

# Stanislav Krapivnik: Iran Lesson - Will Russia Retaliate Against Estonia?

Stanislav Krapivnik discusses how Iran's ability to follow the US up the escalation ladder may be emulated by Russia, and the first step would be to make an example out of Estonia. Krapivnik is a former US Army officer from Donbas, who has since returned. Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennDiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: [https://x.com/Glenn\\_Diesen](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](http://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. Today is April 11th, 2026, and we're joined by Stanislav Krapivnik, a former U.S. Army officer who was born in Donbass and has returned. Thank you again for coming back on the program.

## #Stanislav Krapivnik

Always a pleasure.

## #Glenn

So we see that the United States has now essentially failed not only in its proxy war against Russia but also in its war against Iran. And this is happening at a very crucial point in world history, as power has shifted from a global hegemony to a multipolar distribution of power, in which two centers of power have now resisted the U.S. military. Now, not only is it multipolar, but unlike the former multipolar era, this is a multipolarity led by non-Western states. I mean, the defeats in Iran and Russia really seem to intensify this shift away from a world order organized around the West. I just wanted to ask first if you see these wars in the context of world order as well.

## #Stanislav Krapivnik

Yeah, you know, the irony of all this is that Russia has always tried—well, has in the past, not so much right now—to be part of the West. And the West has always been looking down its nose, going, "Eh, you're not good enough. You may look like us, but you're not good enough." And now Russia has swung hard the other way—basically, to hell with the West. The pendulum swings: pro-West, anti-West. And right now it's very much in the anti-West camp, and it'll stay there for

years, maybe decades. It's ironic, because one of the leaders in the West is corroding and collapsing, and Russia could actually have been the savior of the West. But, you know, that's how it goes—the people you spurn today may be the ones who own you tomorrow.

So yeah, that's whose hand you're going to need to pull you out of whatever hole you step into tomorrow. That's why you treat others the way you want to be treated yourself. But that's Christian morals, and the West gave up on those a long time ago. "Do unto others as you wish." Maybe read a morality lesson while you're at it. That said, you're supporting genocide left and right—which, at least, I'll give the Europeans, the Western Europeans—that they, except for the British, who are still doing it anyway, are not supporting the Israeli genocide policy. At least verbally, they're not supporting the Israelis. Again, of course, Merz was crying for Netanyahu, his love toy, love boy over there—talking about how much Germany has to support the Israelis.

But at least the act of actually showing some backbone—the Italians stopped any pretense of supporting the Israelis. Iran—the interesting part is that Iran could never really be considered part of the West. Iran's government was very pro-Western, let's be realistic about it. So when Trump said "regime change," he's absolutely right. He did generational regime change. The people who were pro-West, the people who wanted to make a deal with the West—the same people who, for forty years, didn't develop nuclear weapons even though they could have—because the earliest article I've seen, from the *\*Jerusalem Post\** in 1986, said "Iran is going to have nuclear weapons in a month."

## **#Glenn**

I know, it's shocking.

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

In a month. And they've been beating that same drum for forty frigging years. The people who wanted to be close to the West—they're all dead now, or most of them are. There are still a few left. And the West killed them, in one form or another. Not only did parts of the West kill them, but the rest of the West came out sanctimoniously and charged them with aggression for responding to being attacked—for their people and leadership being murdered, and civilians being butchered. Particularly, let's just start with the school and the little girls. And the people who came after are the younger generation—the ones whose psyche was formed fighting the American proxy in Iraq that had invaded Iran. People seem to forget that part.

It wasn't just a border war. Iraq had invaded Iran in a surprise attack. And then that long war—Khomeini Jr., at seventeen, was an infantryman, volunteered for two years on the front lines watching his friends die. This is what formed their youth and their mentality. It's rather ironic that these are the people the West has brought to power in both Russia and in Iraq. And you're right—the West has shown its incapability to actually do anything. I mean, let's not celebrate that this is all over. You know, as the American saying goes, it's all over but the dying. And that's the truth. There'

s still going to be a lot of dying left, because the conflict in Iran is not over. We'll see if this pseudo on-and-off ceasefire lasts through to the end of next week.

It does give Trump an out from his bombastic stupidity. And, you know, off on a tangent—well, it's not really off on a tangent. I had an interview yesterday with Robert Barnes, and he was telling me he got it from his close sources in the White House. They were close to Vance and other people. He said Vance has been working like a madman to keep Trump under control. Trump is off the reservation—which, if you don't know what that means, when the Americans put Indians on reservations as part of the peace treaties, which were always broken—all of them were broken—start judging who you're dealing with from little facts like that. They would provide food for the Indians, but they'd usually provide rotting meat or nothing at all.

