

Stanislav Krapivnik: Russia & China United in Defense of Iran

Stanislav Krapivnik is a former US Army officer, supply chain exec and military-political expert, now based in Russia. He was born in Lugansk during the Soviet times, migrated to the US as a child and served in the US army. Krapivnik discusses how Russia and China will defend Iran in a possible American attack. Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glenndiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glenndiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glenndiesen> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We're joined again by Stanislav Krapivnik, a former U.S. Army officer and military analyst originally from Donbass, who has now returned to Russia. Thank you for coming back on. I have a lot of questions I'm looking forward to asking you.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Always a pleasure. Always a pleasure.

#Glenn

I thought perhaps we could look toward the Middle East first, because as the United States continues to build up all these military capabilities in preparation for a possible attack on Iran, the big question everyone asks is: what will countries like Russia and China do? They can't afford to see Iran defeated and possibly balkanized. However, neither Russia nor China wants a direct shooting war with the United States. So how does Russia assist Iran in defending itself?

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Well, you know, this is an interesting topic because Iran is presenting, for both Russia and China, a platform of integration where they may be getting battle-tested. Russia has developed for Iran, in very short order, an integrated air defense shield—something Iran didn't have before. At first, Iran had S-300s and S-200s, the older systems from the '60s, which, by the way, still work quite well against Tomahawks when the Tomahawks are actually going to explode. An integrated air umbrella is a system that, if it's fully connected, allows you—on the strategic level—to start picking up and possibly intercepting enemy targets outside the territory you're defending.

Then you have an inner layer where you're starting to defend on a strategic level inside the country. Then you have the battle theater level, then the localized level, and finally pinpoint defense. The Pantsir is on the localized level. The Iгла—or the American system, what is it called again?—well, the shoulder-fired MANPADS. Those are for spot defense, the last line of defense. If something has gotten all the way through, or it pops up very close—like a drone or a helicopter suddenly appearing—then you use spot defense. So this whole integrated system, obviously, you're not going to be taking out ballistic or cruise missiles with a shoulder-fired missile, supposedly.

#Glenn

But you never know. Supposedly, yeah, you can't do that.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

But you could take out a jet, for example, or a helicopter, or a large drone. But that's an integrated system—and it's integrated not just because it has multiple layers, but because the radar systems and the weapons themselves are communicating. So if one layer fails to make contact or destroy the target, it passes that information to the next layer, which engages, then passes it to the next, and so on, until you destroy it at some point—or it blows up on its own. By the way, what I said about the Tomahawks—the twelve Tomahawks Trump fired into Syria—had about a 33% failure rate to detonate. Their warheads were found unexploded. So maybe it was a bad batch, I don't know. But if that's typical, then the U.S. has even bigger problems.

So that's on one level, plus the radar system that went with it. Iran, at the time—at first, Russia was asked, well, pressured—not to sell the S-400s that Iran wanted. I think Iran actually paid for them, and Russia failed to deliver back in the 2000s because of sanctions. After that, Russia was ready to deliver, but Iran said, "We're going to build our own system. We don't need the S-400." Well, they did build their own system, but it was much weaker, worse off, and heavily damaged in the 12-day war. So Iran came back, and Russia came back, built this integrated system over the last six months, trained up Su-35 pilots, and delivered Su-35 fighters—which, by the way, outrange the F-35s, even though it's a generation 4++ fighter versus the generation 5 fighter that the F-35 represents. That's on one side.

On the other side, the Chinese are bringing in their integrated radar systems, which include very tight-beam, low-wavelength sections integrated with satellite systems that can pick up anything within, I think, 500 or 600 kilometers outside of Iran. So anything the U.S. or Israel is launching is already being detected, giving them enough time to start reacting. If you figure a cruise missile is flying at about 1,000 kilometers an hour, you still have around 30 minutes to react before it's in your airspace—which is actually a lot of time for anti-aircraft systems. Our whole point is to try to cut that time as much as possible.

Again, stealth aircraft are not invisible. They're just very hard to detect on radar, so the hope is that they're already over the target, or close to it, by the time the radar system or someone visually picks them up. That's actually how the Serbs took out several American B-1s. They set up circles of people with radios who could see them coming in, because the planes kept using the same flight corridor—thinking they were invisible. Well, no, they weren't. The spotters radioed back, and the aircraft were taken out with an S-300 or S-200 system once they were almost at point-blank range.

So with these two systems—the Soviet, or formerly Soviet, now Russian system—and the Chinese system integrated, we may be seeing a synthesis of something much more powerful. The U.S. planners are writing it off, saying it's not really capable, that they won't be able to do anything. There's a lot of bravado that's never been tested. So there's going to be, I think, a very big shock and surprise for the U.S., Israeli, and NATO forces if they start initiating contact. And I think they will. That's their problem. Whether Trump wants it or not, he's going to be backed into this war.

#Glenn

But all of these things—they weren't there back in June when the U.S. attacked the first time around, right?

