

Martin Armstrong: Forecasting European False Flag Operations to Start War with Russia

Martin Armstrong is the former chairman of Princeton Economics International Ltd. a former leading multinational corporate advisor with offices in Paris, London, Sydney, Hong Kong and Tokyo. He was hailed as Economist of the Decade and was named Hedge Fund Manager of the year in 1998 after correctly forecasting the collapse of Russia. <https://www.armstrongeconomics.com/> 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> Buy Diesen merchandise: <https://diesen-shop.fourthwall.com/en-nok> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We are joined today by Martin Armstrong, an economist and founder of Armstrong Economics. He's also one of the great economic forecasters. Indeed, documentaries have been made about him, and he advises governments and heads of state around the world. Just, I guess, as a brief introduction, you are very renowned for connecting economics with geopolitics, domestic politics, government debt, monetary policies, the social situation, social unrest, in order to identify these cycles and indeed what links it all together.

So I want to welcome you today, and really I wanted to discuss your new book as well. I have a—well, a giant book, I would say, but fascinating as well. It's called Understanding the World Economics. So, yeah, thank you for coming on. Well, let me start with the first question. That is, in the book, you set out to explain how the global economic system really works. And I guess it's a wide question: how do you believe policymakers or economists or the financial markets fundamentally misunderstand the way the world economy operates today?

#Martin Armstrong

I think it really stems from the fact that if you look at all the economic theories that, I mean, Keynes, et cetera—I mean, even Marx—they were all based upon fixed exchange rates, gold standards, et cetera. So currency fluctuation was never considered. It's not in any of the formulas. And as a result, you have politicians in all countries saying, "Vote for me and I'll do this," as if the

world's in recession, and they ignore the rest of the world and we can go in this direction. The analysis tends to be confined domestically, and that's just not the way it works. I mean, we just saw Secretary Bessent stand up and say, "I am the House, you know, vote."

And, you know, you can't talk down interest rates in the United States when long-term interest rates are rising globally, right? So it's as if they just ignore everything outside their own country and think that they can be a dictator or whatever. That's the real problem. We are all connected. And, you know, you can't really look at anything individually. As one of the first international hedge fund managers, I saw how capital moved around the world. Remember Tokyo going into 1989? And this is an example of what I mean about currency. The Japanese yen was rising from 1987 into 1989. So a foreign investor buying Japanese stock made money not just from the stock, but also on the currency, whereas a domestic investor did not.

He just made it on the stock. So this is what I mean about the old theories just don't apply anymore because the currency is a variable. And if we look even at times of war, you know, the U.S. was virtually bankrupt in 1896, when J.P. Morgan had to lend 100 million in gold to bail out the Treasury. It was World War I that made the United States the financial capital, you know, because the money shifted from Europe, which was at war, to, you know, a safe haven, which was America. By the end of World War II, the U.S. ended up with 76% of the world's gold reserves. So you couldn't have somebody stand up domestically and say, "Vote for me and I'll make the dollar the reserve currency." They didn't even know what it meant.

So it's the marketplace that did that. And they don't—I would say that a lot of, you know, people in economics, they follow Marx and Keynes. And you see them trying to alter the business cycle. Oh, there's a disparity in wealth. That's the, you know—well, that's existed for thousands of years. I mean, you can see in Hammurabi's legal code, regulating price controls, interest rates. So obviously, the business cycle has been around for a long time, right? And you can't really eliminate it because everything is included. And as I said, with war, it had nothing to do with domestic policies in the United States. It was really just capital moving from one place to another globally. And that's what they just don't understand.

#Glenn

Well, this capital moving around globally, I mean, this has been a source of many crises. And if I'm not mistaken, you advised the British during the pound crisis in the early '90s. Think about China over the Asian financial crisis, the euro. They advised you about this as well. But what is it that you see being the pressing issue of today? Is it a sovereign debt crisis? Is it the fall of the U.S. dollar? Again, what is it that really pops up on your radar?

