General Michael Flynn: Zelensky Must Go! — General Flynn Warns of Nuclear War

General Michael Flynn was Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) from 2012 to 2014, and the National Security Advisor of Donald Trump in 2017. General Flynn warns against the danger of Zelensky and the risk of nuclear war. 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, everyone. We are joined today by General Michael Flynn, a retired U.S. Army lieutenant general who was the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency from 2012 to 2014 under the Obama administration and then briefly served as Donald Trump's National Security Advisor in 2017. So thank you for coming on the program.

#Michael Flynn

Absolutely, Glenn. And great to see you again, and appreciate everything that you're doing to get your analysis out there on the world stage. It's very important.

#Glenn

Thank you. Well, you've been a very strong advocate for America First in terms of, you know, ending the forever wars and prioritizing American interests. And, you know, towards this end, I was wondering, how do you see how the Ukraine war currently stands? Because, you know, there's a lot of back and forth in the media in terms of how committed the U.S. is. But also, I guess, what is it that the U.S. should do, in your view, to put an end to this?

#Michael Flynn

Yeah. So first of all, you know, and like I'll say it, I've said it this many times to different audiences, you know, America First does not mean America alone or America in isolation. It just means we have a responsibility to protect our sovereignty, to protect the people of the United States of America, and to protect our Constitution and our way of life. I mean, the president of the United States, you know, actually says an oath of office. And in that oath of office, he uses the word "preserve." And that's

tied to the phrase "preserve the Constitution," as well as "protect and defend the Constitution." So, you know, the president has those responsibilities. And I firmly believe that if we don't preserve our constitutional way of life, then we actually will upset the world's posture.

And that's why I say America First, but not America in isolation. Now, that said, to answer your question, I do strongly believe that the first thing that needs to happen is there has to be a reconciling by the Ukrainian people of the leadership of their country. The way that's going to happen is if there is pressure applied by the European Union and certainly by the United States of America and then its partners in NATO on Zelensky to hold elections. And I mean hold elections now. I think if they were to hold elections now, you know, in a fairly short period of time, I do believe that Russia would, you know, they would go to some type of ceasefire in the hopes that maybe a new leader would emerge, which I do believe would happen.

A new leader would emerge who would then be prepared to talk and have a completely different conversation about peace, and not just a ceasefire, but a lasting peace in Ukraine. And all of these people in Europe that keep talking about all the NATO and European Union and all these left-leaning leaders that are in Europe that are talking about, you know, Russia going—you know, Russia wants to go across the plains of Europe again like it was in the days of the Warsaw Pact—are fools, if not completely incompetent in their belief system and their strategic thinking, because Russia does not have that capability any longer. I mean, they certainly have nuclear capability, but Russia is not a military power like it once was, to be able to do that.

And as Putin has said, I mean, all you got to do is look at what are their objectives of this military operation that the Russians have started. They began back in February of 2022. People tend to forget that this war started back in 2014, about a week after the Sochi Olympics. So too many people think, well, this war has only been going on for a few years now since, you know, since, you know, quote-unquote, Putin took advantage of Biden, right? No, this war has been going on since 2014. So that's 12-plus years of war. And if Russia was going to attack across the plains of Europe, they would have already done it. So we have to really do a couple of things. One, their leadership in Ukraine—and Ukraine—I firmly believe Zelensky should step down and he should allow for elections. He should immediately step down and allow for elections.

I mean, like right now, because he is not the guy that is going to lead Ukraine into the future. A beautiful country, beautiful people, a strong history, strong culture, and an abundance of resources. Right? I mean, it has all of the capacity and capabilities, except one thing that is starting to really show is the lack of a younger male population, because many of them have been killed or put into, you know, sort of a sense of fear. And I'll bet you that there's a lot of young men who have left the country. You know, that's why they're starting to recruit young women into the military now. That started probably in earnest, you know, within this past year.

