Christoforou discusses the huge attack on Moscow, PM Fico's warning about the EU provoking a war with Russia, the Russian parliamentary election, developments on the frontline, the collapse of NATO's war narratives, and the Greenland deal. The Duran: <https://www.youtube.com/@TheDuran> Alex Christoforou: <https://www.youtube.com/@AlexChristoforou> Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennndiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glenndiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glenndiesen> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Buy merchandise: <https://diesen-shop.fourthwall.com/en-nok> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. Today is September 21st, 2026, and we have the great pleasure of being joined for the first time by Alex Christoforou, a political analyst and also a popular host of The Duran. I have made sure to leave a link in the description to both The Duran as well as his own podcast. And yeah, make sure to subscribe. So thank you for coming on the program. Thank you for having me on.

#Alex Christoforou

Great to be here.

#Glenn

I was going to say, there's a lot to ask about. The first, I guess, would be this massive strike we saw on Moscow during its elections. I think it was 1,600 drones, if I'm not mistaken, which did some damage in Moscow. I was wondering, how are you, I guess, assessing this in terms of the purpose, and how likely is it that NATO was not involved?

#Alex Christoforou

How likely is NATO not involved? Well, NATO definitely involved. That's my take on it. I don't think that should be shocking to anybody. But no doubt this was about disrupting the elections. So if you look at it from that angle, they failed because the elections in Russia were a success, and we got the election results as well. But disrupting the elections, that's one part of it.

I think another part of it was NATO and the collective West, the United States, sending a signal, a warning to Russia in a way, maybe trying to bait Russia or goad Russia into attacking a European country or creating the dynamics of the scenario where they can continue to talk about some sort of Russian retaliation into Europe or some sort of Russian sabotage into Europe, basically. Because we're hearing the collective West leaders and much of the media continue to talk about how Russia, after the elections, is now planning some sort of a strike or some sort of action against Europe in order to test the integrity of NATO. So one part of the drone strike was about disrupting the elections. I think another part of it was to try and just feed this entire narrative of Russian retaliation, Russian sabotage, and just trying to bait Russia into some sort of action.

#Glenn

Well, on baiting Russia, though, you know, when you say this, it sounds a bit like what the Prime Minister of Slovakia said a few days ago—that is Robert Fico. He was arguing that a lot of European leaders seem intent on provoking a war with Russia. Are they preparing for war, though? Because, you know, if you would assess capabilities and intentions, I would look at their capabilities and say, no, they're not ready to fight the Russian Federation. But the intentions are starting to sound as if they're gearing up for war.

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, I agree with you. The fact that Fico has said this about three, four times now—he's even put out the videos talking about how Europe is looking for a pretext. Those are his exact words. They're looking for a pretext in order to get into some sort of a conflict with Russia. It's concerning because Fico, he's part of the EU. He's part of NATO. So obviously he sits in on the meetings. He listens to what all of these people are saying. I mean, he's there. So he has as good an understanding as to what they're trying to accomplish as anybody. He's on the inside.

And the fact that he's putting out video after video and message after message about how the Europeans and NATO are searching for a pretext to get into a conflict with Russia, and how Slovakia is not going to get involved in any of this, I think this is concerning. I mean, if it was a one-off, if it was just one post on X from Fico, you could say, okay, it's one post. But over the past three, four days, he's been putting out two, three videos as well as two, three posts about this. And he continuously says that Slovakia is not going to get involved in any of this. So that does have me concerned, absolutely. Can NATO, without the United States, can they actually get into a conflict with Russia? Will they get into a conflict with Russia?

I think there are some people that do believe that they can get into a conflict with Russia and they can win. Actually, I know that there are people very high up in the EU who actually do believe that Russia is losing the conflict in Ukraine, that the Russian economy is collapsing, and that if NATO, without the United States, just pushes Russia a bit harder, then they can get to regime change and

the collapse of Russia. I know this. There are people in the halls of the EU and of Brussels who do actually buy into this. I also think there's a lot of leaders who, as Putin described, are just looking for a distraction, something to distract away from their own local problems. So I think you have a little bit of both, or a lot of both.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, it's what you said about them actually thinking it. I have a friend and colleague in the EU Parliament, and he made the point to me that most of the people he talks to in the EU Parliament, they genuinely believe that Ukraine and NATO were winning. This whole narrative, Ukraine is turning the tide, that this wasn't just some propaganda bit by them, some talking point in the media, that they genuinely did believe this. But now, kind of, reality is starting to set in, and there's panic. So all his colleagues are essentially talking about, we have to put pressure, escalate. But how would actually such a war with Russia go? Because I think they kind of imagine they would just tip the scales a bit in favor of Ukraine. But I think they're overestimating the escalation control here once a German missile starts to be fired into Russia, for example.

