

Gilbert Doctorow: European Naval Blockade on Russia? Europe-Russia War Coming

Dr. Gilbert Doctorow discusses how European leaders are sleepwalking into a war with Russia. Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glennDiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glenndiesen> Support the research by Prof. Glenn Diesen: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glenndiesen> Buy me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f> Books by Prof. Glenn Diesen: <https://www.amazon.com/stores/author/B09FPQ4MDL>

#Glenn

Welcome back. We are joined by Gilbert Doctorow, a historian and international affairs analyst. Thank you for coming back on the program. It's been a while. My pleasure. So, you recently published volume two of your war diaries. This is, as I understand, I haven't gotten to read the whole thing, but this is largely about the period when the Russia-Ukraine war evidently switched from being simply a war between Ukraine and Russia to becoming a more obvious European-Russian proxy war. I was wondering if you could say something about your new book and that period. All right.

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, I'll use the plural here because Volume 3, 2025, will probably come out between six and eight weeks from now, depending on the speed of the production company in Arizona that is doing the layout. 2024 was, as you say, and as I describe in the book, a period of transition from an SMO, Special Military Operation concept, to a war with the West — the collective West — not just with Europe, but with the United States, and with a new nuclear doctrine by Russia, which came out in late November of 2024. That was the culmination of warnings to the West that had started as early as March and April of that year, as a result of the actions on the ground, particularly the new threats to Russian security coming from Europe and also from the United States in the form of long-range missiles, which were being put up by the Germans. Already, medium — well, let's say 300-kilometer range — missiles had been supplied by the British and the French under a common missile, SCALP in French.

And what's the Shadow? I forget exactly what it was. It was the British Storm Shadow. These had been supplied and had been more or less neutralized by the Russians. They learned how to handle them. But longer-range missiles were offered from the United States and from Germany in particular. It was the Taurus missile. And as early as March of 2024, when there was intercepted and published by the Russians the conversations between top-level Air Force people in Germany discussing how

they could get around Chancellor Scholz's prohibition on supplying such weapons to Ukraine. And that conversation had the intent to use the Taurus missile to destroy the Kerch Bridge, which was the iconic achievement of engineering, bringing together the mainland of Russia and the Crimean Peninsula.

So that was scandalous, and it tipped off a wave of rethinking in Russia over what their security threats were. And ultimately, in the revised nuclear strategy, which came out in November, it was all put together — pieces which came out from March through September — when President Putin had a very important interview with Pavel Zarubin, who was on the streets of Petersburg, just off the Palace Square. Principles were set out piece by piece and all culminated in a nuclear doctrine, which seriously lowered the threshold for Russian use of nuclear weapons against those who were equipping Ukraine with long-range weapons, long-range missiles, and the sources of production.

So that was a very — and also the whole notion of what the nuclear threat was, or the strategic threat to Russia, changed from having been based for decades on ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, which were the key issue in the SALT treaties, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties. Now the Russians saw as the biggest strategic threat to themselves medium-range missiles that the United States had already agreed under Biden to place in Germany during this current year, in 2027. So they revised their strategic doctrines around this new reality.

So that was the, that is what I see as the key point, which makes what I'm describing in 2026—sorry, 2025—different from the preceding volume one, which was 2023. Also, of course, my own life changed during 2024 when I started doing almost daily interviews. The Indians were the first to bring me into that very frequent review of breaking news, which compelled me to get my mind around issues which otherwise I might have ignored from week to week. That was the case in my volume one.

There were periods which I was not covering in a daily or even weekly sense, which in 2024 I was necessarily, because I was being invited to, as I say, get my mind around some issues before the general news came out from the West, because I was dealing with a broadcaster who had access to what was being said or stated before it reached the general public. And I also, in that volume too, put in a lot of references, a lot of links to many of these interviews. I didn't burden it too much with the transcripts, because then the whole volume would balloon out. But a few I did give, just so people have a taste for what these discussions, like the one we're having now, are like.

And I call them discussions rather than interviews because in this case, and in one or two other cases, the invitee, the holder of the platform, as you are, engages in a discussion. So this is the feature of Volume 2. Volume 3 will be different. I won't go on about it. But 2025 was the year of Trump, and the whole attention, the whole nature of what I was covering, changed from what's going on on the battlefield to how it's being evaluated by other commentators, to how we evaluate the course of negotiations. Are they really substantial? Are they just hot air? So those issues became the driving force of all commentary in 2025. There you have it.