And it's usually because of corrupt supply-side people, suppliers. And if the Indians had to go hunt, that was forbidden—they weren't allowed to hunt—so they really had a choice of either starving or hunting. But if you went to hunt, you'd gone off the reservation, which is where the saying comes from. It means you've broken the rules and gone out somewhere in the radical areas. And, by the way, for the Indians that meant the American army would come in and massacre them for it. So it was either slow starvation or fight. But in Trump's case, you know, "off the reservation" means he's gone off to la-la land. And he's actually started to get desperately and very dangerously insane. So where this goes... I don't know. More likely there's still going to be quite a bit of dying left.

There's a lot of dying left in Ukraine. The future is sealed. Even if NATO comes in, as Americans roll in, neither will the Turks. In fact, the Turks are now—there are proposals from them to move the Turkish Navy and blockade Odessa. There's a saying, "Lie with curs, get fleas." And the Turks have definitely got Ukrainian fleas after Odessa. They supported Ukraine as much as they did—selling them weapons, building new ships for them, which are never going to be delivered now. And Ukraine responded by attacking a Turkish tanker in Turkish waters with a drone. I mean, that's a slap right in the teeth of Erdoğan—or more like a spit in his eye. He can't let that go. And the Turks are outraged after everything they've done for the Ukrainians. They should have known better who they were getting in bed with.

Now they have the Ukrainian fleet that they have to deal with, and the Turks are outraged. They're looking—well, that swing, you know, Turkey... it's probably 60% pro-Ukrainian in public opinion versus pro-Russian. And now it's not even 60% pro-Russian—it's probably closer to 80% pro-Russian after Ukraine's unabashed aggression against Turkey. And, you know, there's still... just as another hit to the world markets, Europe created a Frankenstein monster. And now that Frankenstein monster is paying Europe back. Prices are skyrocketing, and the energy crisis is dragging the European Union down even faster. So what does Zelensky do? Putin declares a 30-hour ceasefire. Zelensky—more than likely, I mean, not more likely, 100%—through Azerbaijan, Ukrainian drones struck two Russian oil platforms in the Caspian Sea. All right.

Granted, there's not much to burn on a platform. I mean, there are drilling platforms, and any oil that may be coming up is underneath, going into pipelines to be pulled out. So if you hit something on top, you might hit some kind of fuel canister or something like that, but there's not much to burn on top of an oil platform, realistically speaking. But the fact of the attack puts price pressure on the market in only one direction, which then translates, of course, to whom? It's not going to stop Russia from getting fuel for itself and for the Russian military. It'll just scare the markets even further and drive prices up for everyone. By the way, all those idiots in the U.S. who are virtue signaling to Ukraine and writing, "Oh, this is great"—well, yeah, you get to pay more. Enjoy bankruptcy even faster.

## **#Glenn**

You know, when you said that the Russians were never considered part of Europe—it really builds into a wider historical failure, in my view. You can go back to Peter the Great, 300 years ago, who really wanted to Europeanize Russia. Of course, part of it was about modernizing its industries and becoming a maritime power on the Baltic Sea, but it was also a cultural revolution to reshape Russia to be more European. And as you said, it was never accepted by many of the European states. The Russians were still seen as the Asiatics of Europe—the barbarians at the gates of civilization—essentially remaining the "other," the east to the west, all of that. But what I found interesting in the '90s was Boris Yeltsin.

I mean, for me, he was like the second coming of Peter the Great—except he didn't bring forward a navy or prosperity. But he wanted, again, to remake Russia as European as possible, though more in the geopolitical sense. That is, he was rushing so fast to the West that he just ignored all the traditional partners in the East. And of course, once he threw away the alternatives, you know, he wouldn't be rewarded—now he could be exploited. I kind of look at this as similar to what the Americans can do to Europe now. We only have one partner; they can put any deal on the table. But I think this is why what's happened now is so significant. It's not just Gorbachev's "common European home" over the past forty-plus years that's been thrown away—or that possibility.

It's, you know, Russia's Western-centric foreign policy for 300 years. That modernization and development kind of meant you had to look, to some extent, toward the West. But now, you know, the Russians have all these partners in the East. It's very different. It's frustrating as a European because I've made the point for decades now that Russia in Europe would be a source of revival—a powerful Europe with autonomy. In contrast, what we did by re-dividing Europe, by expanding NATO, is what's going to make puppets out of us: unprosperous, weak, lacking in security, and, of course, vassals as well. I mean, we should have worked toward having no dividing lines.

However, if you try to push that argument in Europe, no one wants to hear it. All they want to know—not just since 2014, but in general—is that you have to support the dividing lines, even though there's no good reason given. All they want is to know that you're in the trenches on their

side. That's it. The whole aspiration of ending the dividing lines in Europe is a non-issue. But I wanted to ask, though—while the war isn't over, as you said, neither in Iran nor in Ukraine—we do see that some parts of the U.S. hegemony system seem to be falling apart. Because if you want hegemony, you have to base it on alliance systems.