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, I definitely agree with you that there is a panic, and I think that's when they're at their most dangerous, is when you have this panic. Because the problem that a lot of the leaders in Europe have is that, one, they genuinely believed the propaganda that Ukraine was winning, that Ukraine had a chance to win this conflict. They were never winning at any point in time during this war, and they never had a chance to win this war. But they bought into it. And now they have the problem, the embarrassment, the humiliation of trying to explain this to their people. How do you go back to your country? How do you address your country and say, well, you know, the \$50 billion that we've given to Zelensky, well, that's disappeared.

And now Russia is on the verge of victory. So this whole thing, this whole four-year thing—the sanctions, the Nord Stream bombing, the cutting off of Russian energy, the increase in prices, the increase in your own electricity and in your own oil and gas payments—you know, it's all led to our defeat. How do you explain that to everyone? So, you know, the only path that they have is either real escalation or pretend escalation, and to just try and keep this thing going, at least until something resolves itself. They're hoping that maybe something will happen, maybe some collapse in the Kremlin, maybe some palace intrigue, maybe the United States will get involved.

And to just kind of keep this thing going, or at least keep it going until they have their next election cycle. And who knows, maybe they end up leaving, like Macron, and the next person comes in. And, you know, in that case, Macron could just kind of dump it on the next president, President Le Pen, for example. And she could take the blame for everything that's going to happen to France with

regards to their support for Project Ukraine. So I think that's where they find themselves, the leaders of the EU and of Europe. As to how they're going to escalate, Sikorsky says we can defeat Russia without the United States. That's nonsense. And Sikorsky knows it.

That's basically Sikorsky saying we need the United States in order to take on Russia. And I think that's the logical expected outcome, course of escalation. They're going to run to Trump. They're going to run to the United States, and they're going to basically beg the United States. The vassal is going to go to the master, and it's going to say, "Please help us. Please bail us out. Please get involved. Give Zelensky Tomahawks. Give him Starlink over Russia. Give him whatever he needs in order to try and defeat Russia." And Trump, you know, if you look at Trump and you see everything he's been doing over the past couple of years, Trump will probably fold.

#Glenn

Yeah, that's a very good chance. When I heard Sikorsky speak, he argued that Poland has more military capabilities than Russia and they could defeat them quickly. Poland? I mean, I'm not talking down the Poles in terms of their army. They seem to have done more than many of their other European counterparts. But still, this seems fairly delusional to me, though. And I guess I felt more comfortable when I thought they were just lying to us, but now that one gets the impression that they're genuine about their beliefs, I'm a little bit concerned. I remember back when they did this big offensive and the Russians decided to pull back in the Kharkiv region and in Kherson because they essentially saw that this was going to be a long war.

So they tightened up the front lines, realizing that from now on we're going to have to measure success in casualty rates, not in territory. And the Europeans began celebrating this as well. "We're winning, we're winning." But I thought they were spewing propaganda. But from what I'm being told, this is their conviction. They believe in this. But it begs the question: all of these attacks now on Russia, this 40-day campaign, it was going to put the pressure on Putin, but... But I guess my concern is that they have the same assumption, that if you put pressure on Putin, the Russian public will say, "Okay, we give up on this opportunistic war of expansion," as opposed to what they see as a war for their existence.

So, you know, I guess that just brings me to the election. Well, you know, you would have thought if the thesis of the Europeans is we put a lot of pressure on the Russians, the Russians will give up their imperialist dreams and get rid of Putin. But if the counter-hypothesis is correct, that they do see this as a war for their own existence, you would assume that they would rally around the flag and they would throw their support behind Putin. Is this how you interpret the elections we just had now in Russia, the presidential elections, that is?

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, I think the best way to interpret the elections, the obvious way to interpret the election results, is that the Russians voted for stability, and they voted for Putin and to support Putin because Putin is tied to United Russia. So he's connected to United Russia. They got 57% of the vote, a little over 57%. And the results were fairly similar to how the parliament is already set up, to how it breaks down today. So we're not going to see much change in the makeup of the parliament. But the Russians definitely voted for stability, and they voted for the Russian president in these parliamentary elections. It wasn't presidential elections, but I think the result speaks for itself.