#Glenn

Well, if you fast forward two years to 2026, we see now that the involvement of NATO countries in this war is, well, it's very overt now. If we look at this whole process over the past four-plus years as being this incrementalism or salami tactics, now we see it being quite blatant. For example, yesterday we saw NATO surveillance drones monitoring Russia's Black Sea coast. And then this morning, very predictably, the strikes are coming in. And we also see similar attacks, that is, attacks on the Baltic Sea coast in Russia, around St. Petersburg. This also seems very likely, or one could say even with greater certainty, almost certainly an attack coming out of the Baltic states. I mean, how long do you think this can go on? Because from what I understand, the pressure is building up in the Kremlin not to simply allow this kind of escalation control on the side of the Europeans, that they can simply launch attacks on Russia and pretend it's Ukraine, and Russia can't do anything in return.

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, we spend a lot of time these days talking about Mr. Trump and about the midterm elections and how his handling of his look for an off-ramp to the war on Iran that he and Israel launched, how that is modified according to the political calculus of the November elections. Strangely, we don't apply the same kind of logical or analytical approach to Mr. Putin. We deal with him as if, well, he is the whole of Russia. That's been going on for two decades. There's only one man whom you want to listen to in Russia, and that is Mr. Putin. And we don't consider him as living in a democratic country, which actually he is. There are all kinds of deformations in democracy, as I know in the big neighborhood to my west in France, where the president is, in effect, a king.

But we only talk about it occasionally. Here in Russia, yes, Mr. Putin is a political animal. And he also has elections, by the way. Not his personal presidential election, but he has, like Mr. Trump, he faces parliamentary elections. And in the case of Russia, they have to take place before the 26th of September. And so it's not just you and me and the Western observers who remark on these dramatic, destructive attacks on Russian refineries and other critical infrastructure, which are enabled by the United States and European intelligence on a daily basis, providing the targeting information necessary. Not where the target is located—that's pretty obvious—but how you get to it, because these drones, they don't fly at several kilometers' height.

They fly just at very low levels, and they can smash into electric helicopters, power lines, and all kinds of obstacles on the way if they aren't properly guided. So that critical information has been provided from the West. Now, the Russians, a lot of Russians are enraged by this. And while I agree completely with peers who are saying, oh, look how popular Putin is, it is now a 70% rating, down from 80%, but that really doesn't make much difference. But they're not talking about the party politics in Russia. They're not talking about the collapse of support for United Russia, which was traditionally, going back decades, 30% of the electorate versus about 20% or 18% of the electorate

for the Communist Party, and maybe 12% of the electorate had been for Zhirinovsky's party of the ultra-right.

Now, they've dropped from 30% to 20%, which means, I mean, to my understanding, they're very close, neck and neck with the Communists. And from 20%, it's pretty hard to stretch yourself over to 51%, even if you're playing electoral games with how you designate the winners in electoral districts, by the party lists or by candidate names. So the elections in September are not a foregone conclusion to backing Mr. Putin's policies. On the contrary, they will be highly contested, and we'll see who wins. So I say we have to apply to Russia the same analytic techniques that we use in examining what's going on in France and what's going on in the States. But for some strange reason, those of us who all admire Mr. Putin's Russia refuse to recognize that this is a democracy.

#Glenn

How do you think, though, if essentially this pressure builds up so much that Russia has to find a way of responding, how do you think this could, I guess, manifest itself? Because I've heard talks now about Russia invading the Baltic states. This seems very unlikely. I'm not sure what they would exactly do there. It seems more likely that Russia might be moving towards something similar to what the Europeans are doing — this kind of strikes on Russia with plausible deniability. But, of course, the Russians don't have a proxy state to attack from. So how do you think the Russians might approach this if they decide to step over this line and begin to attack in a way that they know where the attack comes from, but again, with plausible deniability?

#Gilbert Doctorow

I don't see a reason for plausible deniability. What they would be counterattacking is, by every international measure, a casus belli. When the Estonians and the Latvians and Lithuanians permit Ukrainian drones to fly over their territory and attack the Russian Baltic ports, you've got a war over that. So I don't see why they have to look for a proxy or an excuse. If they want to be a world power, which they want to be, but not a global power in the sense of being able to project their military might around the globe, but at least in their region, at least in Eurasia, then there is no reason to be apologetic. In fact, there's a demand that you just assert your rights. As you and I have discussed, and as you, as a theoretician in this domain of deterrence, have made very clear, either you use it or you lose it.