#Martin Armstrong

Well, it is a combination of, I guess, a couple of things, and one that is driving war. One thing that our computer has clearly established by correlating everything back, you know, in ancient times, you don't get war when everybody's fat and happy. When the economy goes down, tensions rise. That's when you find civil unrest, wars, you know. So, you know, as far as we have, you know, globally, we definitely have a sovereign debt crisis. And this is being accelerated, as you see, with long-term interest rates rising.

You can't have Europe beating the war drums and expect interest rates to go down. So... and the other problem, I would say, that the economic theories have is that they assume everything is logical, rational, et cetera. And that's just not the case. Back in '85, you know, when I got called in with the Plaza Accord, and they said they were going to lower the value of the dollar by 40%, and I said, "You're going to cause a crash within a couple of years." And they said, "Oh, well, you're the only person with such a model."

#Glenn

And when somebody else agrees, then maybe we'll listen.

#Martin Armstrong

You know, what they don't understand is, you sell, lowering the value of a dollar, of a currency, to sell more widgets, right? You're actually devaluing everything else in the country. So the Japanese had bought a third of the national debt, so they start selling. Okay, you end up with a crash. And it's a matter of confidence. Because they stood up in February of '87 and said, okay, that was the Louvre Accord. All right, the dollar's gone down enough. What happened? The dollar continued to make lows. Once the government does that—this is my objection to Bessent recently—then you are wrong. You lose the confidence of the marketplace.

And that's what happened. The crash really came when the dollar made new lows, and they perceived the central banks could not control it. All right, then it's like, you know, that's it. It's going to go down another 40%. So it is a confidence game. And we are in this all together. And unfortunately, politicians and the economic theories, they assume everything is rational. Gee, we raise interest rates, this... All right. When Keynes came up with that whole idea of manipulating interest rates to affect demand, at least it made some sense during the Great Depression. The U.S. had a balanced budget. Today, all governments have got perpetual debt.

So if the Fed raises interest rates to fight inflation because energy prices went up, how is that going to make inflation or energy prices go down? It won't. All it will do is increase the interest expenditure in government. So they have been neutered in a way. They no longer have the power to do what they do. And my concern is that when the marketplace as a whole begins to see that, then it's Katie, bar the door. I mean, nobody will trust government anymore. We're starting to see it. I mean, the

London Financial Times just did run an article saying that foreign capital is moving into the United States, but not to the Treasuries.

It's moving to the private sector: stocks, real estate, things of that nature. So it's a contest between private assets and public. And the more you lose confidence in government, the more the money moves to the private sector. So here in the United States, a lot of people call it the everything bubble. Real estate is going up. Stock market goes up. Gold goes up. Collectibles, rare cars. They call it the everything bubble because that's basically capital running away from government. Some people like rare coins. Other people like gold. Other people like stocks. We're all not the same. But you see all these things rising. So, I mean, that's probably the real core of this.

And so in that book, what I'm trying to lay out here is that all the economic theories were based upon a fixed exchange rate. They're domestically oriented. And you have to look at this from a global perspective, right? Because capital will move. Europe goes into war, the capital is moving. Simple as that. It always has. And so, you know, even we've looked at things like the Suez Canal Crisis, the dollar went up. Cuban Missile Crisis, oh, that's closer to the dollar, dollar goes down. So capital also moves away from wherever it sees a geopolitical risk. And so it's been a fascinating study over the years. But that's really what you have to look at economically.

#Glenn

But I'm thinking, as a forecaster, what must be extremely challenging today, though, is there's so many variables at play, causing, you know, all connected, causing almost a perfect storm. That is, well, for example, China now—for, you know, the rise of China has essentially disrupted the distribution of power, the concentration in the West, you know, ending a period of centuries. We see Russia, since Peter the Great's time, 300 years ago, it always focused on the West for modernization, economic development. Now it decided to look East because, well, largely also fueled because of the war in Ukraine. They finally realized, after three centuries, that they would never be welcomed in Europe, and now they have an alternative in the East.

We see Iran weakening the American bases across the Persian Gulf and the Gulf states. And if they don't trust America for security, would they still sell their oil in dollars? Would they still invest in the U.S.? Would it still help to keep the AI show running? The Europeans appear to be committing collective suicide, which they tend to do every few decades. And we see U.S. sovereign debt, the crisis building up. I'm not sure how severe the bond crisis is, but when you have all of these things coming together... I mean, how do you forecast? Because this is just such a mess. And again, they're all connected.