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Well, the S-300s were, the S-400s were not, and the decapitation strike at the beginning actually did damage quite a bit of—well, at least some—we don't know exactly how much, but at least some of the radars and some of the anti-aircraft systems, and it killed key officers who would have been in charge of getting all that up. Plus, the Chinese systems and the multi-phase radar systems were not there. So all of this has been brought in over the last six months, set up, integrated. We'll see how well it's integrated. Well, you know, combat is the ultimate test—when your life is on the line.

So we'll see at that point just how integrated those systems are. But if they're as integrated as they might be, one thing that's going to happen is—well, you know—China, Russia, and Iran signed a trilateral alliance too. If this integration works, we may be seeing it all along the Russian border areas, and for the Chinese border areas—China using Russian S-300s, S-400s, S-500s, the 550s that are coming out right now—and Russia using the Chinese radar, and Iran as well. So this could be a very big game changer, a synthesis of these two systems. We'll see. We'll see.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, this is one of the strange things I think was missing in the—well, you probably saw Marco Rubio's speech in Munich. It was very imperialistic. I mean, he complained about the loss of the European empires proudly being spread across the world, all of that being lost after World War II. However, I thought it was a bit strange, because the assumption was that we're not going to

apologize for throwing away all these rules and liberal pretenses, because we have to reverse our decline.

We're going to just use extreme force in order to restore the empire. If only it were that simple. The problem is, if you punch too hard, if you get too aggressive, then the rest of the international system will begin to collectively balance against you. People used to call it Kissinger's worst nightmare—to have China and Russia come together—but putting Iran into the mix, this is, you know, of course it would be the weaker of the three, but it kind of shows these three large Eurasian powers coming together. How foolish this idea is, that if you just throw away all your inhibitions and go for empire, then no one can stop you. It seems not well thought through.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

It's worse than that, Glenn. It's worse than that. First of all, there are minor players involved—there's also Belarus, obviously, and North Korea. North Korea is nuclear-capable, although while we're at it, there may be Cambodia, which is much closer to North Korea. There may be—I'm sorry, the other one—Thailand. Which one initiated hostilities? Thailand is actually, I think, under American tutelage lately. A composure, right—Vietnam, if we're going to start going down that line. So yeah, the Turks aren't exactly thrilled with us either. They don't want the refugees. They don't want Iran being destroyed. They may not be best friends with them—far from it—but they don't want the chaos that's going to happen, especially on their own borders. And there are other countries involved. India right now has got a bad relationship.

Now, interestingly enough, India—the country that was once the biggest blocking force in BRICS against a combined currency of any kind—is now the biggest cheerleader. Modi and Trump had a falling out because of Trump's mercurial attitude toward everything when he doesn't get his way. And, you know, India is now the big cheerleader. I'm not saying India is ready to join a military alliance of any kind, but that is a possibility. Russia is brokering Indian-Chinese peace, and there's actually quite a bit of trade between the two, interestingly enough, that people don't talk about. So we'll see. We'll see how it goes. There's always Pakistan. Pakistan made overtures toward Iran, stating that if Israel uses a nuclear weapon, Pakistan will use a nuclear weapon on Israel in defense of Iran.

So there's a lot at play—not just counting the three. Uh, there are a lot of other issues that could really, really change the outlook. And you're absolutely right: nobody likes the big bully. The international tendency is, if somebody's coming at you—one guy, two guys, three guys—everybody figures, you know, we're probably next, time to rebalance it. And when somebody like Rubio, in his—what I call his “call to re-empire” speech—basically says that all of Western civilization, the only thing it ever achieved that was worth anything, was empire... that's what you get from that speech. There was nothing else in Western civilization but empire; its glory was empire. Well, you know, there are several problems there. First of all, to understand where Rubio is coming from—you know his ancestry?

#Glenn

Yeah, Cuban, right?

#Stanislav Krapivnik

No, well, Cuban as far as he came—his father was born in Cuba. But that's not ancestry, that's just, you know, recent. His family is from somewhere in mid-minor Spanish nobility that later became part of the viceroy class. His ancestors, not that far back—maybe 150 years ago—were Spanish viceroys. They were the governors, the nobility used as administrators in the Spanish Empire. They were the local big guys. That's where his family comes from. And as somebody whose family is also from nobility—well, on my mother's side; my father's, no, not at all, from the other side—you learn about who your ancestors were. That's something that gets passed down, and it's taken very seriously. So he knows who his ancestors were. He even mentioned it in his speech: "My ancestors are from..." I don't remember the exact province they're from.

They would be very shocked and impressed that, you know, their offspring, after all those generations, has come back as a diplomat—the main diplomat to Europe and so on. He's got this drive to, I guess, reclaim the viceroy role of Latin America, or at least some portion of it. So empire is what he was raised on, at least to some degree, even though his father fled Cuba from Batista, not from Castro. His family moved to Miami four years before Castro came to power. It's not what he tells people, but it is what's historically documented. So his whole mindset is empire. You're dealing with a person who believes the triumph of Western civilization is empire—enslaving the Third World. You know, his ancestors were the big guys who sat over the dirty, ugly peasants and beat them around because they were the viceroy class. And I think that's still heavily influencing him today.

