

Douglas Macgregor: Iran War Destroyed NATO, Gulf States, Israel & U.S. Empire

Douglas Macgregor is a retired Colonel, combat veteran and former senior advisor to the U.S. Secretary of Defense. Col. Macgregor argues the Iran War has contributed to destroying NATO, the Gulf States, Israel and the U.S. Empire. Please like, subscribe & share! 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 are joined today by Colonel Douglas McGregor, a decorated combat veteran, author, and former advisor to the U.S. Secretary of Defense. As always, thank you very much for taking the time. Happy to be here. We're getting some mixed messages from President Trump. That's a big change. Well, no—yeah, good point. We hear that the U.S. already won the war, but if the Iranians don't agree to a ceasefire, they'll destroy all the infrastructure in Iran if they don't open the Strait of Hormuz. At the same time, he also argues that the U.S. is ready to leave and that the Strait of Hormuz should be the problem of the Europeans and the regional states. So how are you assessing the state of this war? Because I guess, you know, I understand there are a lot of different audiences to communicate to, and one wants to put pressure while at the same time have something offered on the table. But how do you make sense of the current position now?

#Douglas Macgregor

Well, I'm not sure a decision is being made—or if it has, he's not sharing it. I think it's a very strange set of circumstances. I mean, when you have this incessant drumbeat: we've already won, we've destroyed everything that could be destroyed, they're down to nothing, they can't keep up, they're running out of missiles, their back is against the wall.

#Douglas Macgregor

Well, if that's true, why is it that every time he makes some sort of statement along those lines, a wave of missile attacks comes out of Iran—tactical and theater ballistic missiles, drones that do enormous damage to Israel and, frankly, to the Gulf Emirates? I mean, if that's really the case, why hasn't Iran already hoisted the white flag? I just think those claims have to be dismissed up front. What I'm hearing from people on the inside whom I trust is that we've perhaps reduced Iran's

ballistic missile capability from 100% down to maybe 70%, that their air defense has been very effective against unmanned surveillance aircraft, selectively against other kinds of aircraft, but has not performed as well as they'd hoped.

But they have always been willing to absorb the strikes. They've always known their infrastructure would be brutalized, and they think the payoff is worth the trouble. So that's the first thing. The second thing is, if things are going so well and we've had so much success with the air and missile campaign, why would we want to introduce ground troops into the equation? It doesn't seem to make a lot of sense. I don't think you're getting a truthful assessment from the U.S. side. I think the president is desperate. He faces public humiliation inside the United States as well as overseas if he admits the truth. And when he starts talking about, "Well, maybe I'll just leave and dump all of this into the laps of Europeans," we ought to stop and consider a few things.

First of all, commercial traffic through the Strait of Hormuz has fallen by about 95% to 97%. Fifteen million barrels of oil a day have been taken offline. The physical shortages have already hit so hard that right now Singapore jet fuel is selling at \$231 a barrel. And as long as the war persists, the real people who shut down the Strait of Hormuz are not the Iranians—they're sitting in London. They're called Lloyd's of London. The insurance brokers aren't going to insure anything that goes through the Strait right now because it's a war zone. So if you really want to open up the Strait, you've got to stop the war, not just pass an ultimatum to the Iranians and then turn to the Europeans, who were never really consulted on this whole business.

Neither were the Japanese, neither were the South Koreans. I mean, frankly, we ignored all of our allies and simply acted independently in the way we decided to act. And it was never really in our interest to do so. When you turn to a friendly country like India, you discover the Indians are apoplectic. They do \$180 billion of business and trade a year with the Emirates—suddenly that's gone. And if we continue to destroy infrastructure in Iran, the Iranians have said, fine, if you hit our desalination plants, if you hit our oil infrastructure, we're going to turn around and obliterate everything in the Persian Gulf.