#Glenn

What's your view on the coverage in the West, though? Because, you know, in 2021, when United Russia fell to 49 percent, the Western media essentially was making the argument, well, the Russians are rejecting the Putin system, so recognizing that the democratic process was, you know, working. And now in 2026, five years later, we see United Russia go from 49 percent to 57.8, I think. And suddenly, it's not an election. It was a fraud. Russia doesn't have democracy. They're a dictatorship. I mean, what can you say, really?

#Alex Christoforou

I mean, if there's no vote, if there are no elections, Russia is a dictatorship, an authoritarian regime. If there is an election, it's a sham, and Russia is a dictatorship, an authoritarian regime. I mean, it's never going to change. I actually think that Russians don't even care anymore. I think that's the more dangerous part to all of it. I think the more concerning part is that there's now such a separation, such a distance between Russia and the collective West at this point, that the Russian public doesn't even care what the New York Times or the BBC or whatever they say about these elections.

I mean, they don't care because they know that whatever Russia does, whatever kind of elections they hold, it's never going to be good enough for the collective West. And I think the Russians are just done looking for any kind of approval from the collective West. I don't think they really care what articles come out at this point because we already know what they're going to say. Whichever way it goes, 49%, 59%, 40%, it's all going to be the same article. There's never any real analysis happening from Western journalists or any nuance to it. It's just all the same tropes.

#Glenn

I think that's one thing we often neglect in the West about what happened in 2014. Because after the coup in Ukraine, the Russians didn't just shift their economy to the East. That is when they gave up on this dream of a common Europe. They also stopped caring, I think, because they're no longer looking to have a common European home. So, not caring what European leaders think about them. I think that's something that hasn't really registered yet across the West. But you mentioned before

that the Europeans are hoping that the Americans will take a greater role, that they will be pulled into this war. How do you assess this? I mean, I know that Trump flip-flops, as you said, a lot. Well, he hasn't really landed on a strategy at all, but they seem to be very consumed in terms of their capabilities and everything else in the Middle East.

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, I mean, you know, for me, when all of us in this space, whenever we say Trump, I mean, we understand that there's the man Trump, but there's the mechanism behind Trump. And most likely, it's not really Trump that's making all of the decisions, or any of the decisions. Obviously, the CIA is probably running most of this conflict, if not all of this conflict, with Ukraine. But we have to look at it from the perspective of the executive of Trump. If he could—if Trump, the administration, the apparatus in D.C.—if they could provide Ukraine with the winning formula, with the winning wonder weapon or wonder weapons, they would, if they could.

But they can't. And they're even in a worse position now than when Trump took office a couple of years ago, because now they've got a war in Iran, air defense depleted, missiles depleted, THAAD systems, Tomahawks. They now have another war that's creeping up in Yemen, and Saudi Arabia is begging them for weapons and for interceptor missiles as well. So they're even in a worse position than where they were two years ago when Trump took office. So they don't really have much of a capability to give the Europeans or Ukraine what's needed to, I would say, to try and get to a type of stalemate, if that's possible. I mean, I know they use that word a lot in the collective West media.

It's not a stalemate. But what the United States would like, I believe, what would be their strategy, is to try and get Russia to agree to a ceasefire, to a stalemate, to a pause, to a truce. And they're thinking, can we do this economically? Can we do this with sanctions? Can we do this with more pressure and more weapons? And they've tried all three. They've tried all three together. They've tried all three separately. And nothing's worked. If the U.S. could, it would. But they're in a worse position today than how things were two years ago, how things were under Biden. And Biden gave Ukraine a lot, and Trump has given Ukraine a lot.

I mean, they really have a lot of money and a ton of weapons, just about every weapon, including F-16s. I mean, they've given them just about everything that they had in their inventory. So, you know, I think the Europeans and the Trump administration, they're going to sit down together and they're going to try and think about what they can do. And they're going to come to the conclusion that there's really not much that they can do. The dangerous part is that they'll escalate to a level which will become very dangerous. For example, Tomahawk long-range missiles into Russia, which Russia has said is a red line.

Russia hasn't said they have many red lines. NATO was a red line. Long-range missile strikes into Russia, that was a red line. Lavrov and Putin, Medvedev, they've all come out and said that Tomahawk long-range missiles into Russia is without a doubt a very dangerous escalation and would

be a red line because obviously the Russians don't know if these Tomahawks are going to be nuclear-capable. They don't know. This is a huge escalation, a very risky and dangerous escalation. And so, you know, you could see Trump getting to a point, and the Europeans getting to a point in their panic, where they say, okay, let's give this a shot.