That is, you divide the world into dependent allies and weakened adversaries. And now that the U.S. is obviously in decline, you see the consequences not just in Ukraine but also in the Gulf states. The Gulf states are now asking: to what extent are we inviting the Americans? Are we secure, or are we vulnerable? They're saying the same thing in East Asia. I'm hoping we'll soon have these discussions in Europe, because how much more punishment can we take before we accept reality? But it seems like we still have this dual pressure. On one hand, the European leaders are still angry—they want to defeat the Russians so we can restore the political West.

At the same time, there's a lot of pressure now—you have to adjust to reality before it's too late. For example, the Baltic states are a great example. I mean, by attacking Russia through Baltic territory, this is seen as a way to break the Russians and bring back the political West. But it would also leave the Europeans, much like the Gulf states, completely exposed, with the Americans not coming in to save the day. I was wondering, how do you see this? Do you see Europe backing off, or do you see it going full ahead, moving toward a direct war with Russia? Yeah.

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

You know, Peter the Great—while it's not quite right to say he was trying to get into Europe—he was really trying to get into Western Europe. We were getting back into, well, we are Eastern Europe. Quite literally, Russia makes up about a quarter of the European continent. People seem to forget that. Or, depending on how you look at it, you could call it a subcontinent. You could even think of Europe as one big peninsula of the Eurasian continent. But, you know, we were actively moving back into other parts of Eastern Europe, which were then part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. At that time, almost half of its territory had originally been Russian land that Lithuania had conquered. And Lithuania had become a Russian state because it was about 90% Russian.

But then, with the union with Poland and everything, it was radically different. At one point, Lithuania could have become Russia, I suppose, because it was quite literally competing to become Russia—most of its population were Russians, and they were Orthodox Christians. So, yeah, history takes its turns. It looked in a different direction, and eventually it gave up or lost its empire and was subsumed by Poland. But having said that, I mean, Russia was somewhat backward at that point, but not nearly the way people think. Let's not forget, Russia was one of the earliest countries to adopt gunpowder weapons. In fact, cannon technology, starting from Ivan Grozny—Ivan the Terrible—was very actively developed in Russia.

And that helped drive back and break the various Mongol entities. When they charged in, it helped destroy them at the Battle of Molodi, where Ivan Grozny's army absolutely exterminated the

invading Crimean Khaganate—what we now call the Crimean Tatars, thanks to the Soviets who renamed everything. But they were Mongols, part of the Golden Horde, and they had a contingent of Turkish Janissaries. They were just wiped out. Out of forty-five or fifty thousand, I think only two or three thousand made it home or were still running. And this was in large part due to gunpowder weapons that the Russian state was very actively developing, buying up in every direction, and fielding in larger quantities than many Western or Central European armies were at the time.

So there was a lot of development. What Peter the Great was working toward was not just getting into Europe. Like I said, it was about being accepted—A, by Western Europeans, specifically the Western Europeans, and B, to get the newer technologies like shipbuilding. And by the way, the first Russian fleet wasn't made for the Baltics. The first Russian fleet was built in Voronezh and floated down into the Black Sea to crush the Turks. In fact, while we're at it, one of the interesting things is that in one of the Russo-Turkish wars in the 1800s, Russia was the first country in the world to start using exploding cannonballs. They bottled up the Turkish fleet and just exterminated it—burned it to the ground. Well, I'd say burned it to the ground, but really they only burned it to sea level.

And the rest sank. And the Western media went absolutely apeshit—not, "Oh, look, the Russians beat the Turks, who we've supposedly been fighting for 300 years," but, "Oh, those dastardly Russians, they massacred the poor Turks, the poor Turkish fleet." So we see this as a continuation of the same propaganda you see right now. When the Western Europeans are fighting the Turks, it's "those dastardly Turks," but when the Russians do it, it's "those evil Russians fighting the Turks." So it's the same thing. And you're right—it's absolutely the Europeans, the Central and Western Europeans, who've been very ignorant of what's in their own best interest. I mean, Russia—the only time they look toward Russia is when they need someone to pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

As the saying goes, they need Russian blood and they need Russian gold for something—say, to fight Napoleon or whoever else, Frederick the Great in his time, and so on. That's when they started appealing to Russia. And, you know, in World War I, Russia was driven by pan-Slavicists. And let's not forget, Slavs make up about 50% of the Caucasian population—literally half the white people in the world. Unfortunately, they've been very disorganized and have been pushed and used by other entities to fight each other for millennia—longer, even. Russia was driven by pan-Slavicism and a strong sense of Orthodoxy. In World War II, Russia was driven by the proletariat—workers, the working class uniting. Today's Russia, particularly the people, are driven by realpolitik.