So what does he plan to do? He wants to land troops on some islands, presumably. Right now, the United States Navy sails 500 to 800 miles away from the Gulf and keeps moving, cutting giant squares in the ocean because it doesn't want to be sunk. It doesn't want its ships on the bottom. How do you get the troops in there? Can you get close enough without being detected and without coming under fire to put the troops in a position from which they can attack something? Then how do you propose to attack wherever you want to attack? Can you account for all the potential air defense systems that might be there, including shoulder-fired missiles?

Can you ensure that you've neutralized this brilliant network of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms with strike systems that are all over Iran—and they're miles deep inside the country, anywhere from 10 miles to 200 or 300 miles? All of these questions are never really answered. It's the big hand wave: "Oh, we're successful, we're brilliant, we've done everything right.

These pesky Iranians are too dumb to surrender, but we think we've done enough damage." Now, from whom have we not heard? Who is really in charge? Israel. Why are we in this war? Because we suddenly decided that Iran was the satanic, evil element in the international system that had to be purged for anyone, anywhere in civilization, to be safe? No—that's a lot of nonsense.

We're there because Israel wants Iran taken off the board—which is the phrase used by the neocons in Washington. This whole thing was sold from the very beginning on the assumption that, first of all, it would be a short campaign. We'd be surprised if they didn't fall apart in 96 hours—that's what I was told. Secondly, once we've taken Iran off the board, Israel is safe. It has no worries. It can bully the region, push its power and influence to the limits. And oh, don't worry about the Turks—we'll keep them under control. We're close to the Turks; the Turks don't want trouble with us. They'll do what we say. So the attitude in Israel was, fine.

Now we just need to obliterate Iran. And oh, by the way, if we do this right, we—and you—can move in and take control of the oil fields. Never mind Iraq. Don't mind Syria. Don't mind Turkey. Forget those things; they're not important. And the Emirates—they depend on us for everything, so they'll do what we say. Well, the Emirates have discovered that depending on us is not a very good idea. We've been woefully unprepared for the attacks launched against them, and they've paid a terribly heavy price for our bases and their support for us. So where are we today? There is no trust between the United States and Iran—zero. The Chinese have offered to mediate through the Pakistanis.

We haven't really responded to that, and we've shown no sign that we'd be interested, because the worst thing that could happen to us—in the minds of people in Washington—is that the Chinese supplant our power and influence in the Gulf. And the Chinese are well on their way to doing that. So we're not going to take anything that's on offer from the Chinese. What about the Russians? Well, we're still trying to harm Russia. We haven't given up. We're still doing everything in our power to sustain this fiction in Kyiv called a Ukrainian government. We keep helping MI6 and other European countries put standoff attack weapons in there so that, periodically, they can wake up the international community to say, "Look at us."

We have powerful drones that can reach just outside St. Petersburg and destroy an important oil terminal in Russia. Well, that's about all they can do. Inside Russia, as you know, there's tremendous discontent right now with the way the war is being handled. Russians want an end to the war. They're sick and tired of the nonsense. So it'll be interesting to see what happens in two weeks when the ground dries out in eastern Ukraine. Will the Russians push ahead and finally put an end to this war, or will they sit there, as they've sat for months and months now, behind this defensive line? They take some casualties—certainly not on the scale of the Ukrainians—but nevertheless, it's a constant irritant.

So all of these things seem to be coming together right now, and I think President Trump realizes he's got to make a decision. He said, "Can we do everything? Probably not. Then what can we do? How

much longer can we keep this up in the Persian Gulf?" Everybody forgets we're visitors—we're not residents. We're very dependent on other people's harbors, other people's air bases. How much longer can we do this? How many missiles can we produce in a day—five, six, seven, eight? How many can the Chinese produce? And what about resupply from China? Where does that figure into all of this? We haven't even talked about the space-based intelligence that's been on loan to the Iranians.

