

# Brian Berletic: U.S. Is Grooming Europe for War with Russia

Brian Berletic is a former US Marine, author, international relations expert and host of the New Atlas. Berletic discusses how the US pursues strategic sequencing to defeat one adversary at a time, with a division of labour that undermines the security of its frontline states. Europe is being prepared for war with Russia. Follow Brian Berletic on The New Atlas: <https://www.youtube.com/@TheNewAtlas> 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](https://www.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 Brian Berletic, a former U.S. Marine, political analyst, author, and also host of The New Atlas. I'll leave a link to his podcast in the description. Thank you very much for coming back on. Thank you so much for having me back on. So, you often make the argument that the U.S. pursues strategic sequencing — that is, more or less, a staged approach to how it confronts rival powers, essentially seeking to take them on one at a time. For this reason, when the U.S. engages in negotiation or peace, you make the point that it's essentially using delaying tactics, just setting things up for a later time.

Or at times it can also include a different division of labor, that is, to outsource some of the war to allies. And, well, I thought about you when I was reading this recent speech by Elbridge Colby, the U.S. Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, in which he makes it, well, I would say unmistakably clear that the U.S. is not seeking to put an end to the Ukraine war. Rather, it's outsourcing it to the Europeans, who should continue to fight and escalate. I was wondering, how did you make sense of this speech?

## #Brian Berletic

It's just the update of the division of labor that U.S. Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth announced at the very beginning of 2025, almost as soon as the Trump administration came into office. He talked about how the U.S. needed to pivot elsewhere — now we know to Iran and ultimately onward toward China. And he said Europe is going to take over, basically feed itself next into this proxy war taking place against Russia and Ukraine. That is exactly what Europe did. He told Europe they are going to spend more on defense, and they have. And he told them they're going to double down on their support for Ukraine, and they have done that as well.

And we're watching the natural progression of all of this take shape, with Europe itself throwing itself into this proxy war against Russia. It's extremely dangerous, very concerning. The rhetoric coming out of Russia, knowing and seeing this taking shape themselves, is very, very concerning. And unfortunately, that's what this was always going to end up being anyway. And I distinctly remember warning people that it didn't matter who you voted for in 2024 — this is exactly what was going to happen. The whole reason the U.S. was fighting this war against Russia and Ukraine in the first place — and it is a U.S. war on Russia simply being fought through Ukraine.

Again, go back to the 2019 Rand Corporation paper on extending the Russia war. The whole purpose of this is to create one of many dilemmas for Russia. They're doing a similar strategy toward Iran and ultimately China — creating all of these dilemmas and extending Russia as much as possible. It was never their intention to overwhelm and defeat Russia with just this war against Russia and Ukraine. It was just one of many policy options that were in that policy paper that have since been implemented. And one of the things they were talking about was destroying Russia's energy exports to Europe and how the U.S. was going to ramp up LNG exports to Europe.

At the time, it made no sense because Europe still had access to plenty of plentiful, reliable, cheap Russian energy. And they said, even in the paper, they said in peacetime this has a very low likelihood of succeeding — except it has succeeded. And do you know how they managed to make it succeed? They took peacetime and they simply turned it into wartime. And the only way this policy of keeping Europe dependent on American energy and off of Russian energy, and extending and undermining Russia, is by keeping the war going. So there was never any intention at all, ever, of the U.S. wanting to make peace with Russia.

And this is the exact same reason why the U.S. has absolutely no interest in making peace with Iran, because ultimately all of this against Russia and Iran is meant to target not just China, but also Asia. And I would argue that the war on Iran and disrupting all energy coming from the Middle East, and disrupting not just China's supply of energy from the Middle East, but all of Asia's supply of energy from the Middle East — this is simply the U.S. doing to Asia what it has already done to Europe. They cut Europe off from Russia, from energy through war, and now they're using war to cut Asia off from energy from the Middle East.

## **#Glenn**

I guess what's very frustrating about this whole thing is that all the evidence is there, yet there seems to be this very deliberate desire to just live in our own fake little world, the way it's being sold, essentially. You can look toward the people who discussed the benefit of the Ukraine war — Graham, McConnell, Kellogg, Romney. The list is long, William. They make the point, oh, this is going to be a good war. We can fight with Ukrainians, we don't have to waste our own soldiers, and using Ukraine to knock out Russia, we can focus on the Chinese instead.