The last four years—or actually longer, if you think about it, since 2014—the Russophobia that's poured out of every pore in Europe and the rest of the West has really sobered people in Russia up. And that's why the anti-Western swing has gone very, very hard, very, very quickly. That's the West's own fault as an entity. So yeah, I'm honestly of the opinion that those Ukrainian drones did not fly through Poland and the Baltics. I think those Ukrainian drones—or maybe better to say Estonian drones—were taking off from Estonia and flying into Russia. About six months ago, maybe five, there was an explosion when these drones blew up in the middle of Estonia, and the Estonians didn't blame Russia for drone warfare.

In fact, they tried to hush it up as much as possible. Videos still got out, photos still got out. The exact same drone hit the ground in the middle of Estonia—nice little crater there, chunks of drone in every direction, airplane-style drones. So this is nothing new. But the pressure on the Kremlin to make an example out of Estonia is insane. And when you consider that half the Estonian population is Russian—has been Russian since the 900s—you know, it's... the city of Narva, which was attached to the new entity called Estonia by the Soviets, because there was no Estonia. There was no Latvia. There was a Lithuania, but there was no Estonia and Latvia. These states didn't exist; they were created by the Soviet Union because they were chopping up the Russian map.

Though the people there obviously existed, they never had states of their own. They have no history of self-government. They had a brief moment when they suddenly appeared after the Russian Revolution and Civil War, and then they disappeared, absorbed into the Soviet Union, with additional territories added to them—Narva being one of those. Narva was founded as a fortress by the Danish king Vladimir—I'm still figuring out the names—but quite literally, his name was Vladimir, in the 1280s. That was the fortress. There was a Russian city there called Radva—I've got to look up the exact name—it had been on that location since the 900s. So that area is... you know, the Russians in Estonia have no rights. They're not even second-class citizens.

They're non-citizens, period. They get a great passport, but they have absolutely no rights. Yet they make up about 50% of the population. Officially, they're listed as 35%, but when you consider they can't leave—and the Estonian youth, through Schengen, have been running out of Estonia for the last 20 years, leaving en masse—even though Estonia keeps counting them as if they still lived there, these are people who come back once, maybe twice a year to visit their parents. That's it. They don't live there. They haven't lived there. And a lot of them can't even speak Estonian. They can't speak Latvian. They don't speak English or German. And the Russian population can't go anywhere, so its actual percentage has gone up quite a bit.

Norway is 95% ethnically Russian. And these people have absolutely no rights. Estonia sponsors SS parades every single year—government-sponsored, government people come out there. Literally, Latvia and Lithuania do the exact same thing. And now, after these attacks, the attention toward why the hell Narva is part of Estonia has gotten very high publicity in Russia. You know, "let's get our people back." That's the mentality over these fake Soviet borders that were created by the Soviet Union. And it could have been avoided if Russians were just treated normally in Estonia, but that didn't happen. For that to happen, you wouldn't have the regime in Estonia that you have today, and it wouldn't be supporting the Ukrainians the way it does now.

So the intention is that we have to get deterrence back, and Estonia is the easiest candidate as a testing ground for how we do that. I'll make an example of it. And no, I don't think Europe is going to go—the rest of Europe, the rest of the EU—is going to march off to war for Estonia, especially all things considered at the moment. But is there a larger war, as you asked previously? I know I didn't answer that. I think there is. There's going to be a larger war, unfortunately. I don't think the

European leadership is going to get smart enough to avoid it. And if Orbán loses these elections tomorrow, I guarantee you that the timeline just got moved up very, very quickly toward a big war—probably within the next year, two years maximum.

Orbán's been one of the—probably one of the biggest brakes on this rush toward “let's not have a war with Russia.” And just to understand how insane and stupid these people are—the EU, or soon it'll be the EU—the NATO army will basically be the EU army, because all they'll do is switch patches and put a new one on. Same people. They were practicing for mass casualties in a big war with Russia, and their projection was that they might have to take up to a thousand wounded a day. You people are smoking crack. Ukraine—and this is a very limited conflict, and the Russian military is still very limited by the political heads in what it can and cannot do—Ukraine is suffering around 1,200 to 1,500 dead a day and about 2,000 wounded a day in a very limited conflict. If this goes into all-out war...

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

You know, a thousand wounded a day? Try about ten thousand wounded a day. The European system is nowhere near able to cope with what's coming its way. But we've seen militarization spreading in every direction. I mean, when Germans up to the age of forty-two can't leave the country without permission from the Ministry of Defense, that's the first big step toward the Ukrainianization of Europe. When Germany is condemning journalists—they're not quite shooting them yet, but that'll come in time—they'll take them out into the woods and shoot them, just like the Ukrainians did, disappear them if they're inconvenient voices, just like the Ukrainians did.

And the Ukrainians are probably showing them how to do it properly these days, because Ukrainian “advisers” are all over the place, training all the right-wingers—or the right. And it's not right to say the right-wingers are Nazis. Nazis are not right-wing. National Socialism is anything but right-wing. But all these groups are being trained by the Ukrainians. They're infiltrated through, and they're being brought in as reprisers. So Europe is heading in the same direction. Look, that Turkish—well, he's German, born in Germany, of Turkish descent—journalist, I can't remember his name. You know, they barely got his wife's accounts back open.