And there are many people, and of course the bad boy of Russian geopolitical thinking is Sergei Karaganov. And going back two and a half years, he made it very plain that Russia has to do something. And he's expanded on that in his most recent published statements. But always at the cutting edge, that Russia cannot just take this trespassing on its red lines idly or drawl on about it, or respond in ways that are utterly inadequate to the level of damage that's been done to them. And

so, invade the Baltics? Why? No reason whatsoever. Nothing to be gained and a lot to be lost. Just attack the military assets in the Baltics, including, by the way, the German military outpost — I think it's in Lithuania. They've got several thousand people there. Blow them up. That'll be a good signal.

And it's completely within international law. Now, if you want to say, well, isn't this a path to World War III? I fall back on a colleague in a very small minority of commentators, and that is Paul Craig Roberts, who's been saying, and saying at least to you before, I've joined part of his argumentation, that this type of turning the other cheek is leading us in exactly the opposite direction that you would think prudence takes you. It is leading us to either an overthrow of the existing powers within the Kremlin and a violent counter-strike that could really be World War III, or Mr. Putin himself follows the advice of everyone around him now, or of many people around him now, and doesn't just jaw on, but actually uses military action against NATO countries in a very selective and legally justified way.

#Glenn

I think that's a good point. People often view this retaliation as being dangerous because it does push us towards World War III, which I guess isn't wrong. But it's also that dilemma, the failure to uphold one's deterrence. I mean, when I listen to the media and the politicians across Europe, the logic is somehow that, well, if anyone thinks that Russia has any right to retaliate, then they're spreading Russian propaganda. But this is a very dangerous self-delusion, this idea that we can continue to attack Russia and somehow they would never respond.

I mean, this kind of rejecting that Russia should have any deterrence, it's... it's taking us down this very strange path. And I'm glad you mentioned Germany because they seem to be, to a large extent, at the forefront of this new strange mentality where, well, essentially it's a social... the reality is a social construction in which, you know, if we say that Russia has the right to retaliate, then it has. So as long as we all pretend that this is completely legitimate, we're just helping Ukraine, there's no reason to be concerned about the Russian retaliation.

I mean, it's good for deluding our own public, but we're not deluding the Russians. They know what's happening. So how do you see Germany playing into this? Because, you know, Chancellor Friedrich Merz, he continues to plummet in the polls, of course, but the policies nonetheless continue, as they do across Europe. That is, you know, Merz has this dream about building the largest military in Europe. He's quite open about the desire to escalate the war against Russia. He oversees this deindustrializing economy. He wants to purge the political opposition as, you know, he plummets. What do you think this is heading for, for the Germans?

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, in Russian folk wisdom, you have this image of a couple in bed, and each one is trying to pull the blanket over himself. Now, actually, there are three people in this bed, and each of these three

groups is trying to pull the blanket to themselves and leave the others exposed. Chancellor Merz is, as you say, laying claim to being the military leader of Europe, based on the military-industrial potential of Germany and its population, of course, with 85 million people, which is one of the most populous countries in Europe. And, of course, the best manufacturing industry—the Chinese more or less destroyed the German auto industry—and he is making claims.

At the same time, his laying claims is working against another German whom his party helped to put into position as the president of the European Commission, von der Leyen, and he has publicly disputed her rights both to run the military of Europe and to run the legislation of Europe as it affects businesses and the economy. This is a public spat that came out last week, and von der Leyen had to go to Germany and try to make peace with Merz, but she can't make peace with him because they're both aspiring to top leadership positions in Europe. And he has a much more powerful position than she does. Hers is bureaucratically created. His is by election in the most powerful country on the continent.

So there you have two parties that are trying to pull the blanket over themselves. I say that because she had, several weeks ago, been a very strong vocal advocate for a response to NATO's being diminished or shriveling with the United States' withdrawal from Europe. She responded with a clarity and call to all of the European Union members and certain NATO members to join in a united European army, which, of course, she would head. And after all, she can make reference to her service as the Minister of Defense of Germany before coming to Brussels. Well, that didn't fly with a lot of people in Europe. Now, Mr. Chancellor Merz's attempt to pull the blanket to him has been equivocal in the way that it has been received.