#Glenn

What is happening now, though? Again, on the front line, you mentioned, you know, this—it would look like a stalemate. And I, you know, that makes sense. If you're fighting a proxy war of attrition, you want to see the front lines not moving while the Ukrainians and Russians are bleeding each other white. But, you know, this was kind of outlined in the 2019 RAND paper as well. That is, what is the benefit of war with Russia? Well, you know, you can bleed them, you know, their manpower, their treasury. The negative aspect of seeking to overextend Russia will be if Ukraine begins to falter.

Again, 2019, that's three years before Russia went in. If Ukraine begins to falter and strategic territory shifts hands to Russia, this would make it a bad war. It looks like that's where we're now, though, that the front lines will begin to move faster and faster. But I guess that's a good indication: the front lines begin to move very fast, the Ukrainian army starts to look extremely shaky, like it could collapse. That's when you would expect a provocation, as Prime Minister Fico said. So what does the front line look like now, in your view?

#Alex Christoforou

It looks really bad. I mean, it's a Ukrainian collapse across the entire front line, whether you're looking at Orekhov or the Kharkov area, Dobropillia. There's some fog of war, I would say, about Liman. I would say that's the one area where allegedly Ukraine went on the offensive, a counteroffensive. And the reports we got from some sources—the Russian military has been fairly quiet about this. Even the Ukrainian military official sources have been quiet about this. But there were some people associated with Biletsky and with the Azov guys who were claiming that they had advanced significantly and that they've taken various villages. We now know that the advance has not been significant, not at all. We are starting to get information that Ukraine has suffered heavy losses in this counteroffensive.

And even Biletsky's latest video statement, he did not appear very confident at all in his message. He actually—it was, I would say, it was the opposite of confidence. He was talking about how his forces are fighting to just hold on to their positions. So I even think that Liman—there was a lot of propaganda in and around Liman, and if there was a case of some sort of a Ukraine success in their counterattack, what will inevitably happen is what has happened throughout the entire SMO. Russia will allow the offensive to run a certain course. Eventually, it will peter out, and then the Russian military will roll it back with devastating losses for the Ukraine military. That has been happening over and over in this conflict. The West and the Ukrainians get excited about some sort of big offensive that they're launching.

And then after a couple of months' time, we find out that the Russians have rolled the Ukrainians back, and the Ukrainians have suffered horrific losses, something that this time around Ukraine and the Ukrainian military cannot absorb. In Kursk, they lost anywhere upwards of 70,000 to 80,000 soldiers. And at that point in time, Zelensky just kind of shrugged it off. This time around, he's not going to be able to shrug it off. And we're also talking about Azov guys. The Azov guys are not going to let Zelensky just ignore whatever losses they absorbed from the Russians. So I think this was a very stupid idea. But it's very much in line with the way Zelensky and Ukraine have been running this conflict. It's been very much about media and PR, and less about actually trying to achieve battlefield success.

#Glenn

I think the comparison to Kursk makes a lot of sense. I mean, I remember when the Ukrainians first went in, you had some critics in the media suggesting, well, perhaps this is not a good idea, you know, for good reasons. You know, you'd go way out of your defensive positions. Your logistics are exposed. I mean, there's a ton of things that started going wrong. But very soon, everyone had the memo, the understanding that this is a media triumph. So suddenly everyone had to celebrate this genius thing. And you remember the MI6 and the CIA leaders sitting down together going, wow, this changes the narrative completely.

So even discussing it, as you said, in the language of controlling narratives. But at the end of the day, in the measurements of a war of attrition, they lost a lot of men and equipment. So it was a horrible defeat. But yeah. Yeah, but that's maybe what's happening in Lyman now, because you saw in Lyman, you had this report from the Ukrainians, like a massive territorial rollback by the Russians, and then all the European media at least kind of started repeating this uncritically. But we haven't really seen the videos come up, and that doesn't sound like the Zelensky administration. They tend to... They don't shy away from taking credit when they've done something spectacular.

So it does appear that there was a role that the Ukrainians did push the Russians back, but nowhere near what was reported in the media, though. But anyway, so I want to ask also the prospect of peace here, because, you know, if we do see now the Ukrainian army beginning to unravel, the front lines are starting to crack along the entire line. Strategic territory is shifting hands quickly, especially in Zaporizhzhia. I think that's one thing that's going to really dominate the media in the not-too-long term. But, you know, you would then think that, you know, the handlers of Zelensky, be it the Americans and Europeans, that they now have to make a choice: that is, either war that is escalating as the Russians, or find some peace.

