

Yanis Varoufakis: The Imperial "Board of Peace" & End of the United Nations

Yanis Varoufakis is an economist, the former Finance Minister of Greece, and the author of numerous bestselling books. Yanis Varoufakis discusses the imperialist nature of Trump's 'Board of Peace', and why it will dissolve the UN and international law. Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glenndiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glenndiesen> Support the channel: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/Diesen79> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We are very privileged to be joined today by Yanis Varoufakis, the former finance minister of Greece, professor, and founder of DiEM25—the Democracy in Europe Movement. Thank you for coming on. I've been looking forward to speaking with you about Trump's new peace plan, which many people interpret as an effort to push aside and replace the United Nations and international law itself. You've referred to Trump's peace plan as an abomination. Why do you see it as so dangerous?

#Yanis Varoufakis

I don't just see it as dangerous. I think historians of the future will remember November 17th, 2025, when Resolution 14/2803 of the Security Council approved the Board of Peace, with Donald Trump as its owner and chair. That approval by the Security Council, I believe, will go down in history as the end of the United Nations. Essentially, the United Nations abolished itself through that resolution. At the time, you'll recall, only two countries abstained in the Security Council—China and Russia. I have to say, I was mad that they did. But then again, when I heard their arguments, I thought, unfortunately, they might have a point.

But the reason I'm saying it abolishes the United Nations, Glenn, is because, you know, come to think of it, essentially what it does is a recognition of the end of history—not in Francis Fukuyama's terms, but in terms of the end of history regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. You'll recall, and I'm sure our audience knows this very well, that the United Nations Security Council has been making statements every few months, every year, all the time—some effort to keep on the rails the peace process, or whatever is left of the peace process, between the two sides: the Israeli side and the Palestinian side. And the United Nations has this tactic—or, let's say, it's an institutional memory, not a tactic, an institutional memory—whereby every resolution follows the previous resolutions.

So if you follow the history of the United Nations' engagement with the issue of Palestine, you'll find there's a continuity. It begins with the recognition of two parallel states—Israel and a Palestinian state. One of them was inaugurated; the other never was. And then it moves on to resolutions after every battle that was fought, every defeat of the Palestinian people. What the November 17th resolution did was accept the Board of Peace as the next step in this process. But it also denounced this whole history. Essentially, it was a remarkable success by Donald Trump to step in and save the bacon of Benjamin Netanyahu, because you'll recall that before that resolution, before the ceasefire—the so-called ceasefire, because there is no ceasefire.

I mean, Palestinians are being killed and starved to death on a daily basis as we speak. What the so-called ceasefire and the resolution by the Security Council did was essentially save Netanyahu from a major propaganda defeat. You'll remember that four major countries—middle powers—Canada, Australia, Britain, and France—recognized the state of Palestine. It was a very hypocritical recognition, because if they had really wanted to do something about bringing about the Palestinian state, which they recognized so hypocritically, they would have stopped arming Israel. They would have embargoed Israel. They would have done all the things the BDS movement says they should be doing—but they never did. Still, it was a major defeat for Netanyahu.

Trump steps in, imposes that ceasefire, and brings about the notion of a Board of Peace that will be totally outside international law—totally outside the history of the Palestinian occupied lands as occupied lands—and effectively resets the clock, as if we're going back to 1945 or 1948, or maybe even before that. That saved Netanyahu because, you know, let's face it, the International Court of Justice in June 2024 had clearly stipulated that Israel was in breach of international law and ordered Israel to withdraw from East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and Gaza. You had international condemnation of the genocide. You had the International Criminal Court indicting Netanyahu and his former defense minister as war criminals. And with that resolution, the United Nations Security Council effectively annulled all that.

And we go back to a situation, Glenn, and this is the main point I want to make, where Gaza doesn't belong to the Palestinians anymore. There are no Palestinians in the resolution—they don't exist. It's as if it is **terra nullius**, an empty land. And I'm mentioning that term very deliberately because **terra nullius** was the legal term European colonial powers used a century ago, or more than two centuries ago, to justify colonizing various lands around the world—from Australia and New Zealand to Kenya, South Africa, and so on. The first thing European colonizers did was to say that the land had no people, no history, no owners whatsoever.