If not, we've seen it certainly in the last six months. So there's some tactical issues I've just laid out there. But there's some strategic issues, Glenn. The main issue, though, is that Zelensky is not the

leader to move Ukraine into the future. Definitely not. In my expert judgment as a strategist, as somebody who's dealt in the world of diplomacy, of negotiations, this guy is not the right guy. And until the United States figures that out, never mind the European Union and those other leaders in NATO minus the U.S., until the U.S. figures this out, we're not going to move forward. We're going to continue to have this never-ending war.

And then you have to ask yourself, and I'll stop after this point, these U.S. members of Congress who—we call them CODELs, congressional delegations—that go over to Ukraine and visit with Zelensky as though he's God's gift to Ukraine. And they are asking questions. They come back to the United States, and they're really not asking; they're demanding that we continue to support Ukraine. We continue to go after Russia. We do what? We try to destroy Russia. We try to destroy a country that's one of the largest, if not the largest, possessors of nuclear weapons on the planet, who actually has some attitudes and some frameworks that do align with the United States of America—mainly Christian. Now, does that mean that Putin's a Christian? I don't know.

I've never really talked to him other than said hello to him with a handshake. But I will tell you that too many people judge Russia and judge Putin from their view of, like, 30 or 40 years ago, probably more like 40 years ago, right? The Soviet Union, Cold War days. And we have to stop that. We have to stop that. Russia's population is declining. Through this war, we have pushed them into the arms of the Chinese Communist Party. They are not completely aligned with the CCP. But when we force them into the arms of somebody who they need as an ally, we have forced them to work more closely with the North Koreans.

I mean, so I just think that what we have done is, we have misjudged. We have, I mean, strategically misjudged Russia's capability and capacity. We have strategically misjudged Zelensky's mindset. And I honestly don't think we've misjudged that. I think that there are people that just want to use Zelensky as our puppet, or as their puppet, in terms of the European Union and certainly some inside of our own country, the United States. So I just, you know, we have to be realistic. We have to face the reality of this war that has resulted in the deaths of certainly hundreds of thousands, if not millions.

The loss of prestige globally for a number of organizations and nations, and certainly the cost in terms of, you know, not just lives, but resources, right? The monetary cost that it's taken has taken its toll on a whole bunch of different countries. And, you know, at the end of the day, that war, this war that we're talking about right now, is affecting the economy in the United States of America, no doubt, because, you know, Russia has a capacity to be able to certainly provide all kinds of fossil fuels to the West. And they were for a long time. You know, and that's, I think, what Donald Trump is trying to resurrect again because, frankly, you know, Russia has the capability to do it.

When you look at the potential of the stans, right? Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan and Tajikistan and Turkmenistan, those Central Asian republics, as well as the east of the Urals, there's enormous capacity. Why don't we work with each other? Why don't we sit down at the table and say, let's

figure out how to work economically together, and to benefit our populations and our people instead of trying to do what the globalists want, which is to create a one-world order, which is simply not going to happen while the people of the United States of America still have the rights that we have.

#Glenn

Yeah, well, you know, sitting in Europe, it's a bit bizarre because for those who've been following this over the past 30 years, the Russians have been quite consistent in how they view NATO expansion towards their border very negatively, how they're looking to push back against this. I mean, whether or not one supports that or not is a different matter, but for some reason, as you suggest, Europeans seem to think that they interpret this solely as Russia wanting to essentially march on Berlin or Paris. I'm not sure. It's ridiculous. Yeah.

#Michael Flynn

Let me talk through that because, you know, let me touch on that because people don't understand, and they can go back to the 1994 Budapest agreements, right? The Budapest Accords, right? You had, I think, Mitterrand, Thatcher, Gorbachev, and I think Bush sat at that table, and they promised—we promised, right? We, the United States of America, put our imprimatur on that table accord and said we will not expand, no more expansion of NATO. And yet we've, I think, almost tripled the size of NATO since that period of time. You know, we went from like 16 nations to, I think—and, you know, don't hold me to these numbers—to like 40-something nations now.

Right. So we violated that accord. In addition to that, what we don't understand and what we typically don't want to bring into the discussion when we talk about these peace agreements, because we don't want to bring in the historical boundaries that are even as recent as 1939, or when you go back to the beginning of the previous century. So there's various boundaries that existed, physical boundaries that existed, that were taken, you know, during different periods of time, whether it was World War One, World War Two, you know, the fall of the Soviet Union, and then back to the Russian Federation.