#Glenn

Yeah, no, I thought that part was—yeah, even with the offenses—that is, you know, European civilization has achieved a lot. And I would agree there's been some decadence, especially in civility and morality after the Second World War. But to reduce European civilization to "we had empires, this is what it was, this is what we must have back," it's... interesting, and also very telling of his view. But on the topic of the Munich Security Conference, how do you see the possible relationship between Russia and the Europeans developing?

Going, I guess, further down a dark road, because I saw Chancellor Merz making the argument there in Munich. He said, "We have"—and again, he emphasized "we"—"we have imposed unheard-of losses and costs on Moscow." I mean, quite extraordinary to hear from a German chancellor. You also heard other comments coming from the Danish prime minister, saying we shouldn't respect any more red lines, that there should be deep strikes into Russia. It appears that all the pretenses of this

merely being a proxy war are slowly going away, and more and more there's talk about a direct war. Do you see anything on the horizon? I mean, what's the mood when they hear this in Russia—among the political class, the military, or the public, for that matter?

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Well, you know, the military's job is to take every threat seriously and to continuously plan for it. The politician's job is to figure out what really is the threat and to set guidance accordingly. At this point, I think—at least from what I'm hearing from a lot of politicians and from the military—I've been hearing this from day one, of course, and I've been saying it myself: if somebody's telling you they want to kill you, take them very seriously. They may not have the weapons or the ability to do it right now, but they have the intent. And you've got to accept that they have the intent and the desire to do it.

Now, having said that, what I think we're looking at is that the political class has started to realize, yeah, these people really are that stupid. And these people are stupid. First of all, you're looking at a pampered, inbred aristocracy, for the most part, that's ruling the EU—the same aristocracy that ruled before, except now it's a republic instead of something else. The unfortunate part is that when they were real monarchies, they had better control over their idiots, like these prime ministers, than they do now. Now, as a republic, the worst of the worst can rise to the top, especially in an enclosed system that doesn't allow any real competition, and run the country—which clearly makes things even worse, as republics tend to do in the end before they die.

And all republics die. This is the third or fourth big wave of republics in the world, and they all die, usually within 200 years. They die because of these types of people. The system becomes absolutely corrupt. And, you know, in a crude way of putting it, gold sinks, crap floats to the top. That's how these systems work out. They're a popularity contest at best, and usually the people who are most popular are not the smartest. Worse, they're so rigged it doesn't really matter if you're popular or not—you're going to get the power because you're in that rigged class that's blocked off paths for anybody else.

Well, Romania is a good place to start, you know. The one interesting thing, though—the U.S. State Department put out that Ursula von der Leyen has now rigged eight elections in Europe. Well, not just in the EU, but in Europe in general, because she did it twice in Moldova. So the EU is in the business of rigging elections. I know, it's shocking. Nobody could see this one coming, especially after Romania. My God, you know. That was just clear-cut, fair elections—well, with the wrong candidate. Elections can't hold new candidates in power. So yeah, you're looking at people who have no concept of war.

They have no—well, they have a concept. There are two concepts at work. One, a lot of these people, their ancestry were Nazis—out-and-out Nazis. I mean, even if you look at the head of MI6—I don't remember her name—her grandfather was a Ukrainian Nazi and a mass murderer who was a

wanted war criminal, like the British letterbox. No big surprise there. And now his granddaughter carries that legacy. I'm sure that legacy has been—not that it's a genetic legacy, but a family legacy. I'm sure she's been told all the glories of her grandfather, that they should carry it on. And it's the same with a lot of these people. If you start looking into their family backgrounds, they weren't just some Wehrmacht. Most of them weren't just Wehrmacht officers even—they were SS, card-carrying Nazis.

And Nazism wasn't just in Germany—it spread across all of Europe. I mean, Norway had Quisling, who was very happy to serve his Berlin masters after Norway was invaded by Germany. Granted, Norway was going to be invaded by Britain otherwise. Norway was in a bad position regardless of which way it went. Maybe with the British it would have been a little better than with the Nazis. But either way, you always find people in any country, like Quisling, who are more than happy to serve whoever that power is that comes in. And now, over time—and I think this has been a goal—the people who have been rising to power all over Europe are those whose ancestry wasn't just, like I said, Wehrmacht or any other country's military, but actual SS, actual party members.

It's scary if you think about it—if you look at it realistically—in a lot of these countries. You get people who are upset; they want revenge. Revenge against Russia. They have no concept of military service, no concept of war. At least you could say for Hitler, he knew what war was from World War I, as a corporal. What does Merz know? What does Scholz know? What do any of these people know? They never wore a uniform. Or if they did, it was like Graham—he was a combat lawyer, a JAG lawyer, that's it. So he wore a uniform, but he was a lawyer, which doesn't really make it any different.