It's outside international law. It's like, you know, going to an asteroid between Jupiter and, I don't know, some other planet. And, you know, the fact that the United Nations recognizes that—and recognizes that there's going to be a corporation, a private company—that will have as its lifelong chairman a man, not a president, not a representative of the people, but a man called Donald J. Trump. And he has no obligation whatsoever. He's not answerable to the board, he's not answerable

to the United Nations, he's not even answerable to the Congress of the United States of America. He simply has to give a report every six months to the United Nations, if he wants to.

It's not even a report that has to be approved or anything like that. So essentially, the United Nations annulled itself when it approved that resolution on the 17th of November, 2025. And this is how I'm going to complete my long answer. Apologies for taking so long, but I'm livid about all this. Why did the French and the British, who had supposedly recognized the state of Palestine, including Gaza, only a few weeks before—why did they accept that? Well, they accepted it because, for them, this was something that concerned brown people in the Middle East. It didn't concern them. Now they know better. They know that the Board of Peace is not just about Palestine. It's not about Gaza.

Now the Board of Peace is about everything. And, you know, you have all these Bond villains that Trump has amassed, surrounded himself with. And he's talking about Greenland. Tomorrow he's going to talk about Canada. And, you know, now the chickens are coming home to roost, metaphorically speaking. And you have people like Mark Carney, the Liberal Prime Minister of Canada, coming out with a very interesting speech in Davos recently, saying, "Oh my goodness, this is the end of the world as we knew it." Well, you idiots, you brought this about by approving a United Nations resolution that effectively annuls the United Nations, annuls international law, and annuls your right to exist.

#Glenn

Well, I remember when Trump first proposed to ethnically cleanse the entire population of Gaza, have the United States take over the region, and create this "Riviera of the Middle East." To be honest, at the time I interpreted it as an effort to shake up the status quo and create some room for maneuver. But I thought it was going to be a bit limited as well. But this, as you said, is something a lot bigger. I mean, again, I didn't take it literally, because what he says and what he does are two very different things.

But I think we opened up Pandora's box with this one. Another aspect of this whole thing is what you already alluded to — that this is a private corporation, and even the members have to pay in a billion dollars. How do you make sense of this idea of privatization of international law, or merging all these commercial interests with coercion and, yeah, essentially law? Because this is—well, it's not unprecedented, but still, where is this going? You know what surprises me, Glenn?

#Yanis Varoufakis

What surprises me is that people are surprised. Because, you know, I've always followed a very simple strategy, a very simple way of thinking: I take seriously what villains say. So, you know, Donald Trump—maybe he's not the most cogent or eloquent theorist in the history of the universe—but he's got people around him who are. If you ever listen to Peter Thiel speak to the various tech lords he's gathered around him, they have a very clear view of the future. Their future is the

replacement of the state by corporations. They talk about "free cities," and they don't mean it in terms of freedom for the citizens.

They mean it in terms of cities that belong to corporations, where the board—the members of the board of the corporation—are free to do whatever they want with the city. They went to Honduras, carved out a chunk of it, and turned it into a corporate mini-state. And this is what they want to do. They want to convert our cities. They want to convert our states. They want to convert... Gaza, Greenland—tomorrow it'll be Canada, maybe my country. Well, my country was already taken over by corporations after 2015. It's totally consistent with their own very specific and clearly stated political philosophy.

So, you know, as I said, I'm only surprised that people are surprised. And you did allude to the fact that this is not unprecedented. Now, if you look at the history of colonialism, it doesn't begin with states—it begins with corporations. It was the Dutch East India Company and the British East India Company that conquered Asia, and similar corporations conquered Africa. People say—and you mentioned this—"Oh my God, he's asking people to chip in a billion dollars in order to be, you know, legitimate members of the board of peace."

Well, isn't that how the East India Company was created? Businessmen got together in a kind of thatched-roof building in London, sometime around 1599, if my memory serves me right. They all chipped in and became shareholders—and not only shareholders, but the shares were tradable as well. And off they went. They occupied and took over India, then Indonesia, and then parts of Southeast Asia. At one point, the East India Company had 200,000 soldiers under its command. It was only later that it was nationalized when it faced financial difficulties—a state bailout, or rather, a crown bailout.