And then this is agreement that the West had with Russia. But we violated those agreements. The very first rule in diplomacy, and I think I mentioned here, I sent that article to you a while back. The first rule in diplomacy, the very first rule in diplomacy, is to tell the truth. Then the second part of that is to stick to it, right? To stand by the truth that you say. Does the truth change? And the other aspect, the other way to ask that question is, does the situation on the ground change? And the situation on the ground clearly does, particularly strategically. It always changes.

But then when you do that, when that does change, one of the things to do is, if you are constantly working those strategic relationships, you know, using ambassadors, using envoys, however you want to do it, using personal relationships between presidents of different nations, regardless of who the president is, that the world will always be a safer, more secure place if the United States, Russia,

and I would say China to a degree—although the Chinese behavior has to change, especially with some of their subversive activities that they do inside of the United States, which the American people are well aware of these days.

That's really one of those issues, is, of course, the advent of fentanyl as a drug and as a precursor. And we know that that's coming from the Chinese. Russia is not sending fentanyl into our borders, but the Chinese are. You know, clearly, clearly, when we go back in time to the wars, the big wars that we have faced, Russia's actually been an ally of the United States, and Russia has worked with us very closely. So, you know, whether it's Putin or whoever it is, whoever is the guy in charge here, we are better off if we have those kinds of relationships.

The European Union right now, particularly the European Union, you know, they're part of this globalist community. And they want a one-world order. And for the people of your audience, you know, the idea of a one-world order, or the phrase "one-world order" or "New World Order," it goes back to post-World War I. And so it's not something that just popped up, you know, since a guy by the name of Klaus Schwab started up the World Economic Forum. This idea of one world has always been an idea of the globalists. And the globalists align themselves with communism. They align themselves with, you know, the sort of the isms, the belief systems that are anti-God, okay?

They are definitely anti-God, even though they'll pretend at times to say that they're not. They are clearly, you know, in terms of an economic system, they want a one-world economic system. They want to change the nature of money. And I'm not against innovation and technology and artificial or super intelligence, whatever you want to call it. I'm not against the adjustments and changes that need to be made. But what I am against, what I am firmly against, is, you know, now I'm talking on behalf of the United States as a U.S. citizen, I'm against losing our sovereignty as a nation.

I do not want us to be succumbed or seconded to some global world order that sits in Brussels or sits in Switzerland. You know, I want us to maintain the type of republic, constitutional republic, and democratic ideals and principles that we have. That's what I want. And I actually see that in other countries around the world, particularly in some of the eastern countries of Europe. I mean, there's plenty of countries there that want to maintain their sovereignty, their own protection of their own nation, right, their own system of government. And that's fine. I think that is a healthy, healthy way to function.

I think when we go to a one-world order, which is the direction that the globalists want to take us, I actually think that I see that as the downfall, certainly, of the United States of America. And I do see the rise of capitalism, of people that do not want that way of life, that are, you know, they don't want to be controlled by some very strong, strongly held socialist form of government, you know? So, and I think that from what I've seen in the war in Ukraine, from Russia's perspective, is that Russia did initially attack in 2014. So they did initially cross to Donbas and into Crimea in late February 2014. I think the date was actually the 28th, to be very specific. And so they did that.

But they did that. Now we see more and more that evidence has come out that they did that sort of with a wink and a nod from the United States government at the time, which was Obama, the Obama regime. And, you know, people forget that the Ukrainian government at the time was basically killing a lot of these people in those two eastern Donbas as they were being killed. I mean, I was sitting as the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency at the time, and we were briefing our leadership at that time of the buildup, because you don't just suddenly have regiments upon regiments and divisions upon divisions and artillery formations and paratroopers and logistics sites show up in a 24-hour period.

There was a big buildup prior, and it was sort of, again, it was a wink and a nod. And then Putin went in. And when he went in, he, you know, at the time, he said limited military objectives for these purposes: to protect those people, which were Russian-speaking peoples. Since that time, since that time, there have been—I forget the exact phrase—but basically referendums by those people in those Donbasses for who do you want to be with? And those referendums came back and said, you know, these are Russian-speaking people, right? They wanted to be part of Russia, the Russian Federation, or they wanted to be independent. And that's fine, too.