Do you see anything the Russians will go for at this moment? Because... I was told by—well, my impression was that at Alaska, they kind of agreed that Russia had to get, you know, they had to get all of Donbas, but they could freeze the lines in Zaporizhzhia and Kherson. That's what, you know, George Beebe, the former CIA director, you know, told me as well. And Mearsheimer last week had

lunch with Sergey Lavrov. He told me that this was what had been agreed in Alaska. And this was a huge compromise for the Russians, given that they wanted all of Kherson and Zaporizhzhia. But I'm guessing the same deal isn't on the table anymore. So what do you think the Russians will accept now?

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, that's exactly what we were discussing, me and Alexander as well, about a year ago when Alaska was being discussed, that the deal most likely looked like it was the Ukrainian military leaving the Donbas, leaving Donetsk, and some sort of a freeze in Kherson and Zaporizhzhia, with the outcome over time being that Ukraine would leave those oblasts. That seemed to be the general framework of what was agreed on in Alaska, which was something that was pitched by the Trump administration. At least that's my understanding of it. It was Witkoff and Kushner and Trump himself that actually came up with this loose framework. And Putin asked multiple times of Witkoff and of Trump, "Is this correct? Is what I'm hearing from you correct? Is this what you're pitching us?"

And the understanding was, yes, this is how we would like to get the first stage of some sort of a peace going by presenting these conditions. And Russia agreed. But it was walked back in 24 hours because Trump made the bonehead move of calling the Europeans, or the Trump administration decided, let's bring the Europeans into it, right? And the whole thing just went south. I don't see any prospects for any kind of peace because I don't think the collective West or Ukraine are really looking for a long-term peace. I think what they're looking for is a temporary truce, a temporary ceasefire, right? Call it a six-month ceasefire, call it a six-year ceasefire. But they want a ceasefire. They want a truce so that they can rearm and take on Russia again. And I think this is the big gap.

This is the huge difference, where Russia is saying, look, we want this thing to just end. We want a comprehensive final solution to NATO and Ukraine and to Europe. We want to solve this. And the West is coming back with ceasefires and freezes and free economic zones and stuff like this, which the Russians are not interested in because they know that this is just temporary stuff. And so I think this is why you have such a big gap. And at the end of the day, you have a Zelensky who will never, ever agree to pulling back the Ukrainian military from Donetsk. So even if you start at that very simple beginning term, which is Ukraine out of Donetsk, the Ukrainian military, Zelensky has said time and time again, no. So you don't have any prospect for peace. At least that's how it looks to me. But who knows? Maybe something does get worked out.

#Glenn

Well, this temporary peace you're describing, it sounds an awful lot like another Minsk Three, because that's essentially what it was. That is, we won't do a political settlement, but we'll just freeze the situation and then incrementally change realities on the ground. That is, to build an army, create defensive positions, et cetera. And suddenly, Ukraine of 2015 is, well, it's unrecognizable from what you saw in 2022. But something has happened on the European side in terms of the narrative

control, and that is that the prime minister of Poland, Donald Tusk, he went out and, you know, made a speech pointing out that the Ukrainians are taking 27,000 casualties a month.

That's 27,000. That's almost 1,000 a day. And I was wondering, why would he make such an admission? Because this is kind of the numbers many people have been pointing out for a long time, but it's always been just dismissed and shrugged off as Russian propaganda. Because the only acceptable official truth from the government is that the Russians are losing a sea of people and the Ukrainians are not. The Ukrainians are smarter people in defensive positions. They've got the good weapons and training. They're fighting for their country, you know, as opposed to being dragged off the street, while the Russians are, you know, this slave army that's doing human waves.

And the assumption was that Russia's always had many times more casualties than the Ukrainians. And anything else, again, is smeared and censored as Russian propaganda. And then suddenly, this well-protected narrative, Tusk kind of walks away from it by pointing out that they're taking 27,000 casualties a month. That's huge. And I'm not sure how to interpret this. Is this the EU wondering, realizing, okay, perhaps we have to change the narrative to start talks? Or is this to go to war, to again tilt the scale in NATO's favor?