He doesn't know any of these people. They really don't know what combat is. They don't know the threats. It's easy to toss somebody else's kids into this. As Albright once said, "Why have a military if you can't use it?" Well, yeah—you have a military so you don't have to use it. That's hopefully the goal. But if your goal is empire, then of course, why have a military if you can't use it? These people are out of their minds. I'm really hoping the Austro-Hungarian bloc stays strong, that Orbán survives the next elections, and that Austria's next elections bring it fully into the bloc—if the conservatives get a supermajority and tell the EU to bounce. There's an article, I think it's 41-7, the common defense article for the EU. Apparently, von der Leyen gave a speech saying they're going to push the Ukraine issue—bring Ukraine into the EU by '27—and then everybody has to go defend Ukraine.

Basically, everybody has to go to war because that's part of the dialogue. Oh, and the veto powers are going to be annulled for countries like Hungary or Slovakia that don't want Ukraine in the EU. I think she'd be very surprised how many countries in the EU would probably say no—we're not going to fight—or would have a revolution on their hands if they tried to force their population. Greece and Bulgaria come to mind there. But I think the intent in the Politburo of the EU-SSR is very much on war, and it's backed up by key countries like Germany and Poland. Poland, by the way, is now seeking compensation for the Soviet occupation, when its population doubled after World War II. It's been shrinking every year since.

You know, okay, fine. If we're going to start going back in time, how about Poland's annexation of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus in 1920? Or 500 years of Polish occupation of Russian land? Or twice the Polish occupation of Moscow? I mean, if we're going to start going back that way, why stop at, you know, 80 years ago or 40 years ago? Let's go all the way—let's go 300 years ago, let's go 500 years ago. Who owes who more? This is the ridiculous level of these politicians. And I don't see—unless there is, you know, short of a coup or a revolution—the right parties taking power in a lot of these countries and steering them away from war. I don't see any way around this. They're insane. I mean, they're clinically insane people.

#Glenn

The issue of reparations, I think, is quite damaging. I get the idea behind it—settling things and all that—but once you create these economic incentives to not let the past rest and start making money off it, it's poison to diplomacy. You'll always have incentives to cash in on former grievances. And of course, this couldn't be more political; it wouldn't be happening otherwise if it weren't for the current conflict. But it's a good point you made about threat assessments—they're based on capabilities and intentions. So if you're expressing hostile intentions without the capabilities, I think stupidity defies logic.

It's a good way of—well, you're defining it, because now you're telling your opponents what you want to do, even though you don't have the means to do it. So it's a very dangerous thing, and it's a form of self-sabotage as well. However, the United States has both intentions and capabilities. The intentions became a little clearer after Rubio's speech. But we do see, for example, whenever a U.S. drone flies over the Black Sea, if you go through the Telegram channels, they already know that a Ukrainian drone attack will follow. These are still U.S. weapons, missiles, U.S. intelligence—the U.S. picking out the targets as it flies the drones along the Russian border.

So it still seems very much like a U.S. war. So how do you see this affecting the talks now between the Americans and the Russians? Because Trump still insists he's only a mediator and that this is a conflict between Russia and Ukraine. Of course, every now and then, Rubio and the rest will come in and say, yeah, this is a proxy war. But at the same time, they want to be the mediator. So how do you see this working in the negotiations? Because surely the mood in Russia must be getting quite angry about the very direct involvement of the United States.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

It is. I can't speak to exactly what's going on in the Kremlin. I haven't been invited there in a very long time—like, never. I'm like, boy, if you read Newsweek or these other journalists' pieces, apparently I'm best friends with Vladimir Vladimirovich and privy to all the secrets. But yeah, I learn

new things about myself all the time when you read this kind of pulp fiction. But the reality is, we've seen Lavrov come out and repeat the same message three times in one week—that this is all just a big boondoggle. It's heading into a dead end, and something needs to be decided.

Um, I think the Russian, uh, and Vladimir's patience has got to go down in the book of Zen—you know, it's legendary. I mean, personally, I would have struck already, at least some kind of preparatory blow as a warning. The U.S.—first of all, these negotiations are pointless. Let's just begin with that. They're absolute kabuki theater. They're going absolutely nowhere, and they're not going to go anywhere. Negotiations are never done this way. Like I've been saying, this is the McDonald's drive-thru, fast-food drive-thru of negotiations.

You're not getting real food. You're getting crap—plastic crap, basically. It's the same thing you're getting out of these negotiations. I think the Russian side was like, "Let's talk to the U.S. side and pull them into our orbit, because we can have mutually beneficial economic relationships." Well, so far, the three businessmen that keep going are Jared Kushner, Wilcox, and the other guy—I can't remember his name. He's an investment banker who's now head of the U.S. federal procurement office. He just showed up last time in Moscow.