So he's got to answer this question. And I think tonight he recognizes he's got to go one way or the other. He's got to say, "It's over. We've won. We're leaving." In which case, Israel is in trouble, because Israel hasn't won. And Israel needs us backing them unconditionally to win anything. So I don't think the Israelis will approve of that. It's very hard for me to believe that the immensely powerful Zionist billionaires in the United States—who are really the foundation of the Israel lobby's influence and power—are prepared to throw Israel under the bus, as they say. I find that hard to imagine.

And perhaps President Trump will say, "Well, we're going to continue to support Israel." That's like saying, you know, "I have all these dead cats, but I'm going to keep feeding them as long as possible," because that's what Israel looks like right now. It's in ruins. It's not getting any better. We don't know how many people have died, but certainly a lot more than the Israelis were prepared to accept. I think that's pretty obvious. So what do the Iranians want? Well, the Iranians want us out of the Persian Gulf. What have we done for decades? We've surrounded Iran, placing bases wherever we could from which we could threaten Iran.

The Iranians have said, "No thanks, not anymore." The Sykes-Picot states that were created at Versailles in the aftermath of World War I—gone. "We don't accept that anymore." So what do they want besides us out of the Gulf? They want change in Israel. They're not going to accept peace with the Israelis or with us as long as we continue to back Israel's campaign of mass murder and destruction in Gaza and the West Bank. They're not going to come to peace terms with the Israelis as long as the Israelis are expanding into Lebanon and killing people there by the thousands, or expanding into Syria. So how do we deliver on Israel? Are we really in control? I don't think we are.

#Glenn

I spoke to an Iranian as well who made the point that if they go up the escalation ladder, they can do a lot of different things. Most of them I would have predicted, but one of them I thought was interesting—that is, to reward Iraq for its assistance. They could also change the borders of the region. Since you mentioned Sykes-Picot, that is, Kuwait could end up joining Iraq, essentially. So there are a lot of surprises that seem to be outside our control at the moment in terms of how the region will be impacted by this. What I wanted to ask as well, though, was how you see the region beyond the Middle East being affected—especially the NATO relationship. I find this interesting, because on one hand, Trump has been arguing that NATO is now a paper tiger.

Marco Rubio said, "Perhaps we should just, you know, reconsider this relationship. They're only there when we need to help them, not the other way around." And yeah, I can kind of understand it from both sides. From the European perspective, the Americans never told them, didn't inform them, never cared—and now they want them to go on a suicide mission into the Strait of Hormuz. On the other side, the Europeans blocked access to military bases and airspace. Poland was asked to hand over some Patriot batteries to help out the United States in the region, and they declined. So I can understand where the mutual frustration comes from, but... what do you think this war will do to the transatlantic partnership?

#Douglas Macgregor

Several years ago, in 1991, during the air campaign, most of us who were prepared to invade Iraq were sitting on the sidelines, watching it unfold in front of us. We were literally up on the Saudi border, watching all the sorties every night—bombers and all kinds of aircraft going in. And one night, very early in the morning—about four a.m.—I was trying to get some rest when a soldier suddenly woke me up. He said, "Sir, quickly, get to the CP. We need you right now."

I said, "Okay, what's happening?" He said, "Well, we have a report that we're under fire." I said, "Really? That's interesting. I didn't think the Iraqis, during the air campaign, would risk an attack—but all things are possible." So I got up, walked into the command post, and said, "Now what's going on?" They said, "Well, Ghost Troop—that was G Troop—has an observation post up here. That means a couple of Bradleys up on the border, and they say they're under fire." I said, "What? Get this man on the phone." Well, the man on the phone was very agitated. "We have air-to-ground bombs coming in!"

#Douglas Macgregor

Fully on our location.