And that's how the British Empire, you know, began. So this is what he wants—that's what Peter Thiel and the various thinkers, technocrats, and tech lords around him imagine the world to be like now. That's not surprising at all. I'll tell you what is surprising—well, maybe not that surprising, but still more surprising—is that the rest of the world went along with it. The British went along with it, the French went along with it, every single Arab country went along with it. Turkey, which supported Hamas to a very large extent, went along with it. Qatar, which had Hamas leaders on its soil, went along with that. You had countries like Egypt and Algeria waxing lyrical about Donald Trump, calling him a man of peace, right?

And, of course, you had the Europeans who thought, well, why do we care? As I said before, this is about Palestinians. It's not about Palestinians—it's about you folks as well. So the only silver lining I see in this disaster for the world and for humanity is that the centrists who, you know, just like—think about it, a bit like the Weimar Republic, Hindenburg—handed over the chancellorship of Germany to Hitler, thinking he could control him. And look what happened to those liberals who were more afraid of the left than they were of the Nazis. In the end, they ended up in the same prison camp as them. So it's only a tiny silver lining. The catastrophe is still with us.

#Glenn

I think that's a great point. Well, eventually it will come for you too. And I think it was obvious in a message that Macron sent to Trump, which Trump then published—this private message—on his Truth Social. Macron apparently wrote to him saying, "Listen, we are fully with you. You're doing great things in Syria and Iran. We are completely with you, but just leave Greenland alone." This assumption that if we just cheer him on, back him in what he might be doing to other parts of the world, then perhaps he'll leave us alone—but I think we're just feeding and building up this monster which, as you said, is going to be out of our control. But what does this mean for—well, I was going to ask how you expect Wall Street, the military-industrial complex, and big tech to react to such a thing. Would they support it? Because overall, there's a tendency in capitalism to have this concentration of wealth to the point where democracy can no longer work.

I mean, this is not just opponents of liberal democracy—sorry, of capitalism—who suggest this, but even liberal capitalists. Classical capitalists like David Ricardo noted in his work that with every new technological innovation, capitalism would concentrate more power in capital as opposed to labor, and that would skew the whole relationship. But do you see it in this context, that now we're going to have corporations beginning to displace entire nations? Yes.

#Yanis Varoufakis

Well, as I said before, corporations began the process of imperialism. And, you know, militarism, corporatism, and imperialism went hand in hand. At some point, when corporations—just like when Wall Street went belly up in 2008—they were essentially nationalized, basically bailed out. Their losses were passed on to the state. This is exactly what happened decades ago. And now, now that they're back on their feet, they're taking over the states again. So you asked me, what will the response of the military-industrial complex, Big Tech, and Wall Street be? Let me take this one at a time.

The ones who are loving it are Big Tech because, you know, I wrote a book a couple of years ago called **Technofeudalism**, in which I argue that a new form of capital has emerged—living in our phones. It's called cloud capital. It's not producing anything except the power to directly control our minds and, through that, to amass particular forms of rent in the pockets of Big Tech. And this cloud capital, over the last few years—especially after the war in Ukraine and the genocide in Gaza—has been merging with the military-industrial complex, because now we have autonomous AI drones.

We have software by Palantir running on the servers of Amazon Web Services, Google, and Microsoft. These programs were trained in Gaza and are being trained in Ukraine. And then, you know, the result of this training is software that's sold to the National Health Service in Britain, for instance. So you have the privatization of the National Health Service by American cloud capital trained in the killing fields of Gaza. As I said, Big Tech is loving it, and this is why people like Jeff

Bezos, Mark Zuckerberg, even Elon Musk—who disliked, even despised Donald Trump—have now surrounded him.

And they are, you know, treating him—looking at him as their great benefactor. And there's another dimension that explains Big Tech's enthusiasm for Donald Trump: the Genius Act last April, which he passed through the Senate and the House of Representatives. Essentially, he's legitimizing the privatization of the dollar through Big Tech, through companies like Tether. And now, you know, you're going to have Google, Apple, and others issuing their own stablecoins. These are cryptocurrencies, but they're nothing like, let's say, Bitcoin, which is a bit anarchic. No, these are U.S. dollar-denominated cryptocurrencies.

