

Larry Johnson: Putin Warns the West - Russia is Ready for War

Larry Johnson discusses NATO's increasingly direct involvement in attacks against Russia, and Putin's warnings to the West about war. Johnson is a former CIA intelligence analyst who also worked at the U.S. State Department's Office of Counterterrorism. Read Larry Johnson's Sonar21:

<https://sonar21.com/> 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 again by Larry Johnson, a former CIA analyst who writes on Sonar21. I've left a link in the description. Thank you for coming back on, Larry. It's great to see you, as always.

#Larry Johnson

Always enjoy the invitation and the chance to chat with you.

#Glenn

Very good. I want to talk about an article you recently penned because, well, that is on Russia now recognizing that the Europeans are essentially preparing for more than an indirect war — a very direct war with Russia. Again, I think this has been a long time coming for Russia. For more than 12 years now, we've seen NATO using Ukraine as an instrument to weaken Russia as a strategic rival. Again, we've heard enough comments from top American officials to verify this. And we know that in 2014, of course, the NATO-backed coup was framed as a democratic revolution.

But what they really did was build a huge Ukrainian proxy army while sabotaging Ukraine — the Minsk peace agreement. And since 2022, I think all of this has continued. All paths to peace have been blocked by NATO countries, while at the same time announcing that weapons are the path to peace. So incrementally as well, NATO's involvement has escalated, especially when things are going bad for Ukraine. And now we see NATO weapons being used, NATO intelligence, NATO targeting — where the weapons are guided, long-range at least, by NATO satellites — and even NATO contractors pulling the trigger.

So... and, well, we can say furthermore, you know, unless we are to believe that the drones that attacked St. Petersburg from the Baltic Sea did not transit through airspace or even originate in NATO territory, then, you know, we can say that all these attacks are now also coming from NATO, at least using their territory. So something appears to be changing in Moscow. Perhaps it's the European leaders speaking ever more openly about the need to break Russia, mass-produce long-range weapons to strike deeper and deeper inside Russia. I mean... there's no more pretending anymore. And something, as I said, appears to have changed in Moscow. And Putin's speech, I think, was also an indication of where things are heading. I was wondering, what is your take, though, on this speech?

#Larry Johnson

Yeah, I've learned to pay attention to Sergei Karaganov. I know he's a mentor. I think it's correct to describe him as a former mentor. At least you worked with him at one point. And, you know, Sergei has always been, you know, he gets dismissed by some — oh, he's just a political scientist — but he's a very thoughtful guy. He's very good at seeing trends. And so let me pose sort of the opposite case that will reinforce where Sergei is coming from. If the Sinaloa cartel was being supplied with drones and missiles by China and Russia, as well as the intelligence for hitting coordinates inside the United States, and they were able to launch attacks there all along the southern border of the United States, going deep into Texas and into Arizona, New Mexico, the United States would view that as an act of war and would retaliate accordingly.

They wouldn't sit there and pretend that it was just some minor border dust-up. Well, that's exactly what's happening now with Russia. And I think that we can see that, let's call it the Anchorage period, where Putin met with Trump, and there was some hope that the United States was engaging Russia, and that there was going to be perhaps a diplomatic exit, or at least something other than force — that's dead. Absolutely dead. And that has been announced as well by Sergei Lavrov, among others. Ushakov, Yuri Ushakov, who's a close advisor to Putin — they've all made it clear that that process is dead. And this goes back to Sergei Karaganov's position: the West has lost its fear of Russia. They assume that we can do whatever the hell we want. We can bomb them. We can kill them. We can destroy schools.

#Glenn

And Russia's not going to do anything in return.

#Larry Johnson

And so I think Karaganov, he's talking a graduated escalation, but nonetheless an escalation. Step one, you start hitting these sites, hitting the factories, military sites in those countries to let them know, no, you've now crossed the line. You've hit us. We're hitting you back. I think, and frankly, that ought to be followed up by putting NATO on notice that any surveillance aircraft that are even

in international airspace that are collecting information on Russia will be targeted and will be shot down. The West has got to know that they cannot continue this kind of provocation. Because as Sergei has pointed out, if this continues, the next step is the use of tactical nuclear weapons. And that pushes the world into a whole new direction. But I hope there is nobody left in Russia that harbors the illusion that somehow the West is seeking a peaceful, negotiated outcome.