#Alex Christoforou

Yeah, that's a good question. I was wondering why Tusk would throw out that number as well. Maybe Tusk screwed up. He does have a tendency to screw up, so it could be a mess-up on Tusk's part. Perhaps he's putting that number out there in order to prepare people in Europe for the truth that is about to come sooner or later. The numbers will come out as to Ukraine's losses. They've done a very good job over four years to hide it. I mean, their narrative control is pretty impressive. And everyone is very disciplined amongst the EU leadership and then the Western media. And they stick to that narrative control. They never, ever talk about Ukrainian losses. And they constantly talk about these losses that Russia is incurring, which, by the way, are losses which the Ukrainian military and the SBU come up with. So they feed it to the Western leaders.

They feed it to the Western media, and then they disseminate it and repeat it over and over again. So maybe Tusk was throwing it out there to prepare everybody. Perhaps Tusk was sending a message to Zelensky. Poland does have some issues with Ukraine, and maybe Tusk was telling Zelensky, look, you got to cut out this whole pantheon of the heroes and bringing all these Banderites back to Kyiv and honoring them, because I know the real situation. So you need to cut it out. So there could be something like that in play. It's hard to know why Tusk threw out these numbers, but the numbers are in line with estimates that Putin has put out there. He's put out a number similar to that 27,000. And Budanov, just a couple of weeks ago, said that Ukraine needs 30,000 soldiers to replenish losses on the front lines. So the number does line up.

#Glenn

Well, given none of the other European leaders are repeating this, perhaps, as you said, perhaps it was just Tusk and he either slipped up or... It's a good point. You know, the Bandera emboldening, or building up the Bandera groups in Ukraine, was perhaps meant to... Well, not perhaps. It was obviously meant to put their anti-Russian force into power. But, of course, these groups have some problematic history with Poland as well. So it's a good—yeah, that makes a lot of sense.

#Alex Christoforou

Alexander talked about that in one of his videos a couple of days ago. Yeah, maybe. Maybe Tusk, who does want friendly relationships with Ukraine, but he has Nawrocki there, who is more antagonistic towards Zelensky and towards Ukraine. Maybe Tusk is trying to figure out a way out of this mess that Poland is in with Ukraine, at least with regards to these Banderites.

#Glenn

Yeah. Now, like I said, it's a well-protected narrative. I mean, every month you have—well, not every month, but most months—you have, like, exchanges of dead soldiers where you have, like, 40 dead Russian soldiers being handed to them while the Russians are handing over a thousand. So, you know, this death ratio is in terms of, you know, not who's been killed, but just which dead soldiers are exchanged. The rates are usually 1 to 20, 1 to 30. I mean, and, you know, you could say, well, how would you end up with soldiers of the enemy?

Well, you know, that's only if you take territory. So you can argue, well, the Russians are also taking more Ukrainian dead because they are expanding. But the European narrative is also that the Ukrainians are taking back land and the Russians are advancing. So it's very hard. How can you argue on the territorial issue, the casualty, and still, how would you explain these numbers? I've asked before, and I'm being reassured it's Russian propaganda and talking points to even mention it.

#Alex Christoforou

Any way you slice it or dice it, it looks bad for Ukraine. I mean, and these numbers have been consistent for about two years. I mean, if this was just like two months of 20 to 1,000, you could say, okay, but over two years, these have been the numbers, and these are confirmed. So this is not an estimation by Ukrainian media. This is not an estimation by Russian media or anything like that. These are confirmed exchanges. So we have the numbers. And it's been that way for two years, this 20, 30, 40 to 1 ratio. So every month we get these numbers. And it's exactly as you say. It's the best indication that we have of the real losses that are happening on the front line.

I'm not saying it's the final indication or it's exactly the way the breakdown is with regards to casualties, but it's the one confirmed ratio that we do have. And it's been fairly consistent over two years. And it shows that Russia is advancing because if they make the argument, which I've heard them make—the collective West media—where they say, well, the Russians obtain more bodies

because they're advancing and they have the ability to pick up more Ukrainian casualties, well, that's an admission that Russia is advancing. So which one is it? Is Russia not advancing, or are they advancing? So any way you wrap your head around it, what it points to is, once again, a Russian victory.

#Glenn

Well, I've also been told that pointing it out undermines the war effort, because if you really care about Ukraine, you would support the war effort, which means you should ignore the horrible casualty rates, ignore the brutal recruitment, and don't disrupt the men, and soon women, to be sent into the meat grinder. So there's a narrative here which is, you know, quite horrible at its core. But Poland, on the topic of Poland, they're opening up. Well, it looks as if they can't say anything with certainty. There is a given that Trump changes the situation a bit back and forth.