#Martin Armstrong

Yes, the computer's been tracking all of it together. For example, you take the energy crisis. Yes, it may have begun with Iran. However, you have Zelensky in Ukraine. Trump is told, "Don't attack the

refineries," and he says he doesn't care. And so he's impacting much more seriously than Iran because he's hitting the, what we would call, the refined products, whereas Iran is more on the crude oil side. And the refined products are much more critical because a refinery can't do all three simultaneously. It has to be set up for gasoline or jet fuel or diesel. And gasoline, the consumer tends to look at what they're paying. Fine. But economically, the diesel is much more serious.

You know, for example, in Asia, we've got, you know, offices there in Thailand. And I can tell you that staff couldn't even get gasoline to fuel up a motorbike. That was one thing. But the worst was the fact that there was a shortage in diesel. So the ships couldn't even go out to fish. So now you're affecting the food supply. Farmers, they need the diesel to basically just harvest the crops. And Zelensky doesn't care. And he knows what he's doing. I mean, the crops in Russia basically feed many, many countries. And what he's doing there is setting in motion—also, you're looking at a food crisis coming. And the same thing in the U.S., but the U.S. is at least to a large extent self-sufficient, right?

It's not as bad as it was in the '70s, where there were gas lines and things of that nature. But you do see that in Russia. And Zelensky is just kind of a rogue guy. He doesn't care about the rest of the world. It's him, and that's all he cares about. He won't have an election because he knows he would lose it. I mean, we've had, you know, staff in Kyiv and Donetsk, and, you know, most people there are against him. I think even Foreign Policy magazine came out with the polls saying he's negative at this point. And our staff there from the very beginning said he didn't win the election initially and that it was rigged.

So, I mean, this is, you know, not unusual when we see elections rigged all over the place anymore. Yeah. But putting it all together, the computer does a pretty good job of that. I don't think that any individual can do it in their head so easily because it is a lot of variables. But the computer puts it all together, and it has had a phenomenal track record. I mean, you look on our site, even back in 2013, the computer projected war would begin in Ukraine. And there's videos, you know, even in the movie they did on me. I stood up in 2011, said the computer says the war cycle will turn up in 2014. That was exactly the Ukrainian revolution. So it's been quite phenomenal.

And what I'll explain is this, is that I didn't write a program to predict war. I was writing a program that tracked capital flows. And we got called in by the Central Bank of Lebanon. And they asked if I could do a model on the Lebanese pound. They had found a ledger in the basement with somebody writing down the prices back to the mid-19th century. I said, sure, we'll put it in and see what comes out. And I thought there was something wrong with the data because the computer came out and said their country was going to fall apart in eight days. And I said, look, there's got to be something wrong with this. And very calmly, they asked me, they said, "Well, what currency does it recommend?" I said, "Well, the Swiss franc."

#Glenn

Eight days later, the civil war began.

#Martin Armstrong

And I came to realize, because the same thing happened with the Gulf Wars and stuff like that. And then even I stood up in '98 in London and said Russia was going to collapse, which turned out to be Long-Term Capital Management. And the London Financial Times even stuck in the back room and put that on the front page: "Armstrong says Russia is going to collapse." But what I came to realize was that Lebanon was—it didn't come to me for that forecast. It came to me for the timing. They already saw the money moving. And I had one client in Saudi Arabia who was a big shipper in the Gulf.

And he called and said, "Iraq's going to start attacking shipping tomorrow in the Gulf. What do you think gold's going to do?" I said, "Do you think a war is going to start tomorrow?" He says, "Yeah." I realized that somebody always knows in advance. The computer picked up October 7th in Israel. All the defense stocks started moving a week in advance. Somebody knows. And the SEC used our stuff with 9/11, looking for who put on airlines a few days in advance. But this is the way the world really functions. I mean, somebody always does know. Even Pearl Harbor, we have the Honolulu Tribune article. We published it on our site.