It can be said in the open, but again, it's not a world these people are comfortable living in. So they essentially ignore it. And the same with what you said about decoupling Europe from Russia in terms of energy. This is a disaster for Europe, but, you know, they said this long in advance in all the strategic documents — that Nord Stream is a bad thing. Then, of course, just as they said they would, they knock out Nord Stream. And then, you know, they can sell all the stories — yeah, it's a Russian playbook, obviously Russia destroys its own infrastructure. We repeat it. Even when it's exposed, we say, okay, well, I guess Russia didn't do it anyway.

We will embrace any ridiculous story as opposed to face reality. So it's, uh, yeah, it's quite weird that this is actually real, but it seems kind of obvious that the goal is to outsource the war to the Europeans, which will essentially make the Europeans into the new Ukrainians. And these escalations worry me, though, because primarily, well, the main two things are the massive drone program, which is done very, very openly, and it's becoming very hard for Russia not to respond to this, making matters much worse. We know now that attacks are coming out of NATO territory, that is, out of European states — Finland and the Baltic states. All of this is happening while the U.S. is pulling back and handing this war to the Europeans, who seem to be very eager to take over. I mean, do you think the Europeans are being set up for war?

## **#Brian Berletic**

Yes, absolutely. And I would say the Americans are backing away in the sense of absolving themselves of responsibility, but they're very much still involved in the war. The U.S. command is still in Germany overseeing the entire war. All of these drone strikes deep inside Russian territory, again, according to The New York Times itself, and as is obvious to all of us who know the intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance capabilities required to do this effectively, had to always have been the U.S. They admit it was the CIA and the U.S. military overseeing this drone program, striking deep inside Russian territory. Not only that, but also the maritime drone attacks taking place all around the globe, targeting tankers carrying Russian energy exports.

So the U.S. is still very much deeply involved and overseeing this entirely, but they're absolving themselves of responsibility, and they're putting the Europeans out there in the front. And also, as you mentioned, getting the Europeans ready to be the next proxy into the breach as Ukraine slowly crumbles. I think you will watch a very gradual, incremental, salami-slice approach, having the Europeans just get a little bit more involved. There was a little bit of a scare where people thought maybe British warplanes were trying to intercept Russian drones over Ukraine, but they might just have floated that story out there to test the waters a little bit.

And they might actually start doing things like that to incrementally get Europe more and more deeply involved. They're already utterly involved in the war. The U.S. is fighting Russia through Europe just as much as they're fighting it through Ukraine in many ways. We know that European weapons are going into Ukraine. And as you mentioned, the drone production, we knew this wasn't really all taking place inside Ukraine at all. All of these weapons, missiles, even tanks that they say

Ukraine is making — they're not making any of those. It's all being built all across Europe, in the United States, in other U.S. proxy territories, and then it's simply being finally assembled in Ukraine.

And that's how they can say it was made in Ukraine. And so a whole process has been taking shape for years, the whole course of this proxy war. And unfortunately, it does look like Europe is going to end up in almost direct conflict with Russia. And people will say, why is Europe doing this? Because this doesn't serve their interests at all. But this is the danger and the power of American political capture over these countries. They control the information space. They control the political space. U.S. corporations are working in tandem with some of the largest European interests, but American interests are actually dominant even in Europe in many cases. And so this is why this is happening.

And this is the same reason why we watch the Persian Gulf Arab states go along with the U.S. war of aggression against Iran. This is why we're going to watch countries like Japan, South Korea, the Philippines — they'll go along with U.S. escalation vis-à-vis China, even though their largest trade partner, import and export, is China. They'll go along with it because their governments are politically captured. And ultimately, those handful of individuals — this is how elite capture works — those handful of individuals work for U.S. interests at the expense of their own country's interests. Their position is owed to the U.S., and they do everything on behalf of the United States.