#Glenn

I don't know—maybe he's just taking a field trip.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

But, you know, I think the point was maybe we can pull the Americans out of their stance a little, because we can have mutual business deals. Now, the one thing Trump does not want is a lengthy war—which he may wind up getting as a rocket war in Iran. He doesn't want U.S. troops dying by the thousands, or even by the hundreds, every day in a full-scale war like the Ukrainians are fighting. That wouldn't fly very long at all in the U.S. Once the caskets start coming... then they'd have to start ordering a lot more American flags made in China to drape all the caskets coming in if they went down that road.

And that's suicide for Trump. In fact, if Iran sinks an aircraft carrier—or even heavily damages one—and they can, because they've got live radar and satellite data coming in from China and Russia... I've mentioned that to people, and they're like, "Oh, you know, the aircraft carriers will be running in the Indian Ocean. They can't find them." Why do you think they can't find them? How many Russian satellites are there—about 170? How many Chinese satellites—about 300? You think they can't find them with live data?

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Of course they can't.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Same thing the U.S. does—the U.S. and U.K. do—for Ukraine in the Black Sea. Even if that happens, it could be a massive, devastating blow, and possibly a resignation blow for Trump, because he doesn't have Congress's approval. That's how Congress plays both sides: if you win, "We were always behind you." If you lose, "We never told you you could do this war, so we're going to go after you to make our name." It's duplicitous, but that's American politics. But in this case, if you listen to what Marco Rubio said—"We need our allies strong. We need to start rebuilding your empire. Go east, young man. Go east and die under Russian tanks and artillery fire." That's what they want the Europeans to do. The U.S. isn't going to go fight this war.

The U.S. is going to make money off this war. Something I've mentioned quite a few times—do you know what the Americans call World War II? "The Great War." Not because it was great in size, but because it was great for America. World War II lifted America out of the Great Depression and put her back on her feet economically. And because everybody was whacking each other back and forth—depending on who you ask about when World War II started: for the Russians it was '41, for the Europeans it was '39, for the Chinese it was '36—because everyone hit each other hard enough, the U.S. ended up becoming the biggest economic superpower on top of everything.

It had—I think it was responsible for about 50% of the world's GDP at the end of World War II. And it was a great war. They went from being in a Great Depression, losing about 10% of the population, to suddenly becoming a world economic superpower. Maybe not a military superpower—well, not the preeminent superpower, because it was huge at that point too—but economically, they were the superpower. So, the first article that I read—I think it was in **Foreign Affairs**, if I remember correctly—it was in 1999, ninety-nine, that said, "We need another great war. We need another big European war. That way we can write off our debts, become creditors, and rebuild Europe."

Now, if **Forbes** is talking about it, and it had this article in 1999, you know they've been talking about this for quite a while. So even if we start from 1999, that's 27 years the U.S. has been building up to pushing Europe into a suicidal death ride against—well, who else? Against Russia. They're not going to go against China; China's too far away. But against Russia. And if everybody's destroyed, we can come in and pick up the pieces we want, write off our debts, and rebuild you for big credits—while stripping you of everything that's worth stripping. And that's the American point in this. America's not going to fight Russia directly. Suicide.

#Glenn

What they're going to do is stay neutral—and they're going to sell. Well, neutral.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Once the fighting starts, they're going to sell equipment and fuel to the Europeans under American flagships. If Russia sinks an American flagship, it's game on for the big, big, big war—possibly a nuclear war. Russia's fighting Europe. Well, you know, hey... all those little people are getting killed off, and we're going to make money off them a while later. And people—when people hear this, somebody's going to say, "No way, they can't be that evil. They can't really be doing this. That's insane." These are the Epstein people. These people would literally eat their own people's children. I mean, and you want morality out of these people? It's the bottom line.

Where are we going to make the best ends with? How many do we have to sacrifice? Who gives a damn? They're not real people—but they're ours. And by "ours," I don't even mean Americans. I mean our clique. These are the people telling you we need to cut humanity down to 500 million of the "golden class." But really, the golden class is going to be that half a million, and then maybe 20–30% who are educated and serving them, and the rest will be the peasants. I mean, these are the people pushing these ideas. Believe you me, they want this. They may not have the capability of doing it at the moment, but if they keep telling you they want this—they want this. This is what's really in their souls. They still have it all.

#Glenn

Well, that's another thing that seemed clear from Rubio's speech. Ever since Trump got re-elected, the lingering question has been: what is the objective here, in terms of the loss of unipolarity? Do you want to restore it, or do you want to adjust to multipolarity? I think that's been cleared up. Also, the relationship with Russia— is the objective to end this century-long conflict, to weaken Russia, or to outsource it to the Europeans? I think that's been settled as well. But no, it's the perhaps darker intentions toward Europe. Nobody wants to hear it, because we have a narrative built on an 80-year history of a benign alliance of peoples with the same values.