They came out, you know, I think it was Friday or Thursday before they were attacked, and said, "We're going to be attacked on the weekend." So somebody always knows. And that's what the computer picks up. It picks up the capital flows. And when money starts moving dramatically with no economic reason, it's somebody knows what's coming, and they're getting out of the way or whatever. In some cases, they do it to profit from it, like 9/11 terrorist attacks. They were using markets to make money. So it's been an interesting, I would say, a few decades of watching how this stuff actually works. But I mean, that's really the true bottom line. Somebody always knows.

#Glenn

Well, by forecasting, yeah, based on these capital flows, you know, there's been a lot of comments about the Trump administration, that they're seeking to manipulate the markets a bit. That is, yeah, they, for example, with Iran, on a Friday, they announce wars, and by Sunday evening, before the stock market opens, they, you know, say that peace has been achieved. I was just wondering, how do you see the current manipulation? I mean, do you see any wars coming up, or do you see the wars coming to an end? Because it appears, well, at the moment there's a concern that the war with Russia could spread into the European countries, while also in the Middle East the war appears to be spreading as well. I was just wondering, the capital flows of today, do they give us any indications of what might come next?

#Martin Armstrong

Yes. I don't see either one coming down. The main reason you have Europe promoting war with Russia is that I can tell you that there is a problem with the EU. They saw the rise of AfD in Germany. You had Meloni come out and say, "We want some of our sovereignty back." You're seeing this rising everywhere from more or less people getting frustrated with the EU. Now, they have a real problem. Either they create an external enemy, which is Russia—it's basically probably the best money you can buy to create an enemy—or if they don't do that, the EU will collapse. Because you're having rising separatist issues. Same thing's happening in Canada. The West wants to leave from the East. Centralized governments never really work when they become more authoritarian.

And that goes back to, you know, Roman times. And, you know, maybe they just get drunk on their power, and you will now do this, you know, sort of thing. So your choice is they need an external enemy. Now, there's a Roman historian, Sallust, who commented on his observation as to why the Roman Republic fell. And I think it's applicable today. He said that once Rome conquered Carthage, Macedonia, and Corinth, it no longer had an external enemy. So consequently, he said, they turned inward, groups formed, fighting amongst each other, and he said that lack of unity basically tore it apart. That's what we are seeing. Once communism fell and the Cold War ended, all right, there was no longer an external enemy.

So you have these neocons, including Kallas, that are... They turn their hatred of communism into just ethnic hatred of Russians. All right, you forgive the Germans for Hitler, but they don't forgive the Russians for Stalin. And I think it's largely from the standpoint that they can't sleep at night unless there is an external enemy. I mean, Russia is no longer communist. You know, they've adopted capitalism, like, you know, so has China. So what is the actual issue? It's no longer what it used to be, where Khrushchev, "We will bury you," the idea that communism was better than capitalism. But all that's gone. So what is the actual issue? They have to say Russia wants to invade Europe. Why?

They won't ever explain that. Europe doesn't have anything. When Japan invaded Manchuria, it was to get assets, natural resources. Europe doesn't have anything of value. It has to buy energy from Russia. You're not talking about gold. I mean, what do you get? So it's the other way around. Russia is the richest country in the world from a natural resource perspective. So Hitler wanted it, Napoleon. So it's more beneficial for Europe to say, "Russia wants to invade us, so we have to go after them." But it's more profitable for Europe than it is the other way around.

So it gets quite convoluted, but it's usually always out of self-interest. And as I said, at this point, Europe has—the EU has abused its power. And I mean, just look at France. I mean, you brought in all these people with a completely different culture, and it had been reported a couple years ago that over a thousand girls were raped in Germany on New Year's Eve. And then the politicians said, "Don't call it rape, call it assault." It's always covering up their mistakes. So what do we really have? I mean, France is in chaos because of this. At least the migrants that came into the U.S. weren't—they were at least still Christian.

They weren't burning churches and things of this nature. And in Germany, the stats are out. Over 80% of the people who have committed crimes are migrants. So it's just a different culture, and these people did not necessarily come in to assimilate. They came in because it's a free lunch. So you see them trying to get out of France and get into Britain because Britain will give them more money than France will. So it gets to be a real mess. And unfortunately, our computer warns that you're going to continue to see civil unrest and most likely international war as a distraction.