#Douglas Macgregor

Well, I'd never heard of anything other than air-to-ground bombs. I hadn't heard of any anti-gravity bombs. And I said, "What the hell? Is this man sober?" Of course, there was no liquor to consume, so I assumed he was. Then the next thing I get is, "We need help! We need help!" One of the sergeants there was a very smart noncommissioned officer. He said, "Yeah, that's a great idea—let's all get under the artillery fire with Ghost Troop." In other words, if everybody up there is under fire, why are we going up to join them? Why don't we do something intelligent and try to find out where it's coming from, or whatever? Anybody who thinks American soldiers are stupid is wrong. They're actually very intelligent people.

So finally, I got the executive officer on the phone, and he said, "Look, I'm sorry about this. That man had been watching flares dropped by A-10s and others. Those flares were used to distract air

defense systems so the missiles would be diverted by the flares instead of striking the target." I think that's kind of what Donald Trump is asking the Europeans to do—"Hey, we did something immensely stupid. We're sending the United States into a recession, and most of the world is at risk of going into a depression, all because we went into the Persian Gulf for Israel. We've set back the world for God knows how long—ten years before we recover—because food, fuel, feedstocks, fertilizer, the big ones right there, the four Fs, are screwing us."

You know, we're screwed. Thank you so much. Yeah, let's all go down to the Persian Gulf and contribute to this catastrophe. And Trump said, "Well, if you're not going to help us, we don't need you." You know, this goes back to the false assumption that the North Atlantic Treaty was designed for anything other than defense—and that defense was against the Soviet Union. Period. That's it. And ever since the Soviet state system collapsed, we've been trying to repurpose and repurpose. The famous statement was, "If NATO is not out of area, then it's out of business."

We don't need it. And I told everybody in NATO, get smart, get out. You don't want to go to all the hellholes we've identified for invasion and occupation. But the Europeans—well, you know, "We're afraid, and we really need the Americans here. It's vital to our security." Okay, fine. Here we sit. Now the Europeans are saying, "This is a dumb idea. We don't really want to participate in this. And why aren't we talking to the Iranians?" Because the Iranians have said, "Look, the Strait of Hormuz is closed to countries unfriendly to Iran. That's all." Which means even though the number of tankers used to average seventy-five a day going through the strait, now it's three to four. But that number can rise, provided the tankers and their destinations are not to places unfriendly to Iran. So many people are saying, "Well, let's talk to the Iranians."

And the Americans are saying, "That is unacceptable. You can't talk to those people. If you do that, you're going back to Munich—you're negotiating with Hitler." Yes, here we go again. So we're in a bit of a pickle. I think the Iranians hold the strategic initiative. They're not at the end of their rope. I think he's got to make a decision: do I bail on this? It's a stinker. I made a mistake. Find a way to get out and blame it on other people—that's the standard Trump approach. Or do I say, no, I'm going to obliterate you. You refuse to negotiate with me, the great marketer, the great salesman. Then I'm going to wage a war-winning air and missile attack, bring in ground troops, cut you off from the Gulf, and force the Gulf open.

#Glenn

And I think the Iranians are sitting there saying, "OK, go ahead."

#Douglas Macgregor

Because if you're going to put ground troops anywhere in that area, you have to neutralize all the strike weapons, neutralize the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance network, and stop all potential air defenses, including shoulder-fired missiles. Because if you can't do that, first of all, they

may never reach their destination. They could be shot out of the sky before they get there, because they're going to have to fly in. I don't see a massive amphibious assault working. That means they have to get there without already being identified in Kuwait, Bahrain, or the UAE—and I don't see that happening. So I think the Iranians hold the strategic initiative, and we stand an excellent chance of ending up like a giant 14-, 15-, 16-, or 18-wheel truck headed down the side of a mountain toward a concrete wall. We'll just end up battering ourselves against a concrete wall one more time.

#Glenn

I've heard many commentators argue that if the U.S. could just control the coastline, then they'd be able to control the Strait of Hormuz. They don't seem to recognize that there's a vast amount of territory behind Iran's coastline that can also be used to target. But either way, the coastline is a huge area, so it doesn't really make much sense—especially if no one's planned for this in advance. But what about Bandar Abbas?