The French have said yes and no. There's the big dispute over this jet fighter project, which the Germans and the French had co-authored and now is in very great doubt. But generally speaking, the French and the British are very quietly trying to pull the blanket to themselves because nobody there wants to see a Germany that runs Europe, not just politically, as Germany has since the days of Chancellor Merkel, but militarily, which is the pretension of Pistorius, the Minister of Defense today, and of his boss, Merz. What you would get as a result of this is Hitler's dream come true. So people do have a memory. They know what World War II was fought about, which was largely to prevent just what Mr. Merz is advocating.

#Glenn

Well, another issue is, well, I guess this Trump split with Merz. Obviously, the two men don't like each other very much. But we saw that Merz was trying to make himself Europe's front man in Washington with the war in Iran. That is, he went to Washington. He positioned himself very much as being the number one supporter of Trump there. And this is when he thought that the war against Iran would go well. Now, of course, he sees that the war isn't going well. So he goes where the wind is blowing, and he's now criticizing Trump. And as a result, we now see Trump threatening to draw down U.S. forces in Germany. Given this split that's emerging, let's say Russia now sees this

attack on itself, obviously backed by the Europeans, to be untenable, and it decides to strike, well, for example, some German arms industry, if not logistics, as well as targets in the Baltic states. How likely do you think it would be that the United States would, I guess, come to the rescue of the Europeans now?

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, the American rescue effort has been in doubt ever since Trump came back into office. He made scathing comments about NATO, not quite as open as Macron had done a couple of years earlier, saying NATO was brain dead, but close to that. He's also made it clear that without a 5% budgeting of European NATO members for NATO, for defense, the United States would not honor its obligations under the NATO treaty of one for all and all for one. And so I think it is reasonable to say that the Europeans should have no expectation of Trump coming to their aid if they, by provocations and by giving Russia a legally valid *casus belli*, as they are doing now, find themselves in a direct war with Russia. And Europe now is totally disorganized in terms of defense principles and objectives. And the only thing that unites all of Europe is the lack of technologically advanced armaments, both defensive and offensive, to last for more than a few days in a war with Russia.

#Glenn

Well, the most recent news now, of course, is the United Kingdom leading a group of 10 European countries who are going to create a naval alliance against Russia. The language they use is meant to sound defensive, so they're going to contain Russia at sea. But this, of course, comes against the backdrop of the threats being made by the Americans to invade Kaliningrad. We've also seen the targeting of Russian vessels, either by boarding or piracy, however one wants to frame it, of what's referred to as Russia's shadow fleet. But we also see direct attacks on Russian civilian vessels as well, under the guise of it being the Ukrainians. But given that this is now being set up, it's kind of obvious the direction this is going to head.

They're going to seemingly, well, do a little bit like what the Americans did with Venezuela or Cuba, or now with Iran. This is starting to look like a naval blockade, which is an act of war. Some would say that the Russians invited this on themselves, given that they didn't uphold their deterrence in the other area. But do you think this is more of a PR stunt, or do you think they're actually moving ahead with this?

#Gilbert Doctorow

As long as the current Russian leadership backs off each time that Europe, NATO, and the United States advance, this will continue. However, I don't believe they can back off much longer. The issues that you and I are discussing are being discussed publicly in Russian social media, and it's not at all flattering to the current leadership of the country. So either Mr. Putin and his colleagues will change policy and strike back. I did a little hint when they had the Russian naval vessel

accompanying two shadow fleet tankers through the English Channel. They were giving indications they're ready to defend their shadow fleet with naval force.

The issue, again, is that Russia has all the military wherewithal to sink everything that NATO could throw at it. They're joking that there are more missiles in Kaliningrad than there are people in Kaliningrad. So it's all there. The question is, where is the will to use it? And Mr. Putin has been very poor in the performance of that. But I don't think this can continue much longer. His colleagues are getting more assertive. The public is getting more assertive. And it doesn't look good if he were to stay long with this turning-the-other-cheek. I think he will have to change his policy or someone will replace him.

#Glenn

I see that the spokesperson, Peskov, was making the point that if the Europeans try to put what is essentially a naval blockade on Russia, then they would put an entire naval blockade on all of the European Union. Again, I'm not sure if he's blowing hot air or exactly what this would entail, but obviously the Russians, they also lock themselves into position. Once you begin to utter this rhetoric and nothing happens, this would be a further disaster for your deterrent. And there would be even more pressure to come back hard later in terms of restoring this. So again, it seems very dangerous, what is being done. I did want to ask, though, about how you see the Europeans also pushing this on the rest of the world.