I think they've made a serious mistake. More or less, there was a Roman emperor, Valens, who, because Attila the Hun was coming, he decided to let all the Germanic tribes in, the Goths, train them into Roman tactics, thinking he could use them in the military to defend against Attila the Hun. And they said, "Thank you very much." They turned on the Romans and waged war and killed the emperor in battle. Anybody that thinks you can take these migrants, hand them a gun, and say, "Go defend Europe against Russia," they're going to do the same thing. They're going to go, "No, you know, we're not interested in dying for you. What do you got in the pantry?" and just point the gun back at you. I mean, this is human nature. It's happened, you know, many times before.

So why would it be any different this time? So the computer's looking at all of that. It does definitely show rising civil unrest, and things should—you should be able to see a lot more, I would say, tendencies in this area should heat up probably in the first quarter next year. That's where the computer's really showing. Even energy prices, diesel may not peak until maybe March next year. So I don't think that Trump will be successful in bringing in Zelensky. And then what does he say? The people want an election. Trump says, "Get a new president," and he says, "Oh, that's Putin's position." So he has to say that, otherwise he's got to call for an election. "It's not the people. People love me. It's Putin that wants me gone." So you can see how they manipulate the words all the time. And unfortunately, that's where we're headed. I would be very careful about the first quarter next year.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, again, forecasting under Trump, though, given that his policy shifts so dramatically, you know, in the beginning of 2025, we were told that, well, he had this Oval Office moment with Zelensky where he was essentially telling him, you know, "You're playing with World War III. Put an end to it." And then after that, suddenly he started shifting a bit towards the Ukrainian position. Then we saw increasing support, for example, with the deep strikes into Russia. Now he's going back again, calling for elections and criticizing Zelensky for not taking a better deal two years ago.

Let's talk about possibly stopping the intelligence-sharing process. I don't know. How do you explain this? Because I can't... I mean, on one hand, you can argue that perhaps he sees Ukraine is falling apart or losing, so he wants to wash his hands of it. It could be just a reaction to Zelensky being rude about the peace deal, or is it just a tactic that is—you want to look a bit unpredictable because

then all sides will have to, you know, they will be more eager to make a deal now because they never know where he's going to stand tomorrow. I mean, I have a very hard time reading him, so I'm just assuming forecasting must be challenging then.

#Martin Armstrong

Yeah. Honestly, whatever he says is kind of irrelevant, mainly because he will respond to the same facts. I was surprised. I was called in, and I was told they wanted to give me a briefing on what they were doing in Russia. So I went, I took my assistant with me. We get there, and she has to step out of the room. "No, sorry, she can't be here." I said, "What's going on?" Then they asked me to write the peace plan to present to Putin. And they asked me to use my back channels to get it to him. And I was like, "This is the State Department's job. You really want me to do this?" And they said, "Yes." So I did. You can pull it down off of our site. And I laid out the whole history of this, how it really began.

And even with Iran, I was publicly saying that there was no way they were going to agree to any kind of a peace before the midterm elections. And Trump initially, I think, was listening to Netanyahu. And Netanyahu's strategy is always the same. He wants to assassinate whoever the head of a country is, or a group, Hezbollah, Hamas, whatever. And he thinks that if you take out the leader, you automatically win. It's never worked once. And Iran is not stupid. He attacked in '25. He assassinated a few of their military leaders. So they reorganized their government and they created four tiers, knowing he was going to try and take out the Ayatollah. Okay.

So he sold this idea to Trump: "Take out the Ayatollah, we win in one day." So Trump was repeating that: "One day, that's it." And then all of a sudden he realized that's not the way it works. Okay, so he was keeping that up for a while. Um, I guess they do listen to me maybe more intensely these days, because I was warning, I said, "Look, they are not going to settle anything before the elections." Their operation is always reverse regime change. I don't know if there's just nobody there that has the experience, but in 1979, they took the hostages. They held them for over 400 days, and they released them the very day that Ronald Reagan won the election.