#Douglas Macgregor

That's a city of about 580,000. They also have a uranium mine not far from the city where they process yellowcake. They've got a desalination plant there too. That plant could be destroyed, which would harm the people living in Bandar Abbas. I think they have some backup plans for that, though. But the bottom line is, what are we going to do about it? The islands all sit close to Bandar Abbas. If you can't control Bandar Abbas, what makes you think you can control those little islands? In other words, it's damned if you do and damned if you don't. The Iranians might just take the position: let them all land, and then we'll erase the islands. And see, this has been a problem we've been dealing with in our war planning for years.

You have the Marine Corps and the Navy wanting to repeat World War II. They talk about island chains. Well, unless the island is about the size of Borneo, it's going to be annihilated from the air—top attack, ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, drones—they'll all land on top of you and kill everybody on the island. We've attached so much significance to little islands without understanding that they no longer hold the strategic value they did 80-plus years ago. They're just an invitation to lose people. And that's the other issue: assuming you get on there and can survive for any length of time, how do you feed yourself? How do you evacuate the wounded?

And then ultimately, how do you get out when it becomes clear this is a dumb idea? At least the British in the Dardanelles were able to pull vast numbers of ships in and systematically evacuate the 500,000 troops that were there. That's not so easy in the Persian Gulf. You know, if you stand above Qeshm Island and look down, you're on top of an escarpment. The terrain is very high and very steep. So what are you going to do on those islands? The other thing is, the notion that all the oil would stop moving at that point is false. The Iranians have other means of exporting oil. They're making a lot of money right now—that's obvious. They're charging tolls.

But again, you listen to the Chinese, the Russians, the Indians, and others. They're very intelligently saying, look, we need to end this. We'll get together, we'll have a commission, maybe we sign a treaty that guarantees access to the Strait of Hormuz. We did that after World War I for the Dardanelles. We have a treaty—the Turks control the strait, but it's all carefully measured, it's all carefully managed. The Turks don't arbitrarily say, "You can come, and you can't." They haven't done business that way. That can be organized as well. But the key thing is, we can't be in the Gulf. Our time there is now over. And if we can't be in the Gulf, I don't know where else we're going to be.

#Glenn

Well, this could have fit within Trump's wider plan. If the goal was really to pull out of Europe and the Middle East, then, well, this is really the time. He can clearly argue that the Europeans weren't reliable, that the Middle East should look after its own problems, and then focus on the Western Hemisphere and East Asia, if that's the objective. But a key problem, though, is Israel here, because the US and Israel do appear to be joined at the hip. And Israel, of course, has been pushing hard for this war for several decades now. It finally has the war.

If Trump now decides—no matter how he wants to end it, even if he just declares victory, says we don't need the Strait of Hormuz and we'll go home—where does that leave Israel? Because if they're locked in a war with Iran, which they don't want to end, is the U.S. still able to leave? And if the U.S. is able to leave, what do you do with a vulnerable Israel armed with nuclear weapons, not ready to give up this fight against Iran? I mean, it's... you know, one doesn't want to be hyperbolic, but on the other hand, this is a very strange situation to be in. There's a lot of desperation, and a lot of countries have bet everything on this conflict.

#Douglas Macgregor

Glenn, you're absolutely right. The key thing to remember about NATO is that once you leave the Beltway and drive across America, the vast majority of people don't even know what it is. If you ask people, "Do you know we have U.S. Army ground troops in Germany?" they'll say, "Really? I didn't know we had any troops in Germany." And some people who are moderately smart and educated will ask, "Why, after 80 years, do we still have troops in Germany?" So I don't think that's a big deal here at home. Now, you'll have all sorts of people in Washington who will hurl abuse at Donald Trump for destroying NATO, the greatest alliance ever. It's all crap. Nobody cares. The electorate does not care about that. But they care about the economy, and this is accelerating very bad trends.