## **#Glenn**

This incrementalism, it's very subtle because you don't notice it from day to day. But given this war has been going on at least since the Russians invaded, more than four years now, the rhetoric and openness — it is quite evident what has happened. For example, in this country, in Norway, when the Russians invaded, we had a prime minister who made it very clear that under no circumstances would we send weapons to a country at war. Now, of course, four years later, there's not a single member of parliament who opposes sending weapons. Not a single member of parliament suggests that we should even talk to the Russians. While today I looked in the paper and I see a headline that Norwegian drones will kill Russians. This is it. So there's no more pretense. You know, the hatred is already out there. The intention is there.

And it's, you know, it would have been unthinkable to have this kind of language and positions only four years ago. But it's this incrementalism. It builds up, all dissent is being wiped away. And it's kind of frightening when you see this shift and how the public just walks along and follows this. But I wanted to ask about this concept you just brought up, the elite capture, because if you live in Europe, you tend to get the impression that a lot of this political leadership, well, they were trained, if you will, very closely with the United States. Sometimes their loyalties are also not very clear. I mean, this shouldn't be controversial to say that Europe has a denationalized political leadership, very much influenced by the United States. But how do you see this? The Europeans, what kind of instruments are there for this elite capture?

## **#Brian Berletic**

I think the European Union itself played a central role in all of this. The European Union was essentially a layer of bureaucracy the U.S. draped over continental Europe and smothered individual national sovereignty. And we can see how Europe systematically searches for, hunts down, and eradicates any sense of national interests within the entire European Union. And I can't remember what the referendum was for, but it was maybe Ireland being part of the European Union or something like that. And there are many, many examples of this. I'm sure you could provide several as well, being in Europe, where they have the referendum, and it doesn't go the way they want it.

So they just hit the information space for a year or two, and then they do it again and again and again until the information space has been sufficiently manipulated and they get the results that they want. Except that's not actual self-determination. That's using the illusion of democracy and self-determination to manipulate and control people and to channel them in a direction that is actually, objectively, contrary to their own best interests. And having all of these European countries collectively placed under the European Union and subjected to a collective foreign policy that is detrimental to all of Europe's best interests and each individual member state's best interests?

How is that objectively against the best interests of big business in Europe, the ordinary people across Europe, all kinds of groups of people, big and small, all across the continent? And you can see how it has harmed Europe. And we could just talk about the last, you know, since 2014, actually. And before 2014, I actually thought there was a good chance that Europe would work its way out from under U.S. subordination because they were building the Nord Stream pipelines. They were working closely with Russia and with China. And I thought for sure that they were going to make it. But then again, the U.S. provoked a war.

And under war, you have so many options to manipulate people emotionally, politically, economically, in terms of military power. And that's exactly what they did. They used the conflict they created with Russia in Ukraine to upset that process that was taking place, to cut Europe off from Russia, and also to begin the same process of cutting off Europe from cooperation with China. And so all of their alternatives were removed. The U.S. literally just blew up Nord Stream, and then through the persistence of this war with Russia, they've forced Europe to cut all energy incrementally off from Russia.

And so this is what has fully and completely subordinated Europe to the United States. And so primarily the European Union, there are a lot of institutions and programs the U.S. runs in Europe, very similar to the National Endowment for Democracy, by PAC, parallel or adjacent organizations and institutions, both American government programs and private corporate foundations. And they've just chipped away at it. Like you say, it happened so slowly, people really didn't notice it until it was too late. And they've already accumulated this huge amount of power over Europe. And there's really nothing Europeans can do now to organize against it, unfortunately.

**#Glenn**

Well, the EU has a very interesting history. It has a tendency to look at opposition as a temporary speed bump to be overcome. That is, for example, the EU constitution they wanted to have back in 2005. And two of the few countries that had a referendum on it, France and the Netherlands, said no. So then they sat down and thought, OK, how can we overcome this opposition? OK, let's reframe it as a treaty instead. So they made it into the Lisbon Treaty, essentially rewrote it, and just packed it in as a treaty so there wouldn't have to be a referendum. But then, of course, the Irish still needed a referendum, and they also voted no.

And then they had a campaign to re-educate them, enough pressure. And they made them vote again the following year. And then they got it right. And this is how it advances. And they have all these ways of reassuring that, you know, as the EU evolves, you know, takes on this power, they're still going to have unanimous decision-making, these kinds of things. But now you see von der Leyen say, well, we can't have this, this makes us a hostage, unable to make a decision. We have to be able to defend ourselves. So now, of course, they're going to centralize more and more power, something that's causing, yeah, quite a lot of tension.