His wife's accounts were closed. He never broke any laws, but he failed the morality test for the European Union, and they banned him from being able to buy food, work, sell, or use money. And unlike when someone was excommunicated in the Middle Ages—when, if they wanted to leave, they could—now you're not allowed to leave. You can't leave Germany. You're meant to sit there and starve and die slowly, as an example to everyone else, to the rest of the Western Europeans, and particularly to Germans, of what not to do if you don't want to die slowly and starve, and be murdered by your government on a slow scale.

So the Germans—yeah, the Germans are bringing back the draft. Uh, they're looking like the other countries. Hey, the Poles brought back the draft during the Easter holidays two years ago, so

nobody quite noticed. They woke up after the Easter celebrations and—ah—we have a draft. You know, the laws had been passed. That's nice. They're doing the same thing in a lot of large parts of Europe. So Europe—non-Russian countries, non-Belarus Europe—and hopefully, we can still say after Sunday, non-Austro-Hungarian Europe—is still in a rush to go to war. It's a suicidal rush, absolutely, but it's a rush to go to war.

## **#Glenn**

Actually, I read in the paper this morning that the Germans had to reverse the rule about not leaving the country because it was too much. But in other areas, of course, they continue to—well, let's say—lose their minds while pushing further in this direction. I think part of this idea of joining the war against Russia is the delusion of escalation control. That is, we can join the war, but we'll do it on our own terms, so we can still limit the fight to Ukrainian and Russian territory. One of the key lessons from the Iran war should be that you don't get to dictate the terms anymore.

It's like when the Iranians began attacking all the American bases in the region and shut down the Strait of Hormuz, and the Americans more or less said, "Well, that's not part of the rules. We were planning on limiting it to your territory, and maybe you could strike Israel." I mean, this is the delusion of escalation control. And I think this is linked to the unipolar moment, because if you didn't follow the rules set by the US and Europeans for how wars should be fought, you'd be crushed—as opposed to being just a little bit crushed. So I don't think they appreciate that the rules have changed. You mentioned this about Europe—that's a good point. I make that mistake myself.

And it's interesting that by using the word "Europe" to exclude Russia, there was a lot of academic literature about this in the '90s—that the European Union gradually began to refer to itself as "Europe," you know, as part of a broader effort to push the Russians out of Europe in the security, economic, political, and even conceptual realms. So, simply, Russia's not considered European. That was the idea being discussed. And now I find myself referring to Europe and Russia as if Russia isn't, you know, the largest country in Europe. But yeah. I wanted to ask about the Baltic states again, though, because I remember when they joined both the EU and NATO—in other words, "Europe"—in 2004, the whole argument was that the Russians should be happy, because now they were joining the community of values.

So as they're joining this liberal democratic club, if Russia is worried about the rights of Russian minorities, well, this is supposed to be the guarantee. But now it's 22 years later. You know, these are people who were born there—their parents were born there, their grandparents were born there. Why can't they still vote? Why can't they get positions in government? Why are they second-rate citizens? And it's as if people believe this wasn't a geopolitical project, that it was actually a community of values. I don't think it was deceptive; I think people genuinely believed this stuff. Yeah, yeah. But again—sorry, I'm getting to my question. The Iran war—one of my main takeaways was that one of the reasons I think Trump had to back out eventually was because he didn't have escalation control.

He couldn't go up that escalation ladder because the Iranians followed him all the way up. Whatever they did, the Iranians would mirror it. And I'm thinking, to what extent have the Russians taken a page out of that book? Because they didn't do this. They decided, well, let's just focus on finishing the military operation in Ukraine and not stir up a direct conflict with NATO. If Ukraine now begins to fall apart—its army at least—over the next few months, we're seeing this rhetoric coming from the British, French, and Germans that, well, then we have to step in to essentially turn the tide. Not using those exact words, but as you said, they're all now talking about war with Russia. So, do you see Russia changing its approach, not just to Ukraine, but to the Europeans as well?

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

Yeah, you know, and by the way, the excuse the Baltics use for the Russian minority is that they were Soviet colonists. They remind everyone that these areas were part of Russia since Peter the Great defeated Charles the Not-So-Great, and out of magnanimity, after taking these territories, he actually paid for them. Russia bought the land—it didn't buy the people. The people aren't even mentioned in the contract, because they had no rights between the defeated Swedish Empire and the Swedish Empire that, quote, "sold" the land. But it's the same kind of logic as when America bought the Midwest—or the Southwest—from Mexico after American troops were already occupying Mexico City.