But on this channel, I had him on twice—Harald Kujat, the former head of the German army, who even held one of the highest positions within NATO. You know, he makes the point that not only did NATO provoke the war, but that the US and Britain sabotaged efforts to make peace, both in Minsk and in Istanbul. What I found most interesting is that he also says part of the reason was to sabotage Germany—that they're draining all the resources and industries out of Germany. So, weakening Germany and strengthening themselves. I mean, it just sounds crazy, because nobody ever puts people who make that point on a news program.

It's always interesting to me why nobody seems to want to talk to the guy who held the top position—who was the head of the German armed forces. Nobody wants to hear from him. But again, the journalists, on the other hand, seem to have a window into Putin's head, which is always open. How many articles have I seen now where they claim to know all of Putin's thoughts, his

feelings, his fears, his aspirations—as if these were facts? It's become so common that people don't really question it. Where exactly is this coming from? Where are these excellent sources? It's quite extraordinary. One other thing to add.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

On this topic of the supposedly benign relationship between America and, particularly, Western and Central Europe, I've got one thing to say: Operation Gladio. And if anybody doesn't know what Operation Gladio is, go look it up. That's the stay-behind armies. That's the... I mean, I knew about Operation Gladio to begin with. I had an interview with Colonel Towner—she's a retired Air Force colonel—and she's been huge on that. I mean, I'd written a couple of articles on it, so I knew a lot about it, but she's on a whole different level. And, you know, you should have her on sometime to discuss that. It's amazing, just the amount of terrorism, assassination, control—political control.

I mean, crude, foreign control—gloves-off control—that the Americans were observing since 1948. And for God's sake, portions of Operation Gladio, portions of those CIA-funded and trained stay-behind armies, were trying to assassinate de Gaulle and his bank. Which is why, you know, NATO is now in Belgium and no longer in Paris—because they tried to kill de Gaulle when he was trying to negotiate and get rid of Algeria. De Gaulle figured out pretty quickly—he wasn't a leftist by any means—but he realized that if France kept Algeria, they were just going to flood the country with people, which happened anyway after him, because they opened the borders. But he saw what was going to happen—what France was going to turn into.

He's like, "No, this is an anchor around their neck. We don't need Algeria." There was a coup against him in Algeria by a group of French officers, and with the help of CIA people, they tried to assassinate him and his whole family. De Gaulle took that personally—exterminated these guys. I mean, a radical campaign of extermination against his enemies. And then he told NATO to get the hell out and left NATO. For that, he got a color revolution and all that, and he demanded his money back—in gold, not American greenbacks. So yeah, the gold thing wound up getting him a color revolution from all that. But the point is, the U.S. was never this benevolent friend of Europe.

The U.S. held Europe through terror, through assassination, through extreme hard force. Meanwhile, it was raising this generation of today's politicians who are sellouts. You know, when von der Leyen said, "I feel just as much at home in America as I do in Germany," she's not lying. I mean, with these people, you've got to start wondering where their loyalty really is. And one of the other things a lot of people don't understand is how the CIA operates with foreigners. The CIA will come up to a general in some country and say, "Hey, we want you to work for us. We're going to make you a major in the CIA. Here are your passports. We'll keep all that."

You do the job you're supposed to be doing, and if everything goes sour—or when you want to leave—you come to the U.S. We've got a house for you. You start working for the CIA as a major, as a captain, whatever, instead of being a general where you were. But you know you've got this

money set aside, and you've got a landing platform you can flee to. This is how they buy people. It's pretty well thought through—evil but ingenious on the one hand—and they do this constantly. So you start to wonder: who in your security services is really working for you? Who are they actually working for? Who are the real masters in the media, and so on, and so on? There's been a corrosion and corruption of Central and Western Europe from the mid-1940s, from the end of World War II onward. If we wanted an actual peace in Europe—well, in 1948, Stalin asked to join NATO, which was just being formed.

It officially came into being in 1949. He just didn't quite understand that it was being formed against him—well, not him personally, but against Russia in general, the Soviet Union, whichever you want to call it. But, you know, if you wanted a defensive peace structure in Europe, there you go. 1948 was a prime chance. 1992 was a prime chance with Yeltsin. 2000 was a prime chance with Putin. But they all asked to join NATO. Obviously, there was no interest in that. NATO needed an enemy. NATO needs to fight a war; otherwise, NATO ceases to exist. It's an expense. So, who gets to fight that war? It sure sounds like it's going to be the Americans. They've got China to deal with, you know. So here you go, Europeans—go back to empire. Empire, go east. Go die. So we can make money. That's Marco Rubio's speech in a nutshell.

#Glenn

Well, they also have this for political leaders. I know that, as the outgoing president of Georgia, as soon as she left, she took a position at the McCain Institute of all places and just moved across the U.S. So it's a common thing—a post-career retirement plan. But this is one of the things that annoys me a lot in Europe as well. De Gaulle was considered one of the great statesmen. He recognized that alliances don't mean identical interests; they're overlapping interests. And when those come into conflict, you stand up for your own country. But now we see the interests drifting apart between the U.S. and the Europeans.