So, it is becoming a very... well, I would put it as an ugly project, but I'll probably get in trouble for calling the EU an ugly project now. But this is what it's become. However, whenever you look at how the United States is trying to put Russia on hold, that is handed over to the Europeans, it's obviously because, well, they couldn't defeat Russia, and the United States has other objectives. The main adversary of the United States, the main peer rival, will be China. Then, how do you see China fitting into this wider sequencing logic? Because they seem to be deprioritized at this moment. The US is still in Europe, they're still fighting Iran. We're not seeing that much pressure against China at the moment.

## **#Brian Berletic**

I would argue that the U.S. war of aggression against Iran is actually a direct move against not just China, but even U.S. allies. I would call them proxies in Asia. And if you look at the energy exports from the entire region, not just from Iran to China—because Iran was basically exporting almost all of their energy to China—that has been reduced significantly, mainly through the U.S. blockade. The U.S. is lying; they're not controlling all shipping in and out of Iran, but they are turning back some of those ships, and a lot of those ships are bringing hydrocarbons to China. But the problem is the whole conflict—and this was, they knew this, everyone knew this was going to happen if the U.S. attacked Iran—they knew they would close the Strait of Hormuz, they knew Iran would retaliate.

Whatever you hit inside Iran, they were going to hit in any country hosting U.S. troops, which is practically every country in the region. And that's what happened. And it reduced gas production, and therefore exports, and also oil exports. And it got so bad that there are countries now here in Asia—countries like Vietnam, Japan, South Korea—that are buying more gas now from the United States than they are from the Middle East. And this is unprecedented because they got virtually all of their energy from the Middle East. Some of these countries, 90% or more of their energy came from

the Middle East. Now they're buying it from the United States. And just like the U.S. did to Europe vis-à-vis Russia, they had all of these LNG export projects that they were building that people said, why are you building this?

There's no way you're going to compete with steady, reliable, cheap gas from the Middle East. Except the U.S. always knew that. We were getting these ready for a reason, just like we were getting LNG export projects ready for Europe for a reason before it was economically viable. We were getting them online and ready because we knew—we always knew—we were going to start a war with Russia and Ukraine, and we were going to force Europe off energy from Russia. And we would have the solution already there, in the process of coming online. And they are doing the exact same thing. So I stumbled across this Alaska LNG project run by Glenn Diesen, and that's exactly what it is. They've been working on it for years, and it makes no economic sense.

And if you look at presentations from like last year, 2025, they were sitting there basically pleading with the audience, yes, this makes economic sense. They mentioned contested waterways many, many times because they said if Asia is getting energy from us in Alaska, it's like a virtual pipeline. There's no way anyone can touch it. And there are so many other contested waterways that aren't very safe out there. But they didn't say that, well, it will be the U.S. and its war of aggression against Iran next year that ends up closing those waterways and making this otherwise unviable project suddenly viable. So it was a definite premeditated conspiracy.

They are doing exactly to Asia what they have done to Europe. And of course, how does this affect China? First of all, they're deliberately cutting China off from energy from the Middle East. It was like half of their imports of energy were coming from the Middle East. But now they're forcing countries in Asia, not just U.S. proxies like Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines, but even countries like Vietnam, to place themselves under energy dependence on the U.S. And that gives the U.S. extraordinary control and leverage over these countries strategically and politically, to basically transform them into what the U.S. has already transformed Europe vis-à-vis Russia.

They can transform these countries in Asia into battering rams, all aimed at China. So it will accelerate that process that was already underway. And what they're doing is essentially surrounding China with hostile nations that are dependent on the U.S. for energy, really have no other option. People could blame Vietnam for buying energy from the U.S., but what was their alternative? It's mainly cooking gas at this point. Not buy it and then just leave tens of millions of people without cooking gas? It really wasn't an option. So the U.S. got a lot of countries in Asia exactly where the U.S. wanted them, and they had the solution already in the works and ready to take advantage of it.