And that is going—essentially, we're going back to the 19th century, when private banks had the capacity to mint dollars, a capacity that was later taken over and monopolized by the Fed. And the Fed has had its wings clipped. So Big Tech loves all that. It loves the dollar fix. It loves what's happening in Palestine. It loves what's happening with stablecoins and the privatization of the dollar. The military-industrial complex is a little more worried. I mean, they like war, they like these interventions, they like the fact that they're selling huge quantities of weapons to Ukraine with European money. More recently, Israel is eating up their, you know, 10,000- or 20,000-pound bombs like confetti.

They love that. They're a little bit worried that companies like Palantir—the big tech companies, the techno-feudal war machines, as I call them—are, you know, sort of competing with them. They're a little bit worried about that. But I think that of the three conglomerates you mentioned in your question—Wall Street, I think they're the ones who are the most worried about Donald Trump. And they're worried because, as I said, with the Genius Act, he's effectively eating into their financial rents on behalf of Big Tech companies—Tether, stablecoins, and so on. They'll try to join them. J.P. Morgan, for instance, is about to issue its own stablecoin, but they are worried.

So when you see that Donald Trump is fighting over, you know, who's going to control the Fed, he's trying to clip the wings of the chairman of the Fed and also limit the powers of the Fed through legislation like the Genius Act. This is because the Fed belongs to the large banks—the Wall Street banks—and they don't want to have to compete with Silicon Valley, with the West Coast. But nevertheless, it's clear to me that, at least so far, Donald Trump manages to dominate those three: Wall Street, Big Tech, and the military-industrial complex. And they're on board with what he's doing with the Board of Peace and the dissolution, essentially, of the United Nations—turning the United Nations effectively into what the League of Nations was, an empty shell.

#Glenn

This whole dissolution of the United Nations—it seems this started more than, well, at least 30 years ago. You mentioned before the Prime Minister of Canada and his comments at Davos, and I thought that was interesting because he more or less called the so-called rules-based international order a

fraud. I agree with that sentiment, because if you go back to Kosovo, that's when we started saying, "Well, it wasn't legal, but it was legitimate." The assumption was that the legitimacy rested on liberal, democratic, or humanitarian justification. In other words, what we said was: international law is supreme—however, because we're the champions of liberal democracy, we're allowed to invoke human rights and democracy to give ourselves the right to be exempted. Not the Chinese or the Russians or others—just us. It's kind of the sole prerogative of the political West.

So it became a hegemonic order to some extent. What I thought was interesting with the Canadian prime minister is that he kind of recognized that, yeah, there was very selective politics. And again, the common denominator wasn't human rights but the power of the political West. So he seems to see that we shouldn't just look at what Trump's doing now, but at the wider context. Meanwhile, the Europeans really bend the knee to Trump here, and they seem to bow and do as they're told.

Indeed, if you only look at 2025—what they backed in Gaza, the attacks on Iran—they didn't mention the U.S. bombing in Nigeria, but also their participation in Yemen, and of course installing this horrible government in Syria. So, it doesn't seem like they want to go back to international law, but rather return to this "rules-based international order," where the political West is the entity that exempts itself from the law. That is, the Europeans just want to be on the inside of this hegemonic construct; they don't want to be on the outside. Is that what differentiates the Europeans from the Canadians now?

#Yanis Varoufakis

No, I don't think so. I think—look, Mark Carney's speech was very interesting, very well scripted, and well delivered. And as you said, he did say things that no liberal centrist has said so far. But in the end, I don't see much of a difference between him—between Canada and Britain or France. The hypocrisy is oozing out of every pore of their bodies, including Mark Carney. You know, for another purpose, nothing to do with this discussion between you and me, just before we connected, I was making notes, reading very carefully for the second time Mark Carney's speech, and I was making some notes. If I may, I'd like to read something that I wrote here.

You know, he says that—as we said—he says that the rules, the international rules-based order, were fake, or quasi-fake, or partially fake. That's a big thing. By the way, the BBC never reported that part of Mark Carney's speech—okay, just put an asterisk there. But then he goes on and says, at least, you know, American hegemony helped provide public goods, and that's why it was tolerated by Canada, by Europe, and so on. And then he explains what these public goods were. He says, "open sea lanes." Really? Ask the Cubans—did they ever have open sea lanes? Then he says, "a stable financial system." What? Has he forgotten 2008? Has he forgotten the weapons of mass financial destruction, which were not an aberration?