The European Union, they threatened the possible sanctions we see now against Israel for buying grain from Russia. So everything that was done in Gaza, the attack on Iran, Lebanon, all of this was, well, not just looked the other way, but also had some consequences—support from the European Union. But now, of course, buying stolen grain from Russia, this is where they drew the line. And it's interesting in the wider context, because we now see that the EU is also putting some pressure on East Asia not to buy Russian oil as well. Energy markets are coming under a squeeze. Do you, I mean, do you see the EU being able to push this, or is this just posturing?

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, just posturing would mean that they are consciously aware that there's nothing behind these threats. I don't think it's just posturing. I think they are making these statements, assertions, because they correspond to their deep beliefs. And it carries responsibility because they are not politicians; they are ideologists. And politicians are people who look for practical solutions. The European Union has stopped looking for practical solutions for at least 20 years, not just last week. And it's breaking at the seams. I couldn't believe last week, when I turned on your news, I heard a debate—actually something resembling a debate—over the harmful effects of European legislation, regulations concerning building construction, housing construction in Europe, which affects Holland.

And the Netherlands said, these spokesmen for the Netherlands said, this is terrible. It makes the cost of new housing exorbitant. People can't afford it, and we are not building enough new lodgings to meet demand. There was an open space, but we all know, every one of us who have bought and sold property two years ago and had to fill out 50 pages of technical descriptions of what I sold and what I bought, where 10 years ago it was like three pages. When I had to have a performance energy proof, which cost a thousand euros, someone came to my new apartment to confirm that the electricity works properly. All of this rubbish, which affects everyone who buys and sells and builds in Europe, is finally coming out on Euronews.

And who's behind that? Well, not just Madame von der Leyen. It's the whole silly European Parliament. They're ideologists. And the whole Green movement, which took control simply because it was an essential partner for a durable coalition of the European People's Party, which... The European People's Party held its strength in the last parliamentary elections for Europe, but its colleagues, the Socialists, lost. And so, to maintain Madame von der Leyen's power, they had to do a deal with the Greens. The results of all this are that Europe is cracking at the seams in every which way, not just on the military defense issue. But the military defense issue is the most irrational.

Carlos' statements, what you have said, are indicative of the utter insanity of the people who are running Europe today, telling Southeast Asia not to buy Russian oil when there's no alternative, when 90% of the oil of several of those countries was coming from the Middle East and now is blocked. And she's saying, oh, don't buy Russian oil. It makes Europe totally irrelevant as a geopolitical player, totally irrelevant. They will laugh in the face of Europe. The Japanese laughed in the face of the new prime minister, laughed in Donald Trump's face when he told her not to buy Russian oil. And she said the Japanese economy could not do without it. So let's talk about something else. These attempts to play a global power when you don't have the wherewithal and when you really don't know what you're talking about, which is the case of Brussels most of the time, make a mockery of Europe.

#Glenn

I couldn't agree more with what you're saying about the irrationality and growing irrelevance. The ideologues, that is the policies now of Europe, they can't defend this in any rational way, which is, I think, also why this increasingly irrational foreign policy is always complemented with growing censorship and centralization of power. But my last question was just about the changing relationship now between the United States and Russia, because I think you, much like myself, were somewhat optimistic in the larger parts of 2023 about the possibility of the U.S. and Russia toning down or reducing some of these great power tensions, which, again, risk taking us to World War III, essentially.

But now it looks like the Russians are also starting to give up on this idea that Trump can actually deliver on any of the things that he said. And, well, in the context of this, we see, of course, the

foreign minister of Iran, Araghchi, coming to Russia, meeting with Putin. And this apparently didn't go down well with Trump. I was wondering, how do you read this situation?

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, I like to use a scalpel and go a little bit deeper to gauge where Russia stands. Mr. Peskov is the spokesman for Mr. Putin. But around him, around Putin, there are liberals and there are conservatives. The liberals are a very small minority in general because they're the holdovers from the Yeltsin years. Now, Mr. Ushakov, who went to great lengths to describe to the public the one-and-a-half-hour-long telephone conversation between Putin and Trump, which was initiated by Trump two days ago, he's a liberal. And he and Mr. Karaganov would be at one another's throats. Let's be clear about this. Mr. Dmitriev, who is Putin's emissary to many of the talks with the Americans...