There's literally a National Council of Energy Dominance created by the U.S. government for this specific purpose. And it has transcended. It's not President Trump doing this. This began all the way under the Obama administration, and it has been incrementally advanced by every single administration since then. And eventually, the U.S. will have Russia and China in a situation where

they're surrounded by hostile U.S. proxies. And the U.S. will be chipping away at Russia and China themselves, just like the U.S. is outright attacking Russia with these drones. They will begin a process of doing something similar with China, almost certainly. And this is what they're openly preparing to do.

## **#Glenn**

Yeah, no, sometimes you wonder why the different leaders don't appreciate what's happening, because on one hand, Trump is talking about how he wants the Ukraine war to come to an end because, you know, he's so appalled by all the killing. And, you know, even though the U.S. is still up to its eyeballs in terms of how it's involved. But at the same time, I saw the U.S. only yesterday — it was the U.S. Secretary of Energy, Chris Wright — he was in Croatia promoting Trump's peace pipeline framework, in which he advocated how all these countries that have always been dependent on Russia for energy, well, that's a horrible position to be in. So they would all be liberated now, and they would have American energy.

And again, it's very in your face, but at the same time, it also begs the question, well, the only reason why they would go for more expensive and, I would say, less reliable American energy would be because the war is going on. So, you know, to what extent can they afford to actually let the war die out? I mean, towards the end of the Cold War, Gorbachev, you know, he made a point to the Americans that if, you know, we put an end to the Cold War, we also have to recognize and manage what this means for the power structures, because the whole alliance systems, which put Washington and Moscow in, I guess, a very powerful position, had become dependent on war. So if we end the Cold War, we also have to keep our hawks in mind, that we have to walk away from some of this. But it doesn't look like the U.S. is prepared in any way to walk away from this war.

It's just shocking that the European leaders don't seem to mind that they're just going to be deindustrialized countries and be put in a situation of perpetual conflict with the world's largest nuclear power. It's hard to see why. But what do you see being the possibility of keeping this Iranian thing going on long enough? Because in Europe, you can hand over the war to the Europeans, fine. They seem more than willing to throw away their economies and send their sons and daughters to die. But in the Middle East, you know, you can't hand over the war to the Gulf states. First of all, they don't have the capability, but also they're not willing to fight either. How long can the United States keep itself in this position? Because it's bleeding out as well in terms of ammunition.

## **#Brian Berletic**

Well, at the level that they were expending munitions from the beginning of this most recent phase—because, again, the U.S. has been on and off at war with Iran since the end of the Biden administration—actually, people remember Israel, on behalf of the U.S., attacked Iran in late 2024.

At that level of munition expenditure, there's no way they could continue sustaining it. But, of course, there's a ceasefire right now. Except, ceasefire or no ceasefire, the amount of energy coming out of the region and going to Asia has been strangled, and it has been reduced significantly.

I would surmise that if energy does start flowing through, whether it's from Iran or from some other states in the region, the U.S. will just start it again for a week or two weeks, strike at maybe Kharg Island, and have Iran retaliate against energy production in the Persian Gulf Arab states and reduce all of that capacity again, and thus reduce exports out of the region. So, again, the U.S. has been building these otherwise completely irrational policies. LNG export projects to Asia—the only way they make economic sense is if this war with Iran continues. And it doesn't have to continue at the pace the U.S. was pursuing it in the beginning. They just got it going. They did this initial damage.

Some people are saying it might take a year or more for some of the damage to be repaired in terms of energy production and exports in some of the Persian Gulf states. So all they have to do is maintain that and just keep the flow of energy under threat and reduced while they make this transition. We remember that the transition from Russian energy to American energy, in terms of Europe, is still actually taking place. They still haven't completely cut themselves off from Russian energy. So it's a process that's going to stretch over a couple of years. The U.S. wants to accelerate this as quickly as possible, but there's also a limit to how fast they can speed through this. They don't want to do it overnight because it would be too obvious. That's number one. Number two, it might create so much instability that nations might say, look, enough is enough.