If you talk to someone like Alistair McLeod, he says this is the end of fiat currency. All you have to do is point to the rise in the value of gold. As gold goes up, the value of the dollar goes down, down, down. We're seeing, in real time, the yuan petro take shape. In other words, instead of a petrodollar, you get the petroyuan. I think that's coming. And the interesting part is, it's going to be backed by gold. China has been hoarding gold, purchasing gold, buying gold. It has a vault in

Riyadh, a vault in Hong Kong. It's real. That's the future of BRICS—that's where they're headed. Now, will it ultimately encompass a basket of precious metals or something? I have no idea. But it's got to be based on some tangible, concrete value. And right now, that's gold.

Now, we can't do that. We just can't. So what do we do? Do we watch our currency go down the toilet? A lot of people think that's where we're headed. And Nassim Taleb—you know him, the man who came up with the idea of the black swan—he's been saying for months, and I agree with him, that, frankly, gold is now the reserve currency. It's not the dollar. And if the yuan is backed by gold, well, I guess the yuan will become the petroyuan. I think we've lost. We've actually lost because of this stupid action, all because of Israel's "Greater Israel" imagination and aspirations, and because the Israelis hate all their neighbors, think all their neighbors are inferior, and deserve to be essentially exploited, bullied, and run and governed by them. It's not going to happen.

#Glenn

So how does this end, then? I mean, if Trump doesn't pull back—it's hard to say. He made some reference to this, but again, he pretended to do peace negotiations during two surprise attacks. So I do think, at some level, he doesn't want this war, that his intentions, not just in the first presidency but in the second, were to avoid these kinds of things. But now that we're in this war and he can't really afford to pull out, it seems—what are the options for Washington here? Do they put boots on the ground? Do they try to invade Yemen? Because if Yemen shuts down the Red Sea—well, it's a huge country, about 34 million people. I wouldn't want to enter that country. But again, desperate situations result in foolish policy. So what do you expect to happen from here on?

#Douglas Macgregor

Well, one of two things. Either he announces, "I have decided unilaterally to end our involvement in this war, and I welcome the opportunity to negotiate with the Iranians and to assist in any way possible to return the Persian Gulf to normalcy." That's an admission that he made a mistake, which is fine. He made a mistake. I don't know if that will happen or not. Personally, I would welcome that development. But I think the Israel connection really makes it impossible at this stage. We don't understand the connection that Israel has to Trump. I don't understand all of it, but I understand enough to know that, yes, you're right. When I spoke to him in April of 2020 in the Oval Office, it was supposed to be short but turned into a longer session, and I was enormously impressed with the things that he had to say.

One of the things that was very clear to me is that he didn't want a war with Iran. In fact, he was looking for some sort of negotiated agreement, and I'm sure he felt that way when he was elected. However, these Zionist billionaires were very instrumental in his winning that election—not only because of the money his campaign was given, not only because of the many ways in which he and his family have been enriched by the Zionists, but also because of what they didn't do. They didn't provide any support whatsoever to his opponent. And the last time around, when he lost his bid for

re-election, they invested heavily in his opponent. So he knew they could deliver the goods. In other words, if he had them on his side, he could win. But when he did that, he had to make some promises.

And I think one of those promises was that he would back Israel's attack on Iran. Whether or not he was aware that Israel's plan is to turn most of the region into a facsimile of Gaza, I don't know. But that's really Israel's answer for Iran—Gaza. And whereas we started out with this decapitation nonsense, I think a lot of that goes back to Israel: "We can get the leadership. If we get the leadership, this will encourage internal upheaval," and so forth. So then they lied about 30,000 people being killed. That wasn't true—it was about 3,000. And they had a very important role in stirring up that violence, passing out weapons, and encouraging people to shoot at police and so forth. It failed. So then the decision was, "We'll try the decapitation. That'll probably work." It didn't work.