#Glenn

Hey, he's a liberal.

#Gilbert Doctorow

He is an American asset, to be very precise about it. He worked for many years with American corporations. His English is fluent. His knowledge of American business culture is terrific, which is why he was chosen to be a counterpart to Trump's emissaries, Kushner and Witkoff. But he's not a strong defender of Russia's interests. So you've got, in the circle of Putin, people who are aggressive, and you have people who are very turn-the-other-cheek and very hopeful of a reconciliation with the United States, just as you have a division of such people in Iran, which is why they never concluded, in December of 2016, just after Trump had been elected, an agreement with Russia on a military alliance.

So in these countries, you've got pro-Westerners and anti-Westerners. The anti-Westerners now are, I think, in the majority in the circle around Putin. But there are very important people like Ushakov, who is a close advisor to Vladimir Putin and was an ambassador in the States. So he knows the issues very well, but he's politically on the other side and for accommodation. I don't see an accommodation with the United States as being a reality. Despite all the talk of Ushakov and of Peskov in the last day about how wonderful this one-and-a-half-hour conversation is, the United States, as you said at the beginning, is still providing critical and military intelligence, enabling the devastating effects on Russian oil refineries.

#Gilbert Doctorow

And critical energy infrastructure.

#Gilbert Doctorow

So the two nations are, by traditional terms of diplomacy, at war in everything but name. And to think that they will have a reconciliation or there are such big deals in business that Dmitriev is talking about all the time is, to my appraisal, nonsense. I believe this war will end without any help from Mr. Trump. It will end because the Russians will achieve their minimal objectives of reaching the Dnieper and taking Odessa.

#Glenn

And that will be enough.

#Gilbert Doctorow

And the rest of the world will have to live with that. So I believe there will be an end to this war. I don't expect to have ten volumes of war diaries. I think that the current volume four, which is now at 115 pages, maybe will go to 150 and will be cut off by what I just described.

#Glenn

Yeah, it's hard to see this going on for, yeah, at least that much longer. But it appears that we've reached this breaking point, though, where it's not possible for Russia anymore not to respond to the Europeans. And again, there's so much happening at the same time. On one hand, you see the U.S. stepping back, leaving this to the Europeans. You see Ukraine beginning to falter on the front lines. And at this point in time, when the Europeans do not have this Ukrainian shield behind them and the big Americans standing behind them, this is the point in time where they decide to really step up and essentially make it very obvious that this is a direct war on Russia.

And while this is happening, them putting themselves in the crosshairs of Russia, we see on the Russian side all this pressure on Putin. We see essentially the lessons taken from Iran — that they should have retaliated and gone up the escalation ladder, as opposed to just allowing the West to dictate, to go up and down as they please, without Russia following them. So it looks as if we're heading into a war now. Now, I know this is not getting any headlines in the media at the moment, but this is at least how I see it — that a major war is coming unless something dramatic happens to change the situation. Do you have any final thoughts before we wrap up?

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, I agree with you. The only thing that is to be discussed in the weeks ahead is how this war will play out, how long it will last. I'm predicting like a week, because that's about the extent of European munitions and using conventional weapons. The thing that's bizarre about it all is that all the announcements that are made — 2029 is kind of the target date for the war. That's when they

say the Russians will attack, but actually the obvious inverse is meant — when they will attack Russia. And so it's all out there at the moment, when Russia still has the window of opportunity that enabled Putin in February of 2022 to initiate his special military operation.

He knew that after 2018, he had a 10-year advantage over the United States and probably an even bigger advantage in strategic weapons against Europe. And so he went in. And that still holds, although it's diminishing. We're now almost five years into this war. And so, I'd say, five years remain before Europe and America will have caught up to the necessary stage to wage war with Russia effectively. This is a time for Russia to finish it up and finish off Europe. They have the capability. They have the will. It's not a story.

#Glenn

Well, like I said, disaster pending. So, no, it's so depressing to see the irresponsibility of the politicians. And I would put the media in the same class, as they all seem to insist the moral thing to do is put some blindfolds on and march towards the cliff. But yeah, here we are. Anyway, thank you for taking time off today to speak with us, and have a good one.

#Gilbert Doctorow

Well, thanks for the invitation, Glenn Diesen.