It was very easy to—well, they paid some ceremonial, symbolic fee for that. The excuse for not giving Russian citizenship in these areas had been—by the way, Russian intellectuals in those areas were part of the movement for independence back in 1990—that they were all Soviet colonists. In Latvia, that's more or less true. I mean, there were obviously Russians living there since the empire before them, since the 1700s. But as Russian land, there were two small Russian principalities, or volosts, in southern Livonia, but they had been exterminated by the crusaders back in the 1100s.

So after that, yes, the Russian presence in Livonia was there, but then again, we flip to Estonia, and you see that Narva—the Russian presence in Narva—has continued since before Narva was even established, since about the 900s. So to call them colonists, you know, they've only been there for the last thousand years—they're called colonists? That doesn't fly very well. And you're right in that... and I've been saying this too: look, Russia just has to—if we don't want to be in a nuclear war, I'll take the Americans.

The Americans would never sacrifice even the smallest American town or village for London, or for Paris, or for Berlin—or definitely for some Warsaw, or, God forbid, some Riga, or any of those other cities. They're not going to do that, no matter how much the Europeans want to delude themselves into believing otherwise. Again, see, the Russians have started this through: "We're not Europeans." By the way, that's a shift in Russia—"We're not Europeans, we're not part of that civilization, we're

our own civilization." And even though they're not going to call themselves Europeans anymore, that's a big shift in Russia right now, in the Russian psyche. They don't want anything to do with those people.

And that's, by the way, what a lot of European and EU businessmen don't seem to understand. They think that once—however long this takes—once this conflict is over, they'll just get to walk back in and start working as if nothing happened. No. A lot of these companies are not welcome. It's going to take at least a generation, if not two, to get the bad taste out of everybody's mouth from what's gone on—on a smaller scale since 2014, and to a very large degree since 2022. And deterrence has to be—if deterrence is not reinstated, we're looking at nuclear weapons. I mean, that's sooner or later, because Europeans are going to do something stupid. The Europeans have not started talking.

The Europeans—again, the EU—have started talking about how they're going to arm themselves, become a nuclear powerhouse. Well, you know, when you have a nuclear power next door, and somebody wants to become a nuclear power next door who, every single day, tells you, "We're going to exterminate you. We're going to destroy your country. We're going to break you into forty different entities. We're going to do this to you, we're going to do that to you." And now they're saying, "Oh, we're going to get nuclear weapons." The pressure on the Kremlin to do something before they get nuclear weapons is going to be insane. It already is insane. And Iran has played a huge role in that, because what do we see in Iran? You're right—Iran has wiped out, I mean, leveled—

Thirteen American bases up and down the Persian Gulf have been hit, and Iran has smacked around American companies and industries in response. I mean, they don't go after everybody. When they get hit, they respond to Israeli and American-owned companies first and foremost. There happen to be American companies all over the southern Gulf, and when they're hit, Iran responds. Iran had thirty universities bombed by what I'll call the Zionist coalition—I don't know what else to call it—between the Christian and Jewish Zionists, both heretical cults. They bombed thirty Iranian universities without giving prior warning. Oh, a little war crime—what's a little war crime between the Zionists for breakfast, right? Iran, in turn, bombed all American- and Israeli-affiliated universities, but they gave them a day's warning to get everyone out.

That's the difference between the Iranians and the Zionists. They actually told everyone, "Get your people out and keep them at least a kilometer away, because we're going to light these buildings up," in response. And they've done this continuously. They haven't hit hospitals, as opposed to the dozens of hospitals hit by Zionists anywhere they've fought, and so on. And what's the message? I've been repeating this message myself—I'll admit that straight off—on Russian television. And I'm probably one of the less aggressive ones who've been saying this flat out: take the lesson. The U.S. is not going to go to nuclear war. The European Union needs to understand deterrence, and the only way to do that is you've got to make an example of something. And Estonia, I think, is the prime example now.

Because whether they're launching these drones out of Estonia—whether it's Ukrainians or Estonians launching them—or they're just passing through Estonia, the fact that the Estonians knowingly allow their airspace to be used means they're now part of the war, no matter how they look at it. Realistically, if they're really flying all the way through, then Poland and Latvia are part of this war too, full stop. But let's just concentrate on Estonia. Estonia is a prime place to deliver a very hard smack upside the head and tell everybody this crap is over. We're going to treat each one of you as making a declaration of war when you do this.

And then we're going to destroy you as a declaration of war. Look at Estonia—that's still smoking. It's going to have to be that way; otherwise, you risk a much larger war. Sometimes you have to sacrifice a thousand to save a million—or in this case, for the European Union, maybe about three to four hundred million. But unfortunately, this is where it's gotten. It's gotten there in large part because Russia's policy has been, well, incremental—trying to advance its positions bit by bit and not make any bold moves. Because again, just like the European Union, the West is projecting its own very warped modern values onto Russia.