So what is the goal now? Well, since Lloyd's of London shut down the Strait of Hormuz and the Iranians can now charge people to move through it, the idea is that you have to destroy Iran. Period. The destruction of Iran, the disintegration of its society. And after all, that's what we wanted to do to Russia. That's what the Europeans don't understand. That's what we wanted to do. And when I say "we," I'm not talking about the average American. I'm talking about the same people who are backing Trump now. They were very interested in the same thing in Russia—destroy Russia, rape it, divide it, fragment it, steal its resources. Well, now we're turning to Iran with the same purpose in mind. And I just don't know that Donald Trump can get off this train to hell. And that's what he's doing—he's riding a train to hell.

#Glenn

Just as a last question, how do you see Russia responding to this? Because I always make the point that the Russians were genuinely very optimistic when Trump got reelected. With the whole Russiagate thing being over, and Trump seemingly having a genuine objective of improving bilateral relations with Russia—whether for shared views on the world in terms of conservatism or just pragmatic great-power politics that would bring Russia to our side of the ledger instead of pushing it toward Iran—it seemed genuine, whatever the reason was. And now, of course, one year into this, the U.S., much like the Europeans, is still participating in the proxy war.

The surprise attack on Iran seems to have shaken the Russians a bit. It shows a willingness to throw out the rule book—kill leaders, attack nuclear power plants, just across the board. They've also lost some faith in diplomacy as a whole. How do you see Russia responding to this? Because on one hand, I see the disappointment, but there are many who still seem to hope there won't be another Trump—someone who actually wants peace with Russia. If he does want peace, of course, as you said, even though it's Trump behind the wheel, it still seems to be the same objective: to destroy Russia, break it up, and seize its resources.

#Douglas Macgregor

Well, first of all, the Russians don't really understand how the American government works. Very few people outside the United States do. The most astute observation Putin has made is that he's spoken with several presidents and then discovered that nothing really changes, because others are in control. Some people call it the deep state. I call it Zionist billionaires—people who are among the wealthiest in the world. They dominate Wall Street; they're financial capitalists. These aren't people who made money by building or creating anything. They're the kings of financial transactions.

And they have enormous amounts of money, and they're willing to use that money to pursue their agenda. We talked about what the agenda in Russia originally was, and now we're looking at the same one again. The good news for them, in their view, is that if this works, Israel will be in charge of the entire region. That means that from their positions in New York and London, in the banks, they're controlling everything—because ultimately, that's what they want to do: control the region's resources. Now, my view is that's not going to happen, and I think the Russians are starting to realize it probably won't. If anything, we've demonstrated not our brilliance or our supremacy in every field.

We've demonstrated that our superiority isn't that great, that our effectiveness isn't what they thought it was—that there are more chinks in our armor than the Russians, the Chinese, or anyone else really believed. That's the danger of using military power when you don't need to. There was no pressing reason for us to attack Iran—none. And when you have to go back to Netanyahu's talking points from 1982 and the bombing of a building that housed Marines who hadn't even been issued ammunition—what a disaster. That's your justification for destroying a nation of 93 million people? Or is it simply because they say things you don't like, but they're a threat to Israel?

Okay, I think the biggest threat to Israel—other than Israel itself at this stage—is probably Turkey. In fact, that's what Naftali Bennett has said, and even Netanyahu has admitted that. Which means, I guess, the expectation is that those laws, they control us and our armed forces, so if we're successful at utterly destroying Iran, then we can turn our attention to do the same thing to Turkey. Disaster. Insane. So NATO is finished. NATO died on the battlefields of Ukraine. It's over. The Russians need to wake up and realize that they—not anyone else, but they—are going to have to settle this war. The only way I think they can do that is by advancing. So we'll see in two weeks, when the ground is thoroughly dried out, whether or not President Putin is willing to finally end the war.