They were part and parcel of this international rules-based order—whatever, rules-based order. The whole, you know, Washington Consensus was built on financialization. So to say that the Americans

were providing us with public goods, including a stable financial system—the only thing the financial system was not, before 2008 or 2015–16 when Trump came along, was stable. It was a totally unstable disequilibrium. And then he goes on to say “collective security.” Really? Has he ever spoken to Iraqis or Afghans? You know, millions dead. What about Libyans? They wrecked that country. Okay, there was a tyrant there, Mr. Gaddafi. And what happened after the international rules-based order bombed Libya?

They just destroyed the place. There’s no country called Libya anymore. And also, “in support of a framework for resolving disputes”? Really? What happened to Palestine during the international rules-based order? What kind of disputes were resolved there? The genocide, the ethnic cleansing, the apartheid state—you know—was effectively erected upon this international rules-based order. So, you know, even Mark Carney’s great speech is riddled with hypocrisy. And what is he proposing to do? He wants to have a new alliance between middle powers—with Germany, with France, and with Britain.

Well, if you really want to do that, begin with a peace process for Ukraine. Where is your peace process for Ukraine? An alternative, you know, a replacement for what Trump and Putin are doing—nothing. The only idea they have about Ukraine is that they should find more weapons for Ukraine to keep killing Ukrainians and Russians, in this reproduction of the First World War with drones that kill thousands of people without any resolution in sight. What about Mr. Carney’s proposal on Palestine? What is he proposing about Palestine? Nothing. You know, he’s going to recoil. He gave a great speech.

He’ll be remembered for a great speech that described the situation reasonably well but had absolutely nothing to offer in terms of what to do about it. Because, let’s face it—you heard what Trump said today: if Canada ratifies the free trade agreement with China, he’s going to slap 100% tariffs on them. Now, what happens to the auto workers in Canada who’ll lose their jobs because they’re producing cars and spare parts for American companies? Does he have a plan for that? Is he going to invest in—bring BYD in to take over from Ford and General Motors? No, he’s got no such plan.

#Glenn

Yeah, that’s a good point, because of course it was a good speech. But the honesty and principles he suddenly comes to champion—one has to ask, why now? And, you know, the day before, Trump went out and posted on Truth Social a map of North America that he’d generated with AI, showing Canada colored in with the American flag, right in front of a European audience. So he knows that after Greenland, the U.S. might come for Canada. It seems that’s suddenly why these principles come into play. But it’s still extraordinary that there isn’t more pushback against this. Just as a final question—do you see this in the larger context of the U.S. having to find a new approach to dominance? Because after World War II, the U.S. had many benefits. It was a technological leader, and through the war it had built up this industrial power.

It had begun to control all international sea lanes. It asserted control over a lot of the natural resources from Saudi Arabia and other places. It's had a key role in the financial institutions—the World Bank, the IMF—and of course, the world then signed up to the dollar as the world's reserve currency. So it was the economic hegemon. In those regards, a liberal economic system is a good thing when you're the hegemon, much like Britain in the 19th century, because it means you integrate the world under your administration. But what we see now is the desperation of the U.S.—all these wars, the economic wars. Is this rooted in the inability to compete with China and, overall, the U.S. exhausting itself, as you see with their debt? Essentially, it's a desperate effort to reshuffle the deck, develop a new system—just anything that would put the U.S. back on the throne.

#Yanis Varoufakis

I have a slightly different perspective on this. What you described as post-war American hegemony ended in 1971. It was exactly as you said up until then, during the Bretton Woods era. In the 1950s and '60s, you had a hegemon—it was a surplus country, technologically advanced, a net exporter. And the whole point of Bretton Woods, Glenn, was to retain the surplus position of the United States. By the end of the 1960s, they lost that position for a number of reasons we don't need to get into now—among them the Vietnam War, the Great Society, and the fact that American capital invested heavily in German and Japanese industry. The result was that German and Japanese industries became more efficient than the American ones.

And at some point, especially with the Vietnam War, you know, in the end the Bretton Woods system was no longer sustainable because it was based on the idea that America would be a surplus country and would be dollarizing Britain, Europe, and Japan, so as to allow them to keep buying the net exports of the United States. But once the net exports went, that system went—and of course, the Americans themselves blew it up. Then they replaced it with a very different system, not the one we described, a system based on the reversal of the recycling scheme that was Bretton Woods.