But apparently they're getting close to now a deal, or actually setting up this U.S. military base in Poland while drawing down forces in other parts of Europe, building this base in Poland. Well, you know, it would make sense. I mean, as you said before, not everything is Trump. There's a machinery behind him, irrespective, you know, in the U.S., of who sits on the throne. It would show some consistency in terms of the direction NATO is headed, very specifically towards the Russian border. So what do you make of this, though?

#Alex Christoforou

They have no reverse gear, as we say often. They're going to continue to prosecute this proxy war. And it goes back to what you said. They always tell you, you can't point this out about what's happening in Ukraine because you're undermining the war effort. You can't point out the truth, because then you're undermining Ukraine and you're undermining the war effort. Well, these are people that don't care about Ukraine and don't care about the people of Ukraine. Because if you really cared about Ukraine and the people that are there, you would have accepted Minsk and you would have worked towards enforcing Minsk. You would have accepted the deal in 2022. You would have accepted every other deal after that. That would have saved Ukraine.

If you look at every deal since 2014, as Lavrov has pointed out many times, it's getting worse and worse for Ukraine. Every single deal, even if you go back to Istanbul in 2022, that was a very good deal for Ukraine, an amazing deal for Ukraine, and they rejected it. And that was initialed as well. And we know that. The New York Times has reported on the agreement, the initialing of Istanbul. So the fact that the U.S. is now expanding into Poland, I don't think it should be a shock or a surprise to anyone. And then the whole narrative of the U.S. drawing down forces from Europe, I don't believe any of it either. I think the U.S. may reposition and reallocate forces. So you take 10,000 from Germany and you move them to Poland.

You take 10,000 from Italy and throw them to Greenland, whatever. I mean, I think they're just going to reconfigure everything. And of course, they're going to push towards Asia, obviously, because the big target in all of this is containing China and eventually trying to get regime change or the destruction of China. That's the main adversary for the empire at the moment. So the fact that they're continuing to push towards Russia, and they push at Russia, should it be a surprise? The war is going. Even when Ukraine winds down, even when Ukraine is over and the Russians eventually complete the goals of the SMO, the bigger war is not going to end. I believe that. Maybe the Ukraine chapter will end, but the overall conflict will not end.

#Glenn

I was also told that, well, for the people who pointed out that only 20% of Ukrainians wanted to join NATO between 1991 and 2014, that this is anti-Ukrainian to point out because it undermines their struggle, apparently, or that 73% of Ukrainians voted in 2019 for a peace platform, which was then torpedoed by Ukraine. Yeah, exactly.

#Alex Christoforou

Overthrowing the democratically elected government in 2014, that's pretty anti-Ukrainian.

#Glenn

Yeah, there you go. I just want to switch gears a bit, because we also have this new deal now between the United States and Denmark over Greenland. How do you interpret this? Is it significantly different from former deals, or is this a capitulation? Trump obviously walked back his ambitions a bit in terms of annexing it. Yeah.

#Alex Christoforou

We'll probably get the details of everything. I think they announced next week that we'll actually get the agreement, so we'll get a better understanding as to what exactly was agreed. But if you go off the initial reports, it seems as if everything that the United States got—which could be significant—an infinity agreement. They can be in Greenland for infinity, whatever that means, and they have access to whatever resources they want. But these are all things that the United States could have achieved if they had just told Denmark, "This is what we want," quietly, in the background.

I'm sure that the United States could have sat down with Denmark and could have sat down with Greenland, and they could have said, look, we want another military base. We demand another military base. And I'm very confident that Denmark would have given it to them because they would not have a choice. But the fact that Trump made this into this big PR exercise with the annexation of Greenland and Greenland being the 51st state or the 52nd state after Canada, and he created this

entire story around Greenland. And at the end, you just kind of get an agreement, which I believe they could have gotten without all of this media attention, to me.

To me, it feels like just like a wrestling match theater. It all seems like theater to me. Trump didn't annex Greenland. He didn't take over Greenland. Denmark had to give up some things. But if you listen to the statements coming out of the authorities in Denmark, they're signaling that they didn't give up that much, that they actually came out ahead. So the whole thing just seems like PR and media and building up on that Trump mythos of the peace through strength guy, the strong president, the great negotiator. Look what I negotiated. It doesn't seem like he negotiated much.