We just... no matter how much we benefit from U.S. policy, this is going to literally destroy our country, which it's going to do anyway. But these people need to be kept in the delusion that somehow they're going to benefit by cooperating with the U.S. through every part of this. And that includes the Persian Gulf Arab states, proxies of the U.S. hosting U.S. troops. But no matter what they say publicly, they're benefiting from this relationship, and they feel they're so far insulated from the worst consequences of it. I'm sure the U.S. made all sorts of assurances to them, to their European proxies, that somehow down the road this will all be better for them. That's what convinces them to go through these very, very difficult times.

That and the fact that ultimately, if everything goes well, completely wrong. They have the financial means to just leave and go somewhere else and leave everyone in their country behind. I mean, that's ultimately what will happen to the Ukrainian population. Their U.S. proxy leadership could just leave and go somewhere else if everything went totally catastrophic. And so that's unfortunately where we're at, which means there won't be peace in Europe. There will not be peace in the Middle East. And this conflict is eventually going to migrate its way directly to Asia. If you're here in Asia, of course, you see the U.S. trying to encourage the Philippines to become more militant towards China over these—they're like World War II rusted-out shipwrecks that they're fighting over.

It makes no sense at all. But the Filipinos are doing it because the U.S. told them to, because they're politically captured by the U.S. So that's why they're picking a fight with their largest import and

export trade partner. And Japan, we see them becoming increasingly militarized. I was just watching a Senate hearing where they were celebrating how bold Japan has become, how they're going to start exporting weapons. They're making U.S. Patriot missiles and exporting them back to the U.S. It's surreal, but it is actually happening. And considering the direction everything in Europe went and everything in the Middle East, the direction that has gone, I don't know why people would not expect and just assume it's going to continue in that direction here in Asia.

## **#Glenn**

Well, Romano Prodi, the former Italian prime minister and also former president of the European Commission, made the prediction that at some point Russian gas will start to be sent again to Europe, but only once the Americans have taken control of the pipeline infrastructure—that is, to be able to get their cut. So I think people, they do see behind all this rhetoric of, you know, “Russia did it” or “people on the sailboat.” I mean, all of this stuff is nonsense. I think some people know what's happening, but as you said, there's no way of breaking out of this either. We also see that the connectivity between many of these Eurasian powers is increasingly by land. I mean, both the Chinese as well as the Russians have a very heavy land-based infrastructure connecting with Iran—be it road, rail, or energy. How do you see this fitting into the wider calculations of the United States to, I guess, disconnect Iran as a very strategic piece of real estate?

## **#Brian Berletic**

Well, that's true. The Belt and Road Initiative is one massive Chinese project that stretches across Eurasia and even beyond that. The massive reserves that China built up—I mean, this is all evidence that China knew this day was coming, and they invested heavily in preparing for it. Russia as well. I remember, again, before 2014, I was wondering, you know, why is Russia building its military up here in the way that it was? Because it seemed excessive at the time. But of course, they could see all of this coming, and they were preparing for it. Iran has been doing the exact same thing. The mosaic defense that I spoke about at the very beginning of the conflict almost certainly helped them prevail through at least this phase of the war. And that was something that they had been preparing for years—the ballistic missile program.

And as you mentioned, there are these linkages between Iran, Russia, and China over land. I don't think that they're sufficient enough for, say, Iran to export energy to China to replace what they were doing by sea. I mean, just transporting by sea is so much easier than, say, by rail. If there was a pipeline, that would be a different story. But there is no pipeline, not that I know of. So, they prepared for this. The question is, did they prepare enough for this? And what can, say, Russia, China, and Iran together do to, say, help the nations in Asia that are now being forced to pick between no energy at all or placing themselves under U.S. energy dependence, which is a horrible place to be because they're not just going to sell you gas at an extra cost, as expensive as it will be.

There's always an additional cost of a political exchange that needs to be done. The U.S. will expect, and they will use that energy as leverage. That's the whole reason they set this up. This is the leverage that they have over Europe, whether Europeans were agreeable to what they were telling them or not. And it will be the same case for Asia. So we have to kind of wait and see how this all works out. I know that Russia, Iran, and China prepared for many, many years—decades in some cases—for this eventuality. But I'm not exactly sure how much they can do for, say, the rest of the multipolar world. The U.S. is pretty much trying to destabilize, strangle, and knock over, and leave Russia, China, and Iran isolated and alone. I don't know. I don't know what they can do. I have to look into it more.