I said, they understand regime change. They're not going to agree to anything before the elections because they know they're going to tear your administration apart. So finally, a couple of weeks ago, Trump came out and said, "Don't expect anything before the elections." I think they finally listened to me. All I can say is, I don't know if anybody there, maybe they're all too young and they don't know what even happened in '79. I'm not sure they open up a history book. I mean, so I don't think Trump is stuck in this. Every time he tries to do a peace deal with Iran, Netanyahu sabotages it. He's tried to do peace deals with Putin, and Zelensky sabotages it.

Despite the press propaganda, Putin is interested in a peace deal. They asked me to write the peace plan and get it to him. So I knew, they're asking me to do this, so obviously he wanted peace. All right, you don't call me in to do something like that unless you're serious. And because I had staff in

Ukraine, I warned them about Zelensky. I was told even when he first took office that, be careful. This is the guy that they have to start World War Three. I have a tape on my site of him as a comedian standing on stage before President, making jokes about confiscating assets from Jews and Russians.

He's the same as George Soros. He married a Christian girl, his kids are baptized, and he pretended to be Christian. So he was part of the neo-Nazi operations. Suddenly he becomes president. "Oh, I'm Jewish." That's basically so they can't say, "Oh, well, how could I be a neo-Nazi if I was Jewish?" I've got him on stage making jokes about taking assets from Jews. The same as Soros. You can look at a 60 Minutes interview. They asked him, "You were doing the same thing. Don't you feel bad?" "No, that's what I had to do. You know, that's reality." I don't see—Zelensky's not interested in peace. You can even—Ukraine Pravda reported, you know, there was a peace deal.

Boris Johnson hopped on a plane, went over there, and told them not to do it. Boris Johnson has now come out. He took a million-pound donation from the military establishment in the UK. Then he took the head of that military establishment to Ukraine to introduce him to Zelensky. And they've supplied like 80,000 drones. I have information—you talk about that White House meeting—I had information from my sources there that Boris Johnson went there a couple of days in advance, told Zelensky, because the meeting was supposed to be in Kiev, he told Zelensky, "You insist it's got to be in the White House."

And you go back and you embarrass Trump to keep the money coming. I warned the White House. This is what my sources are saying. And you can look it up. I think it was Rubio afterwards said, after that confrontation in the Oval Office, Rubio, I think, came out and confirmed what I said. This was supposed to have been signed in Kiev, and it was changed at the last minute. That was Boris Johnson. So everything he has done has to perpetuate this war. Then you have Kallas. She's European neo-Nazi, basically, in a way. She's your version of Victoria Nuland that we have over here. She's publicly admitted that she doesn't like Russians.

Her family was persecuted by them, and they were sent to Siberia. She's publicly said Russia is too big, should be broken up. This is the person who's in charge of your foreign policy? There is no way she would ever accept peace with Russia. Never. Never. This is like Victoria Nuland. Come on. I mean, Lindsey Graham, the rest of them. All I can say is, they all have—in the Biden administration, you had Victoria Nuland, you had Blinken, and you had Garland. Three people in his administration. Look up their backgrounds. All three claim to come from the Balkans, Ukraine area. All three claim their families were persecuted, like Kallas, by Russians.

#Glenn

They have personal vendettas in this.

#Martin Armstrong

They're not objective.

#Glenn

They don't care about the European people.

#Martin Armstrong

They don't care about anything but their own personal agenda. That's it. You've got them. We've got them. This is what's really bad. As long as they're, you know, in the case of Europe, as long as Kallas is there, you're not going to have peace.

#Glenn

Now, let me just ask a last question. That is, of course, we see in Europe that we have the massive economic problems. There's this ongoing chance of war, which doesn't make much sense given the lack of capabilities. But there's a deeper problem as well. And you discuss how you tie social upheavals into the economic cycles. But what happens to ordinary people, though, when confidence breaks down? Because I argue it's not just unpopular politicians we have today, from Britain to, I think, Macron is, I can't remember, I think it's down to 12 or 15 percent, if not 10. Anyway, it's widely unpopular. You've got that, right? But still, Merz is even worse, I think. So what is it? You know, it seems to be a political legitimacy crisis here. So what is it that happens, you think, when regular people, when this continent starts to break down?