I mean, but that conversation then has been forgotten. And what we do is we have all of these people in the West, particularly the European Union, and people in the United States too, no doubt, that keep saying, "Russia bad, Russia bad, Russia bad. We have to eliminate Russia," right? Are we serious about that? Because if we're serious about that, we're talking about a massive, massive undertaking that would lead to, you know, much greater than a World War III. It could lead to a very, very dangerous situation, not only in Europe, but for the rest of the world. And, you know, never mind the fact that we are, you know, up to our eyeballs right now in the Middle East, Glenn.

So I do believe that there is a plan. And I'm aware of some of these things, but I do believe that there is a plan. And I think Putin and Trump are supposed to meet this week, if I'm not mistaken, that there is a plan that could solve this problem in about a month, about a month or less. But part of that is a recognition that Zelensky is not the guy to lead Ukraine into the future. I mean, the guy's declared martial law. You can't even be a legitimate— Glenn, if you put on some khakis and your journalist outfit and walked into Ukraine and tried to report, honestly, you'd be thrown in prison. That's what they do to journalists right now inside of Ukraine.

Okay, they're doing that now. So you cannot report honestly. People in the Rada, which is the Congress or the parliament for Ukraine, they are afraid to speak out because they're afraid that they're going to get thrown in prison. Okay, that's what happens under tyrannical dictatorships. Well, guess what, Europe? That's what you've got in Zelensky. So I firmly believe that he must go and just hold an election. And let's let the people of Ukraine decide what they want their future to be. If they want a strongman who wants to continue the war against Russia, but I don't think that's going to be the outcome of a legitimate election. I really don't believe that.

I think the people of Ukraine are exhausted. Their resources are exhausted. And they're looking for a more reasonable, thoughtful leader who is strong, but is smart and not somebody who is a puppet of the left of the European Union. And I just think that's where we are, Glenn. And I really hope that cool heads prevail. But one of those cool heads is clearly not Zelensky. That guy is—he is all over the map when it comes to what kind of decisions need to be made. You know, because he kind of, you know, he's looking for somebody over his shoulder to tell him exactly what to do. And those people that are telling him that are the globalists that are running the European Union right now.

#Glenn

On the topic of diplomacy, for all the talk about supporting Ukraine, we see from polls that Ukrainians actually want a negotiated settlement, while the European leaders respond by now continuing to boycott high-level diplomacy. They want to deport Ukrainians who fled the war to fill the trenches. They want to lower the conscription age and, of course, begin to conscript women. But what you said about Trump, though, and Putin, is there an actual discussion now, you think, towards a deal? I mean, is the split between Zelensky and Trump written in stone? Is it serious?

#Michael Flynn

Yeah, Trump is negotiating a midterm election minefield right now, because as soon as he says, "I want to talk to Putin about peace," you know, the whole left in America goes, "See, he's a Putin puppet. You know, Putin did steal the election in 2016." I saw that on one of the cable news networks the other day. A guy, you know, supposedly a legitimate member of our U.S. Congress from New York, talking on CNN about how Russia gave the 2016 election to Trump. I mean, that's been proven over and over, so that never was the case. That was a big lie.

But here they are. They're bringing that up again. So this midterm election minefield that Trump was negotiating, you know, but this is where leadership comes in. This is where strength of a leader with the moral character and the moral integrity comes in, to be able to stand there and say, "Hey, look, folks, we can't afford this. We cannot continue to go down this path and hold in abeyance Russia, this giant nation, probably the leader in nuclear weapons on the planet, certainly one of the great economic engines of the world, particularly when it comes to energy resources. And energy resources is not just diesel fuel."

It's also rare earth elements that Russia has in abundance. I mean, these are the kinds of things that we need to be talking about instead of talking about shooting each other across a line that has become opaque. So I do want to see the great powers sit down and have these conversations. But to talk about, you know, not just whether or not we're going to rebuild Ukraine—that's tactics. Those are small minds that go into a peace negotiation, and all they want to do is talk about real estate development in Kiev, right? I mean, what we have to be talking about is the culture, the history, the geographic boundaries, the...