There's still no recognition, it seems, that there are different interests, and your loyalty to the U.S. shouldn't go above your own. But the willingness to throw away national interest now is just extraordinary—the self-sabotage. It's annoying to watch. If you want to talk about restoring European greatness, perhaps looking after national interest before dreaming of empire would be a good start. My last question was about NATO, though. The NATO countries are still pushing this narrative that Russia is taking huge losses and achieving very little on the ground. Again, I know the war narratives are intended to sell a long war—"we're winning, so let's keep the war going." But how are you assessing the situation on the ground compared to these narratives?

#Stanislav Krapivnik

Well, it's obvious that those narratives are built on nothing. They're idiotic. I mean, some of these narratives—especially in the British press—are the worst of all. "The Russians are eating pigeons. The Russians are eating each other. Putin's throwing men with no legs back to the front." Whatever

they can think of to outdo each other in stupidity and ridiculousness, they march forward with all glory and horns blowing. Anybody looking at the map can see it's not moving as fast as, say—well, actually, it's moving faster than most of World War I was moving on the Western Front until the collapse. And then, when the collapse happened, there was no more German government and no more German army.

All of a sudden, it's all over, because now you can just walk in. The Western Allies never set foot on German soil in all of World War I until the German army and government had fully collapsed. Then they went in with very little standing in their way. Now, the Ukrainian army is throwing whatever strategic reserves they have into the area around Dobropillya in Zaporizhzhia. Dobropillya and Donetsk are two different cities or towns. They came in pretty hard and fast in the north—maybe even too hard and fast—and that was interesting. They moved quickly, breaking through the new Russian lines. Really fast. But they lost a lot of men and equipment, because they tend not to, you know, spare either their men or their gear.

They just throw them in as much as possible into the meat grinder. Then, about three or four days into this, all of a sudden Russia starts bombing the bridges across the rivers to the north—the ones the Ukrainians were coming across. And their movement starts to collapse. So this is one of two things: either Russia was caught off guard—surprise, here come the Ukrainians—or this was pre-planned. You collapse your line to draw your enemy further and further in. The reason the bridges weren't hit at first is so the enemy will push in as many soldiers as possible into this new trap. Then they start blowing all the bridges so they can't get supplies or reinforcements.

And what they have is what they have. And then what? In the last day and a half or so, they started blowing the bridges—two and a half days ago, a day and a half. All reports of advance basically stopped. I mean, they're still making claims, but they don't have any video proof or any other proof of an advance. Now, Russia's done this several times: you allow the enemy to get sucked in, and then you start hitting them on the flanks when he's in your prepared kill zone. So this may be what we're looking at here. Other than that, just a few localized counterattacks—usually trying to grab a little piece of terrain back for whatever reason, or just for PR. And by the way, this all happened right before the Munich conference.

So the Ukrainians usually do some kind of suicidal charge before any of these conferences, under Zelensky's orders, because they need some PR at the moment—to show they're still alive and in the fight, no matter how much they lose. Other than that, the rest of the front's moving in the proper direction—well, proper direction for Russia. The proper direction for the what? There are advances up and down the border areas in Sumy. They're combining these small buffer areas with the bigger ones. Kharkiv oblast, same thing. Kupiansk has been reclaimed a chunk at a time. In Kostyantynivka, Russian forces were fighting in the east.

In southeast Kostyantynivka, Russian forces have now moved up into the southwest part of the city. There's a river that runs right through the middle and splits it in two. Just to the north, near

Krasnoye, Russian forces aren't really fighting inside the city itself—they're outflanking it right now and cutting off the final supply line. The idea is to isolate those forces head-on while the enemy's still being supplied, then cut the lines and wear them down that way. From Krasnoye, you go straight into Selydove to the south and downhill, so it's all moving in the right direction.

I mean, again, you look at some of the stuff these generals are even saying, and you've got to wonder. For example, Representative Bacon, who's a retired Air Force general—he puts out, you know, from the British press that got its information from the absolutely truthful Kyiv intelligence bureaus—the whole "Ghost of Kyiv" and "Tank Girl" stuff—that Russia is losing twenty-seven people for every Ukrainian. Well, first, that's ridiculous and it's BS. You don't lose like that when you have air dominance, artillery dominance, ordnance dominance in general. Number two—who's press-ganging people off the streets? Who had a hundred thousand desertions just in the first month and a half of this year? You know, by their own admission, ninety percent of their replacements right now are coming from press-ganging.

#Glenn

Yeah, no, the numbers don't make much sense. You also had those—well, at one point you had the reports in the British media where they had to account for all those, you know, the "Ghost of Kyiv" and all those fantasy stories. And they admitted that, no, it wasn't real, but it was kind of the story we needed then. It was a morale booster. So it's more or less very open now that this is, you know, we're selling narratives, not necessarily reality. It was a feel-good story about resistance. And so, yeah, we went with it—but it's problematic.