Instead of America being the surplus country, recycling its surpluses into Europe and Asia—Japan in particular, and later China—what happened was that it now had a deficit, and it used that deficit to create aggregate demand in Europe, Japan, and later China. It sent IOUs, called dollars, to them, which were then repatriated to New York and became three things: government bonds—in other words, funding the American federal government—secondly, some shares that foreigners were allowed to buy, and thirdly, primarily real estate, which is what made Donald Trump, Donald Trump.

So, you know, this attempt to maintain hegemony after they had fallen behind—after they had become a deficit country—that was Nixon. And Nixon had no problem waging an economic war against his allies. So, you know, Trump is not the first president to wage an economic war. When John Connally, the Treasury Secretary under Richard Nixon, went to Europe after the Bretton Woods

system was blown up on the 15th of August 1971, he told the Europeans, "You're stuffed. I'm here to pay you. The dollar is my currency and your problem." And the Europeans went into a tailspin, and, you know, they tried to create their own Bretton Woods, their own fixed exchange rate system.

So they went through various configurations of a fixed exchange rate regime, and they were failing—with the "snake" within the European Monetary System, with the European Exchange Rate Mechanism. In the end, they created the euro. That was a disaster for investment in Europe, for integration, and so on. And similarly, remember what Ronald Reagan did in 1985 to the Japanese—the Plaza Accords. He put a gun to their head and said, "I'm going to put 200% tariffs on you unless you revalue again." And they did. And the result is that the Japanese miracle died there and then. So this is not new.

What is new? The fundamental difference between the Nixon shock and the Trump shock is China. Because when Nixon was shocking his allies, the way I just described, there was no competing economic system. There was the Soviet Union, but it was already in decline. From the late '60s and early '70s, it was abundantly clear that the Soviet economic system didn't have the capacity to compete in terms of technological advancement, exports, and all the things that matter in financial markets and markets more generally. But Trump is trying to create a new Nixon shock in the context of China, which is advancing exponentially—already twice, even three times, the size of American industry.

In terms of big tech, half of the AI experts in the world now are Chinese. They're not Brits or Germans and so on—they're Chinese. In green energy, we already see a reduction in reliance on fossil fuels and a massive expansion in renewables, which Europe and, particularly, Trump's America are turning away from. So he's trying to extend American hegemony by privatizing the dollar through the Genius Act, as I mentioned before, and by essentially blowing up the European Union, blowing up Canada, blowing up his allies—because he's a realist. He tried to bamboozle the Chinese.

He failed. The Chinese won the trade war against him. He's already, effectively, succumbed to that. In April, you'll see there will be a meeting between Trump and Xi, and they'll extend the truce. And I think they'll keep extending it, because the United States needs China more than China needs the United States—in terms of rare earths, in terms of a number of critical materials for American interests and for the American industrial complex. What he's saying is, "Okay, well, I'm going to extract maximum rents from my allies, and I'm going to coexist with the Chinese."

But, you know, I don't want to have to deal with the European Union as a whole. So I'm going to undermine the European Union. I want to deal with the Germans. I want to deal with the French. I want to deal with the Italians. I want to deal with the Canadians. So I'm going to put the cat among the pigeons. You know, when the Europeans complain that, oh my God, by threatening to take over Greenland, you're blowing up NATO and the EU—well, exactly. That's what he wants. He sees the Western Hemisphere as a bicycle wheel where he's the hub and they're the spokes. And even if some spokes are broken, the bicycle wheel still works.

#Glenn

I think this is something the Europeans really have to understand, because the assumption seems to be that the more they give in, eventually their loyalty will be appreciated and he'll see the value of having Europe as a partner. But I think all he sees is weakness, and he's just looking for something to extract as he decouples from Europe. It's extraordinary to watch. Anyway, thank you so much for letting me pick your brain over the weekend. And, as you said, if this really is leading to the end of the United Nations, it's quite a dramatic development. But, as you also said, many of the people who will complain helped bring this about as well. So, thanks again.

#Yanis Varoufakis

Thank you, Glenn.