## **#Glenn**

Regarding, just as a last question about this division of labor as you define it, what happens if these strategic allies do not want to play this role or take on this burden? Because I guess one of the lessons from the Gulf states is, what is the benefit for us? We host all these American bases, and it doesn't give us security. Instead, it will crush us. And, you know, I'm assuming or hoping that one day the Europeans will come to the same realization that, you know, why did we accept being frontline states for the United States as opposed to finding a common security architecture with the Russians, as, you know, initially agreed in the early 90s, which would have prevented all of these conflicts and wars.

And of course, in East Asia as well, I mean, why, to what extent, what happens if these allies—be it the Philippines or any others, Japan—realize that this is not a great division of labor? That is, they will be destroyed in order to, you know, contain or weaken an adversary of the United States. Because I keep making the point, well, I don't understand why the Ukrainians would continue to fight. They could have gotten a good deal any time over the past—well, a better deal at least, looking now—over the past 12 years. Every day the deal will get much, much worse. And the U.S. isn't there to help them. I'm just—what happens? At some point, surely the allies must recognize that this, I guess, burden sharing is hardly equal.

## **#Brian Berletic**

You're absolutely right. If Europe, and that includes Ukraine or these countries in East Asia—Japan, South Korea especially—if they had independent leadership, sovereign leadership, of course, they would say this arrangement makes absolutely no sense. The U.S. is a liability, it's not going to protect us. Protect us from what? What war would South Korea be having with either North Korea or China? China is their largest trade partner, imports and exports. Why would China want to go to war with these countries that they're doing business with? And the same goes for Ukraine.

Russia had no intention of going to war with Ukraine before 2014. One of Ukraine's largest trade partners at that time was Russia. And the only way this was flipped upside down was because of

political capture by the U.S. They got rid of the independent, sovereign leadership, however imperfect it was. People could argue how well that government worked for the Ukrainian people, but they scooped it out and replaced it with a handpicked client regime. And then they built up a whole structure around it to make sure that client regime stayed in power. Again, back to The New York Times admitting that the CIA took over all their internal security apparatus.

That means that no matter how the Ukrainians feel about it, the U.S. is going to be able to keep their handpicked client regime in power in Ukraine. Unfortunately, they seem to have the ability to do that through the European Union all across the rest of Europe, also in Japan and South Korea. It doesn't matter who the Japanese people or South Korean people vote for, they always get an obedient proxy to the U.S. And so when you're faced with that sort of situation, unfortunately, there is no way out. This is why Ukraine is being consumed by this proxy war. You said it perfectly. It makes no sense for Ukraine to continue. They had so many possible ways to get out of this, and they haven't.

It's completely irrational, and it can only be the result of being politically captured—an irrational, handpicked client regime put in place serving U.S. interests at the expense of Ukraine. Same goes for Europe. Same goes for East Asia. And I honestly don't know what the solution is. I mean, obviously, the people inside these countries need to try to find a way to organize against this. But it's just so hard when your information space is under American control, your political space is under American control, and in many cases, U.S. troops are literally occupying your country—South Korea, Japan, the Philippines host U.S. troops.

Europe, I'm sure you know, hosts thousands and thousands of U.S. troops in many countries across Europe. And so it's an empire. And so how do you fight an empire when you're inside and underneath the empire? It's very difficult. So there's no good answer to that. There's no appealing answer to that question. I guess it comes down to people dissatisfied with this working together with multipolarism to undermine the power the U.S. uses to capture and control these countries, and try to reverse it, and try to help one country after another out from under U.S. subordination. And we've got to hope that that can work, and we have to try to work towards that.

## **#Glenn**

Well, let me squeeze in one last question. If that's the allies, what about the opponents? Because it appears that whatever goodwill or enthusiasm there was about the Trump administration has faded away. And I remember I was at the Valdai meeting, where the Russian president attends as well, when Trump was elected. There was some genuine optimism that they thought this is someone we could work with, to get an end to this century of hostility between the U.S. and Russia. I mean, rationally, what are really our conflicting interests, especially now that the world is becoming more multipolar and global?