#Martin Armstrong

I think, you know, honestly, when they try to, they're going to have to try to do some sort of false flag and say Russia attacked us, because the other way around just does not get everybody riled up to support them. That's why even in the United States, Roosevelt tried to get Congress to issue a declaration of war to join World War II in Europe. They refused, right? He set up everything to make sure that Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. They broke the code. They knew all about it. He put sanctions on them, confiscated all their assets in the United States, then put in an embargo to cut off all their energy, which they were buying from the United States at the time. And you can look it up.

There was a Senate investigation on this because it was so outrageous. He pulled the aircraft carriers out a couple of days in advance, let 3,000 people die to get into war. And the Senate had an investigation because there was way too much evidence against this. And they simply concluded, well, yes, some people had information. We're not sure that FDR knew. And that's basically how they whitewashed it. But they had broken the code. We even have an article from the Hawaiian Tribune

on our site. It was leaked a couple days in advance: "We're going to be attacked that weekend." And they did the same thing with 9/11. There's Northwoods. You can Google that. It's on Wikipedia. It's been declassified.

They actually proposed killing Americans and blaming it on Cuba to justify war. This is what these people do. So I would be more concerned that they're going to do some sort of a false flag and claim that Russia did something. You already have Merz saying, "Oh, it was the airport," and that warrants World War III. You know, they hate AfD. Now they're out there trying to say AfD is getting its money from Putin. I mean, it just gets to be laughable at times. But they are desperate to create war. And this all stems back because you've got civil unrest rising and you've got, you know, discontent growing everywhere. Look in Britain, you've got Scotland, Wales, and Ireland wanting to split.

It, this is, it's the fault of centralized government with their policies of COVID and woke, and then migration. Whatever ideas they had have basically screwed up the European economy. You've got German economic growth down to 0.8%. Italy's down to 0.5%. Instead of admitting they have made a mistake, instead of trying to reverse it, they just try to cover it up. Unfortunately, this is how politicians have always operated, you know, throughout the centuries. Once they get there, they have to defend their own positions, and they'll never admit a mistake. I think that's Trump's mistake with Iran. He should throw Netanyahu under the bus. But instead, you're looking at the Republican Party losing all because he won't admit a mistake.

#Glenn

Yeah, doubling down on the Iran war is—yeah, I keep waiting for some course correction, but I guess it is difficult at that level.

#Martin Armstrong

You know, it's like I said, Iran understands the game. And they got Trump on the ropes, and they have Netanyahu on the ropes. Why would you raise the white flag now? It's just, you wait for the elections. They did that to Jimmy Carter to get him out of power. That time it was a presidential election. So they won't get Trump out, but they will clip his wings dramatically. And so I think for the next two years, all you're going to see is chaos, investigations. They'll probably try and impeach him again. It's just... you know, to them, it's always war.

#Glenn

We have to defeat the other side.

#Martin Armstrong

You know, nobody's for the country anymore. And so, you know, so you see the Democrats. The polls show, you know, 60-some percent are in favor of sending more money to Ukraine. They're against Iran because Trump started that one. So that's just simply the way it is. Trump wanted to put up a wall, we have to take it down. Nobody cares about the country—what's good, what's bad. If he says the sky's blue, I have to say it's red. There's no common bond anymore. And that's what I said about Salas. I think his observation was correct.

He said that's what tore the Roman Republic apart. I think it's tearing apart Western society. It's just so polarized. Canada, the same thing. October 19th, Alberta has an election. Will people vote for a referendum there to separate from Canada? I've dealt with them. I've laid out, this is how you do it. You're going to need to create a currency, central bank, et cetera. I mean, I get called in anytime I end up with a currency crisis or creating something. I'm usually the guy that gets called in on it. But, I mean, so it's everywhere I go, it's the same thing.

#Glenn

Well, thank you for taking the time. Again, I would advise everyone to follow your work closely. Where can people find you?

#Martin Armstrong

Just go to armstrongeconomics.com. We don't sell advertising. You don't have to put in your email. We try to keep it as an open forum for everybody.

#Glenn

Well, thanks again for your time.

#Martin Armstrong

Thank you for inviting me.