Russia is projecting its own values onto them. That's a bad tendency in humanity—to project your own values and your own position onto others. And Russia's position has been, well, if we make too big a move, we'll scare NATO into a war. No—you'll scare NATO out of a war. You're doing the exact opposite of what you should be doing. You need to scare NATO, the EU crowd, into thinking, "Here comes the Russian sledgehammer," and then they'll be more than happy to talk. If we look at the weapons—the heavy weapons—the first tanks that were handed over to Ukraine came from Slovakia. Why Slovakia?

Pre-Fizzo—Slovakia. Slovakia is small, and if Russia were to strike Slovakia, it wouldn't be a big deal. But Russia didn't. And then it went, "Okay," and the rush was on. The doors swung open, the gates swung open, and they started flooding Ukraine with whatever war supplies they could get their hands on. It did go incrementally, except Russia didn't respond the way it should have, and the deterrence was gone—at least on that level. A very wrong move. If Russia had symbolically struck Slovakia or the border areas and said, "Next time we're going after Berlin," everybody would have gotten the message very, very quickly. Okay.

## **#Glenn**

Yeah, yeah. Sorry—those damn Slovaks.

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

You can't really control much of Slovakia. They're insane. "We'll all be peaceful now." At least, you know, more peaceful. But they didn't. And I was saying back then, we should strike them—absolutely—because otherwise things will only get worse. And they have gotten worse. So now we're down to either having a full-on war with the European Union or making an example. But they're still

hesitant to make an example, which just feeds the war hysteria in the West, because it doesn't see any backlash against itself. You're right—they think it'll just stay in Ukraine. Every time we escalate, it's just the Ukrainians getting hit, and they're "meat" anyway.

Who cares how many Ukrainians died? They're not real people anyway. They're not part of the West—they're just proxies. They can die. As many of them can die as we want. We don't give a damn about those people. That's the reality of the West. And so far, they've been proven right. All the responses have gone back to Ukraine instead of going back to where they should—at least the Baltics. And Iran has shown, you know, what are you afraid of? Look what we've done to the Americans. Look what we've done to the American base. Look what we've done to their allies. Are we dead? Are we in this? No.

And you're a nuclear superpower. That's the message in Russia—that's what's resonating, even on state television. The pressure is immense: strike, strike hard, and make an example. It's the proper thing to do to bring back deterrence. Deterrence should never have been lost in the first place; it was lost in an attempt not to lose it, in an attempt not to escalate the war. But again, Russia's projecting—Russian leadership projecting Russian values: we don't want a war, we don't want a big war. We've been pushed into this one by the Western and Central European leadership, and that was a big mistake.

## **#Glenn**

Well, I think part of the problem is that the European leaders, as well as the media, deluded themselves because the rhetoric over the past four years has been, you know, "We have every right to enable Ukrainians to defend themselves." Framed like that, it sounds awfully reasonable. The Ukrainians are fighting for their homeland—why shouldn't they be helped? The problem, though, is that NATO set up the Ukrainians for this. I mean, they're the ones who toppled the government, the ones who armed them, trained them, and sabotaged all the different negotiations, including the 2019 election outcome.

So, for a very explicit purpose, they're seeking to use the Ukrainians to impose a strategic defeat on Russia. As you said, when you have people like the EU foreign policy chief, Kaja Kallas, calling for the breakup of Russia as one of the ideal outcomes, you can't simply lean into this innocent, "we're just helping the Ukrainians" narrative. This is a war against Russia as well. And the Europeans—they're participants. I had a talk with John Mearsheimer, and I said, "Well, you know, we are in a proxy war with Russia." But Glenn, Glenn—we're way past that. We're now fighting a direct war.

And I think it's important. I mean, when you say this in Europe, they say, "Oh, why are you repeating Russian propaganda?" But you have to accept reality as it is. If you delude yourself, you end up doing very foolish things. And the consequence, I think, is about to come. I agree with you,

though. I think if we end up in a direct war—well, not necessarily a great war, but at least a direct clash now between Russia and a NATO country—it will probably be one of the Baltic states, and I guess Estonia is the most likely candidate. Do you have any final thoughts before we wrap up?

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

Well, you know, the Bolshevik—anyway, yes, you're absolutely right. This is way past a proxy war. When the HIMARS appeared, I was saying from day one, these are American soldiers firing HIMARS. This is American from start to finish. People said, "Oh no, Ukrainians fire HIMARS." No, Ukrainians don't fire them—it's Americans firing HIMARS. It's America firing HIMARS at Russian infrastructure, civilian infrastructure, killing Russian civilians. And the New York Times, back at the end of December 2024, came out with a big article basically confirming it—just underlining everything I've been saying.

And on Russian television, they're looking at me like I've lost my marbles. It's like, "Oh, it's Ukrainian." No, it's American. And the New York Times just confirmed everything—even that the missile attacks weren't something Zelensky's dictatorial regime asked for. It was American generals demanding those attacks and using them on Russian cities. Well, Lugansk was just recently hit. A university was hit, a school was hit—big surprise there. And so on. This is nothing new. And Lugansk, if anybody doesn't know yet, is my home city, my birthplace. The...