#Glenn

Yeah, I'm wondering if the deal has an energy component to it, because I remember reading a few weeks ago that the United States dropped off a lot of drilling equipment in Greenland, you know, an oil company linked to Trump. I can't remember the details, to be honest, but without the permission of Greenland. So it was seen as a very bold move. You know, maybe it was just for pressure. I'm not sure if there's a strategy behind it. But, well, it wouldn't surprise me. Again, it would be all speculation. This is our last question, though. How long do you think Europe can hold on here, though? Because, again, Europe is not in good shape either.

We see, you know, the elections, for example, in Germany is a good indicator that people do not care for Merz, especially. And as you said, he's probably the most dangerous man in Europe now. So there's—I'm not sure if this is a good thing to see, to put him in a vulnerable position where he might act out. Probably it has to be done. But now, you know, not only are things going very bad in Europe, but the Saudis, I hear, they're now cutting all oil exports to Europe as well because, well, they're having their own problems with Yemen. How do you see the Europeans holding up here?

#Alex Christoforou

Europe is in a terrible position. Babiš said as much, the leader of the Czech Republic. Fico is saying this as well. Vucic talked about Europe, and he also said that Europe is in a terrible state. They did this to themselves, but they're not going to course correct. They're incapable of course correction. They continue to push forward with removing Russian energy from Europe, from the EU. They're not pulling back on that, even as you have Saudi Arabia telling the Europeans, "There's going to be no oil, definitely not in what remains of September, not in October either, maybe not even in November." The Russian oil cutoff, problems with gas from Qatar, problems with Libya as well, getting the oil from Libya.

So you have all of these problems now in the energy sector in Europe. Their only solution is some sort of a windfall tax on energy companies, which is not going to work. It's going to make matters even worse. Ten percent of gas stations in France are now running low on one type of fuel. It's a disaster. But the Europeans, they have no ability to admit failure. They have no ability to course

correct. It's impossible for them to reengage with Russia, so that's out of the question. So what are they stuck with? They're stuck with pretty much the United States, being completely and wholly dependent on the U.S. for their energy needs. And you even have talk in Congress that the U.S. might think of some sort of a diesel export ban, given the situation.

So what happens then? Where does that leave Europe? And Europe's gas storage for the winter is also very low. It's not at a good level. So the situation in Europe is going from bad to worse. But, you know, we have a leadership here in Europe that doesn't really seem to care that much. That's the sense that I get. They're still committed and focused on defeating Russia. That's all they talk about. Every meeting that they have in the EU is always about Ukraine and Russia. Ukraine, which is not even part of the European Union. That's all they're discussing. You had in the UK, Jacob Rees-Mogg put out a video and talked about sending the British men and women to war.

#Glenn

Some will die, and it's your duty.

#Alex Christoforou

Some will die, and it's your duty. This is bonkers. It's nuts. But they're incapable of finding solutions to problems that they themselves created.

#Glenn

I'm a bit amazed how quickly the narrative shifted from everyone had to say, well, this isn't our war, this is a Ukraine-Russia war, until now, where they're all saying, well, yes, it's your duty to go die. I think the Russians—I mean, it's quite extraordinary. I think they're trapped in narratives as well. You know, in the State of the Union talk, Ursula von der Leyen, the head of the—yeah, the president of the EU Commission—she was making the argument that, oh, well, the Russians cut us off oil and energy, and it's like, what are you saying? This, you know, I talked to the former president of Czech Republic this morning, Václav Klaus, and he was going, why would you say that? Like, everyone knows we cut ourselves off. We said we don't want your oil and don't want your gas. But now they still hold on to these narratives. I mean, you know, you can check these things. You can look up what they said a few years ago. But no one does, in the media, that is. It's quite extraordinary.

#Alex Christoforou

She's said that over and over again, too. It's not the first time that she's said this, that Russia cut us off. And Merz has said as much. They really are stuck in their own narrative bubble. And when you listen to statements like that coming from Rees-Mogg, you understand that these people really are

living in their own delusional world. And this is a problem, though, for all of us. All of us living in Europe or living on this planet, is that we have a bunch of leaders who are completely trapped in their propaganda.

#Glenn

God help us all. Alex, where can people find you?

#Alex Christoforou

The Duran, me and Alexander post daily. And you can find Alexander on his channel, Alexander Mercouris. And you can find me on my channel, Alex Christoforou.

#Glenn

Well, thank you so much for your time.

#Alex Christoforou

Thank you.