The various relationships that have existed, not just for the last five or ten or twelve years, but the last hundred years—what are those relationships? Have they mattered when they mattered, right? How did the United States of America achieve a victory in World War II without the Russians, right? I mean, how did we operate during the First World War without help from the Russians? Frankly, most people don't even realize it, but the Russians allowed the United States of America, even though it was our responsibility for a losing cause in Afghanistan. Most people have no idea what I'm about to say, which is a phrase called the Northern Distribution Network. The Northern Distribution Network went through Russia.

And without that Northern Distribution Network, supported and supplied and secured by Russia, we would not have had the opportunity to at least get to a place where we could have achieved victory in Afghanistan. I mean, people forget about that. I mean, that Northern Distribution Network was not just a ground route, but it was an aerial route too. I remember being in aircraft. And I would, you know, in some of these operations that I was involved in, I'd be up there with the pilots, and they were talking to their Russian counterparts on the ground to give, you know, flyover permission to get through various countries so we could bring in people and supplies into Afghanistan.

I mean, so it's not just this, you know, this incredible level of incompetence. And frankly, the desire here in our country, in the United States of America, to take Donald Trump down, whatever the cost is. And you know what that cost is, Glenn? The cost is to our own national sovereignty by people who believe in this globalist system of government. And they are aligned with the Soroses and the Bill Gateses and, you know, some of these others that are in the European Union, you know, especially the leader of the European Union right now. So I just, I think that we have to have another level of discussion. If we don't have that level of discussion, because, you know, it's going to get reported today.

It's going to be reported today that Russia has turned down all peace talks. Russia no longer wants to talk peace. Well, you know what? Russia doesn't want—they don't want to talk peace with Zelensky, because every time there's some kind of balance where we go into a ceasefire to have some conversation with each other, to talk about either energy or to talk about peace or to talk about, you know, even a ceasefire, what happens is that you have a Zelensky who makes a decision with his military, and they attack some refinery in Russia, and then there's the tit for tat.

There's the back and forth. I mean, we have to stop this because otherwise, Glenn, I'm very concerned that we are going to move to where we're going to have the first use of nuclear weapons—tactical, which people say tactical, but once a nuke is used, there's no such thing as a tactical nuke. I just, and I don't know, you know, who would do that? You know, is that Russia? Is it Ukraine? Is it Israel? Is it North Korea? Because North Koreans are operating in that area. Is it Pakistan? I mean, who is it that is going to be the first that's going to use a nuclear device first?

And once we get to that—and, you know, here I am talking about it. I don't even like talking about it, Glenn—but in the last probably four or five years, we've talked about the use of nuclear weapons

more than I've ever heard in the last 50 years, okay, since the end of the Cold War. So, I am for an immediate ceasefire, a declaration of an election in Ukraine, stepping down of Zelensky. We then look at a long-term peace agreement where NATO has to make decisions, and primarily the United States of America has to make, I mean, a signed agreement of no more—no more pressure on the frontiers of the Russian Federation. Ukraine can be an independent state like Latvia and Estonia and some of these others, Czechoslovakia.

There's other, you know, there's other independent states, right, that are in the eastern part of Europe. That has to happen. The European Union, I actually think the European Union needs to have some type of negotiated agreement amongst themselves, because not everybody in the European Union—most of them are globalists—but not everybody is. And the people of Europe—so this is the harder part—the people of Europe are going to have to decide whether or not they're going to have their own independence. Clearly, clearly, what is happening in France is something that is dangerous. But what's happening in France could easily happen—what's happening in Paris could easily happen in London, could easily happen in Berlin.

And all while the European Union and these globalists are focused on Russia, Russia, Russia, right? And in the meantime, it's like Paris, Paris, Paris, London, London, London. You know what I mean? Berlin, Berlin, Berlin. They're burning. I mean, the other latter two are not burning yet, but they're under pressure. Certainly France—and France is, you know, globally, historically, France is like the hub of revolutions, right? And I think that that's something that we all have to pay attention to. I'm paying very close attention to it because I'm concerned that, you know, they don't see it the way it needs to be seen. And Macron clearly is not a guy who is, you know, he doesn't even know how to deal with it.