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

Yeah, you're right, absolutely. This has gone so far beyond a proxy war into a full-fledged war. I mean, several NATO staffs have been wiped out by Russian missiles. NATO generals—you know, the ones who supposedly go off into the forest in the middle of the night, or into the mountains to go hiking and then mysteriously fall off and die. How else can they write off the losses, or just not mention them? So yeah, this is nothing new. When you have foreign military staff sitting there planning and doing everything except the execution part of someone else's war, you're not in a proxy situation—you're fully neck-deep in the conflict.

There's no other way to look at it. And again, Americans aren't going to fight this war—absolutely not. They're going to make money off this war. You know, I have a little wake-up call for the meat called the European Union, because guess what, ladies and gentlemen—you are the meat. You're the next wave of meat for the Americans to make money off you. Like it or not, look in the mirror and understand: you are bio-material that will be used to make a lot of money for Western finance sitting in New York, and maybe in London, depending on whether the English can manage not to get themselves involved this time.

They did in World War I and World War II. They were trying to make money off it, get everybody fighting, and got sucked in both times. Maybe this time they won't get sucked in, but the point is that Central and Western Europe are already in this fight. It's only going to get worse for them.

Look, the Americans are going to stay neutral, but they're going to feed Europe, and they're going to keep pushing the non-Russian part of Europe into war with the Russian part, because they're going to make money off this. They've been talking about it openly since 1998.

Not in a major way. Like I said, I think the first article I read was in *\*Forbes\**, if I remember correctly. "We need another good war." And the "good war" was World War II, because it got America out of the Great Depression. They were already talking about it in '98. So if they were talking about it in '98 in something like *\*Forbes\**, that means they'd been talking about it among themselves since the early '90s. It doesn't trickle up that fast. And yeah, they've been preparing the biomaterial called Europeans for a big war for the last 20—30 years, actually. And they're planning on making money from it.

America has plenty of equipment that's been mothballed—M1 tanks, M1A1 tanks, Bradleys of different generations. What do you do with equipment that's been mothballed? Well, you either pay money to chop it up, or you find somebody to sell it to. And Europe is going to be the battleground they're going to get involved in. And let's just face reality: for the white race of Europe, it's their Ragnarok. You're not getting out of this alive. White Europeans in most of Europe are already turning into a minority, and after this big war they're going to be absolute minorities. They're going to be a replaced population. I'm going to drop another very uncomfortable thing for people.

When the elites talk about lowering the human population to somewhere between half a billion and a billion people—which means exterminating the rest—and about the "golden billion," most Europeans thought, "Oh, we're going to be part of this golden billion. Europe is going to be part of that territory." You're not on the list. You'll be exterminated and replaced—and you already are being exterminated and replaced—by other populations that are easier to control. Because the golden billion means only those people are going to get to live.

The "golden people" are going to be that top 1%, and they'll have another 20%—the educated managerial and professional class that services their wealth. You've got to have engineers, military, police, and so on. And the bottom 70 or 80% will be the serfs in the neo-feudal technological state—or states. Everybody else gets to be dead. And then you wonder if the serfs will end up envying the dead before this is all over, considering what their lot in life is going to be. But Europeans—the average European—aren't going to be part of this.

They're going to be wiped out one way or another. They're going to be replaced and mixed with other nationalities that are being actively brought in as replacements. Look, we didn't just stumble into mass migration. Of course they knew mass migration would do what it does—it's designed that way. Only an idiot who isn't paying attention to history or reality would think, "Okay, let's bring in 20 or 30 million people—let's bring in 8 million people into England in one big wave over 20 years—and they're going to become the average teetotaling Englishman."

**#Stanislav Krapivnik**

Of course they're not going to do that.

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

They instantly form enclaves, they instantly form separate entities. But because these people are from all over the world and they're in a foreign land, they become rootless, and they're easier to control. And for societies that are used to being controlled, that makes it even easier. So you get rid of the population, you get the population you want—or some mix, an admixture. All you've got to do is look at the reality posters of "We Are Europe": one white girl, a Pakistani or Indian, an Arab guy, and an African guy—"We Are Europe." That's the poster. And then the next poster says, "Defend Germany, defend Europe." It's all white guys. That's the message right there. The people that need to be taken out are the white European males, and then the rest will take care of itself. So, you know, wake up—or your children won't have a future. And your own leaders are the ones who are going to do this to you. I don't know how else to say it.

## **#Glenn**

Well, that's a very dark comment. Thank you, Stanislav.

## **#Stanislav Krapivnik**

Well, thank you. Still, it's been a great weekend so far.

## **#Glenn**

You too, and happy Easter to everybody.