Sorry, let me squeeze in one last question here, because I just remembered there's been some talk in Moscow about a split going on—between people like Kirill Dmitriev, who think it's a good idea to strike a deal with the US based on trade and all that, and then, you know, make peace from there. And on the other side, you have Sergei Lavrov, who's more, well, critical, let's say, of that prospect. How do you see this division? Or do you think it's overblown?

#Stanislav Krapivnik

And then, on the other side of Lavrov, the military is supposedly talking about making a strike—something like on London or Paris. A slightly different kind of strike. And I'm not kidding about that, by the way. Look, there's no such thing as a monolithic government, ever, anywhere. There are always going to be different factions, always people with different views. Actually, you should be afraid if you're running a government that only has your view—then you've got problems. Serious problems. So I think it's being overblown. There's not going to be a revolution or a palace coup or anything like that. There is debate, and there are factions that want a harder line. That's actually good—that they're coming out.

Because if nothing else, the West needs to be reminded that the only thing keeping them breathing is Putin's patience. And there's only so much of that, whether you like it or not. He's under pressure to just say, "Let's get this over with the hard way—take the gloves off." I mean, honestly, if Russia wanted to, it could turn any Ukrainian city into Gaza or Mosul quite easily. Those heavy bombers, the real carpet-bombing ones, haven't gone up. They've never been used so far. That's something, by the way, the Europeans don't seem to understand either. If the fight with the EU or NATO starts, those gloves are off. There's not going to be this, "Well, you know, it's our people there," and all that.

No, it's just going to be mass destruction. It doesn't have to go nuclear. So I think, from that point, it's good that there are multiple opinions—and there obviously are. Like I said, I don't believe a palace coup is going to happen. And the West better pray real hard there isn't one, because if there is, they're going to get their worst nightmare. They'll get that war, and they're going to get dead. They obviously don't understand what they're playing with. But we'll see. And the West is pushing the Northern Europeans around the Baltic Sea—they're pushing hard to start a war, obviously. "Oh, we're going to block all Russian traffic."

Well, yeah, that's an act of war. So when those tankers come through with armed Marines, with MANPADS on board to take out your helicopters—what, you're going to sink the tanker? Okay, that's an act of war. And when it has a destroyer escort, especially if it's going through between, say, Denmark and Russia, that's easily covered by Russian aviation and missile fire, particularly out of Kaliningrad. Yeah, you're going to wake up to a very bad surprise real quick. So far, they've backed off whenever the Russian military shows up. Their bravado evaporated real quick—like with the Estonians, when the Su-35 showed up fully armed. Hopefully, it's just the Chihuahua barking.

But if they decide they're a pack of Chihuahuas—"we're big and bad, we're going to take the bear on"—well, the bears are going to be having some dinner. Fresh Chihuahua. I mean, Estonia—if you look at Estonia, probably half the population is Russian, considering that most young Estonians have Estonian passports and have left Estonia, even though they still get counted in the census. And Russians, even though cities like Narva have been part of Russia since the Middle Ages, they get a great passport but can't go anywhere, so they're stuck there. So you look at places like that—you really want to start a fracas? You're dealing with really stupid people. You're dealing with Captain Estonia. Have you seen that photo of Kaja Kallas?

#Glenn

Yeah, no, well, she did promise us she would start reading books and get smarter, so she's made it to the Marvel comics already, so I believe in her. She'll soon get to the good literature, you know. I did see a report in the media that the Russians might be planning to kidnap her, and I thought to myself, well, that just makes no sense. You know, I think it's from Napoleon—never interrupt your enemy when they're making a mistake. But she's just one walking, talking big mistake. So, you

know, why kidnap her? To get all this brilliant analysis and insight out of the hands of the EU? None of this makes any sense. I mean, I'm sure the Russians are happy she's sitting there. She's certainly not doing the EU any favors.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

The problem with kidnapping her is she's easy to find. You just look for the zone where the IQ drops tremendously—that's where she is. She's in the middle of that black hole of IQ. It's like, thank you, we've all gotten dumber. Please shut up. May God have mercy on your soul.

#Glenn

It's hard to believe sometimes this is real, you know. But yeah, this is who's the foreign policy chief now—this is the best we could get. It's very strange, because across Europe there are a lot of good people, same as in the US. This is where you have the Mearsheimers and Stephen Walts—I mean, these are smart people. And you end up with these kind of drooling idiots. It's very sad. But it kind of goes back to your earlier point, that this is often how you see that... yeah, it's the crap that often floats to the top. It's not a good sign of our time. Anyway, I know you have a very busy schedule today, so I'll let you go. And thank you very much for taking the time.

#Stanislav Krapivnik

All right. Thank you. Thanks, Glenn Diesen. Always a pleasure. Take care.