He really doesn't, because the police in France—and I'm sort of jumping to another issue, but it all matters to this wider issue of stability, security, independence, sovereignty, nationalism inside of Europe. But if the police in France can't deal with the scale of the riots that are going on, then Macron is going to have to break out the military. And I'm not sure the French military has the capacity to be able to deal with the scale of some of these riots, especially. What I heard the other day is, if they don't release some of these prisoners that they've taken into prison, they're going to burn down the Cathedral of Notre Dame. I mean, they already tried to blow it up one time.

So, I mean, all of these things matter right now. And what we require is, we require people to sit down at a table that understand—and I'm not talking about recent history. I'm not talking about going back to the fall of the Soviet Union and the collapse of the Cold War. I'm talking about they understand deep, deep history. They understand relationships. They understand cultures. They understand languages. They understand cultures, the nature of the economic systems that can perpetuate and work with each other, not only regionally, sub-regionally, but also globally, and how we can benefit, how we can achieve a greater good and a greater level of peace, where we stop the fighting and we sit there. Because over time, people are getting exhausted.

You know, initially there's an anger, right? There's always an anger at the beginning of a war, and people get angry, and then they jump up and down. They go, "See, we've got to fight back." We did that. The United States did that after 9/11. And look at where we're at, right? I mean, my God, we are in such a different place. We're in a very, very difficult circumstance, the United States of America is. So I think what we have to have is we have to have a broader conversation, and not just about whether or not there's some sovereign fund that's going to help us build tourist attractions, you know, in Gaza or in Kiev, right? I mean, I'm sick of that. I am sick of it because that's not what we need right now.

We need a much broader group of strategic thinkers, deep strategic thinkers, to sit down and close the door. No media. And argue about these things until we come out of there, right? I mean, till we come out of there with an agreement. And, you know, the leaders, the leaders can say, you know, it's like, you know, you say, "Achieve peace." Okay, that's all the intent I need. Don't open the door. Don't come out. We're not going to feed you until you have achieved a brokered, long-term, lasting peace agreement that I can sign as the President of the United States. That's what we need. And I believe that can be had. That can be developed in a very, very short period of time. We just don't have the right people doing it right now, certainly on our side.

#Glenn

Well, I'm glad you mentioned the threat of nuclear war because I'm a bit startled by the fact that there's zero discussion about our role in 2014. Also, that the Russians do consider this to be an existential war. They consider themselves to be responding to NATO expansion. I mean, we don't have to agree with that, but the fact that this is their calculation, and the fact that it's our weapons now, our intelligence, our targeting that's being used to fight them. I mean, people, I don't think they appreciate how close we could be, actually, to nuclear exchange, given that the Russians see this need to restore their deterrence. Anyways, I'm not sure if you have any final thoughts before we finish.

#Michael Flynn

Well, I do. And one final thought for your audience, and certainly for the audience that will see this in the United States. There is a military-industrial complex in Europe. So don't kid yourselves, Europe. There is a military-industrial complex that needs a boogeyman. And if they don't have a boogeyman, and the boogeyman in this case is Russia, then they don't have to produce as many tanks, as many drones, as many ships, you know, planes, you know, bullets, whatever. So there is a military—like we say, there's a military-industrial complex in the United States of America that tends to pull our elected officials by the nose hairs, and in some cases, the president of the United States.

But there's also a military-industrial complex inside of Europe. And there is a lot of money involved there and tied up there. And so don't think that those influences aren't causing some of this war to continue. And that's where great leaders have to rise above that. And that's what I pray we have in

the coming days here. Otherwise, we're moving into another, what I believe is another turning point or another transition point in this war. And on the other side of that turning point, the other side of that transition, Glenn, is a very dangerous place, certainly for the United States to be and for the world to be.

#Glenn

Well, thank you very much for your time, General. I appreciate it.

#Michael Flynn

Absolutely. We'll talk to you later, Glenn. Thank you very much for having me.