And he can do that. He has the military power to do it. There's nothing really standing in his way. He can obliterate all the opposition. But he's got to do it. No one is going to help him. No one is going to offer him a good deal—it doesn't exist. And Trump, no matter what he privately thinks, has demonstrated he can't deliver. Now we're dealing with the Gulf, and the Russians are watching this. I think the Russians have always advised the Iranians to be conservative—to cooperate, to negotiate. Whether or not they continue to do that at this stage, I don't know. But I think that now,

more than ever, the Russians and the Chinese will back Iran. So I see no evidence that whatever we do is going to result in the outcome the Israelis want.

#Glenn

Well, sorry—let me squeeze in one very brief last question. Wait a minute now.

#Douglas Macgregor

You said that was the last one, Glenn. It better be a short one—I've got to go.

#Glenn

Well, I know you hate this word, but what's the strategy here for the Europeans, do you think? Because they seem to have bet everything on backing the U.S., hoping to win over the love of the Americans. But now suddenly, with Iran, it's essentially the conflict where they decide to turn their back on the U.S. So what do you think the strategy is now? They don't have energy from Russia or the Middle East, their American backup is kind of gone, Ukraine is falling apart, and the Middle East is, again, a mess. How do you make sense of their current position?

#Douglas Macgregor

Keep in mind that in 1964–65, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was approached and asked whether the British would support the Americans if they intervened in Vietnam. And he said, very straightforwardly, absolutely not—we have no intention of involving ourselves there. Did that destroy our relationship with Britain? No, of course not. But in those times, people understood the limitations of treaties and alliances, and the alliance with us pertained primarily to the Soviet threat. So I think you're still going to have bilateral relations between us and the Europeans, regardless of what happens. They buy a lot from us, we sell them a lot, we buy a lot from them—that's still unchanging. But the energy question is critical.

And they are not prepared to go down the same path to extinction that the Gulf Emirates are on. The Gulf Emirates are finished. I don't see those being rebuilt at all. We're not coming back. That was very clear from Trump when he said, "Well, we'll just leave, and that's it. We've done as much as we can—or we'll do whatever we can to obliterate Iran, after which we'll leave too." All right. So the Gulf Emirates have backed the wrong horse, and they've cultivated hostility toward their big neighbor. They're paying a terrible price for it. The Germans, the Poles, the French, the British have done the same stupid thing toward Russia. They've cultivated an enemy in the big neighbor to the east. Huge mistake. Unnecessary. You know that, I know that. Russia has no interest in invading or threatening Western Europe.

That means you need new governments. You've got to get rid of MADS, for God's sake. I was so happy to see the AfD announce quite recently that they support the complete removal of all U.S. forces from Germany. Absolutely. Should have happened 30 years ago. We should never have stayed in that country. There's no justification for it whatsoever. And I think others are going to reach that conclusion. De Gaulle was right. We should remember that. Orbán has been right. The British need a new government badly, and so do the French. And before they get that, or when they get it, they may end up fighting an internal rebellion of various types and sorts. As David Betts has pointed out—I don't know if you've had David Betts on your program or not—I did. But he is absolutely right.

These are things that have to be dealt with, that have to be addressed, and can only be addressed by the Europeans. And while they do this, they need to put an end to the hostility with Russia. And tell these maniacs—I like them, they're wonderful people, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, the Baltic states—stop. Stop the stupidity. You've got to live with your neighbor and get along with your neighbor. It's not that scary an idea. And by the way, that's what Bismarck told them back in 1879: knock it off, get along with the Russians. Whatever you think you're suffering from, it's not as bad as you think it is. And he was right. It wasn't. It got a lot worse under the Soviets. That was a different era, but it was catastrophic. We've got to get out of this business of treating Russia as a perpetual Stalinist threat. They're not.

#Glenn

Well, thank you for accommodating my second-to-last question. And as always, thank you for your time.

#Douglas Macgregor

You owe me, Glenn. You owe me.

#Glenn

I'll make it up to you someday.

#Douglas Macgregor

Thank you. See you. Bye-bye.