Many believed in the rhetoric. Again, I don't want to focus on past tense. I think this has all gone away, but that's kind of my point. It appears that many are waking up now to this strategic sequencing. Most of America's adversaries — if you see the Iranians, after two negotiations where it was said they were close to deals before they had this surprise attack — and now, of course, after two of these fake negotiations they now had, the negotiations in Islamabad, which were also, well, I would frame as a hoax. It doesn't seem very serious in any way. All the U.S. has committed itself to is the starting point of the Iranian 10-point plan.

It was thrown out the next day, so it doesn't mean anything. And the same with the Russians — they saw seven years of nonsense over the Minsk peace agreement. The Istanbul agreement was sabotaged by the US and UK. And now, you know, Trump has been just pulling them along. You know, these are not serious negotiations anymore. And I think the Chinese will also come to this realization, if they haven't already, that the US isn't looking for a way to harmonize interests and manage competition. They're looking to knock out their rival. So what does this mean? Do you think diplomacy is just dead? Are we heading towards world war? How do you see this?

## **#Brian Berletic**

People have to understand that the whole reason there was no change with the incoming Trump administration is because presidents are in charge of nothing. Congress is in charge of nothing. It is the unelected corporate financier monopolies inside the United States that are running everything, that are benefiting from everything — a \$1.5 trillion defense budget. That is the arms industry benefiting from that. Big oil is benefiting from these projects that they proposed, got approved by the U.S. government under Obama, Trump, Biden. The current Trump administration projects have made absolutely no financial sense at all until wars of aggression were fought by the U.S. to make them viable. So when you have interests like that, we're driven by perpetual power and profit and ultimately global domination.

You cannot deal with a country like this with diplomacy in the way we think about diplomacy. There's nothing you can say about it. It's like trying to negotiate with a virus that's eating your body alive. You need to identify how it works and how to displace it from the global body and push it back to a more proportional role within the global network of nations. And that's what multipolarism basically is. That's what is driving it. It is displacing US-led unipolar hegemony. It is offering alternatives, not just in terms of how countries interact with one another, but corporations, goods, and services that countries can get access to without fueling the corporate financier interests that are driving US foreign and domestic policy.

And so this is what's going to have to happen. People are going to have to forget about, you know, the U.S. will never accommodate anyone, anywhere, at any time. They will never accept, you know, being a part of the multipolar world. They want global domination. So as long as that's their obsession, multipolarism has to be resolute in displacing them from around the globe. Because

everywhere you don't, just like a virus inside your body, if it's in that part of the body, it's going to eat it away. And eventually everyone will get sick and die. And as you know, as those with viruses, they end up killing their hosts in the process.

And that's what global empires have always done — become unsustainable, and they end up collapsing. And so this is why multipolarism is so necessary. This is why that is the solution. And I think Russia, China, and many other countries have always understood this. They use diplomacy as a way of trying to make this transition from U.S.-led hegemony as painless as possible, but as you can see, there's still tremendous death and destruction and instability caused through this process. We can only hope that it continues transitioning in the right direction and minimizes the death and destruction caused by U.S. aggression. Unfortunately, I still think it's too little at this point.

## **#Glenn**

Yeah. Well, you once told me that to understand what the U.S. is doing, don't listen to the words coming out of their mouths in Washington. Look at the policy papers which have been funded by the arms industry through the think tanks they fund. And, yeah, sadly that appears to be very, very, very, very true. And, yeah, I just think we're moving into a very dangerous area now, that essentially the vassals of the U.S. are now signing up to go all in as frontline states, while the adversaries have now woken up to know that there is no diplomacy anymore — there's only delaying the inevitable war. So it's not a great position to be in. Anyways, thank you so much for taking the time. Do you have any final thoughts or final words before we wrap up?

## **#Brian Berletic**

A lot of people feel depressed when they hear these types of conclusions. But again, multipolarism is a real thing. Everyone, on every level, big and small, can invest in it. And that's our only hope, and it's what we have to try to do. And even you and I, creating alternatives to Western media — basically Western propaganda — we try to offer an alternative to what U.S. special interests are trying to force people to listen to and believe. This all, I think, does make a difference. And we all have to, in our own way, continue trying, as what else can we do? And as always, thank you so much for having me on.