No, absolutely not. The West wants to destroy Russia. They're intent on that. The rhetoric has become more intense. And what's really bizarre is how the media coverage now is really portraying Russia as on its back foot. Russia is suffering. Russia is losing. Oh my God. And meanwhile, what's actually happening on the battlefield is Russia is moving forward in a way that it has not moved forward in the previous four years. You know, in 2023, they were focused on Bakhmut. In 2024, Avdiivka. I may have them reversed, but it was first Bakhmut, then Avdiivka, or Avdiivka, and then Bakhmut, and then 2025, Pokrovsk. So there was always like one battle that was getting all the attention and all the resources. Not now. There are multiple battles along the line that are taking place and will collapse the Ukrainian line at some point. So the war has changed in tone. That is for certain.

#Glenn

It's been some fictions all along. I mean, I remember when Russia first went in, the main talking point was not just unprovoked, but this full-scale invasion, even though the Russians were talking to Zelensky about finding a peaceful solution on the first day of the attack. Already in March of 2022, the first articles came out that, well, Russia's already losing. It's running out of missiles within the next two to five days or something. Then we had the Nord Stream issue. Oh, yes, they blew up their own pipeline. Then we had the invasion of Kursk, which was, oh, this is definitely turning the tide now. Russia is losing. Every time NATO escalates with a new weapon, it's a game changer. I mean, we've listened to this for more than four years now that the war started, that now the Ukrainians are winning. Now they're winning.

It's getting more and more absurd every time. But again, the goal is always the same. It's to prolong the war, keep it going, and officially the language is, well, we just want Ukraine to negotiate from a position of peace. We want to force Putin to the negotiation table, even though it's the Europeans who refuse to talk to the Russians. It's quite absurd. I mean, anyone paying attention would know that this is absurd, but the propaganda is really dialed up. And they think that following these talking points is somehow very patriotic, even though, as you said, we're heading now towards not just war, but such a war could very easily escalate into a war with the use of tactical nuclear weapons. I did notice in Putin's speech, he did refer to Operation Barbarossa, the 1941—sorry, 1941. Why do you think this historical comparison is so important?

#Larry Johnson

Well, the point Putin was making, and so he did, this was an address on Tuesday the 23rd, the day after the, I guess, the 84th anniversary or 85th anniversary of the invasion of the Soviet Union by Germany. And he was addressing the cadets, graduates of military, intelligence, and police institutions. And in making that, he was, you know, noting that right now the West is making no attempt to hide its intent to go to war with Russia. They're not, I mean, they're openly talking about that within Russia — two to three years, we're going to attack Russia. And Putin's point was just very simple: we've been there before. We, the Russian people, have been there before. We know what it means to face this kind of threat.

And while the Soviet Union was not prepared to repel that invasion in 1941, the message I took from Putin was, we're more than prepared. We know what's coming, and we're going to deal with it. So that was really, you know, I think he put out a notice, put out a red flag that the West should see that you're getting ready to enter a hot zone. And if you follow this, the result will be the same as what happened to Germany and its European allies that attacked the Soviets and were ultimately defeated. But this time, Russia's not going to sit back and wait to be attacked. Once it becomes clear that the West is intent on following through on this threat, Russia is going to take steps to defend itself. That was the clear message I took away from that speech.

#Glenn

This is an important part, though — that is, if Russia thinks it's going to be attacked, it will not wait for the opponent to attack. I think something like this was mentioned in one of the biographies of Putin as well — that is, he learned early on, if you know a fight is unavoidable, make sure you throw the first punch. I would argue that this is one of the reasons as well — well, not one of them, but the main reason why they invaded in February of 2022, indeed. Exactly, exactly, I agree. Because in November of 2021, you know, the U.S. and Ukraine decided to sign this Charter on Strategic Partnership. And at that point, one of the top advisors to the former French president made the point that this signing of this charter made it convince the Russians that they would either have to attack or be attacked.

So this is really, yeah, the straw that broke the camel's back. And why would they wait for an attack on Crimea or Donbass? So they went in, and yeah. But how — but this is — is this what the Europeans are waiting for then, when they talk about, you know, we have to prepare for a future war with Russia? Is that a Russian retaliation they're talking about? Because if they really think that Russia is going to attack Europe, they would need at least to outline what the objective would be. What exactly would be the purpose of attacking Europe? I can only see one purpose. I mean, unless you believe in these fairy tales of restoring the Soviet Union. But the only purpose would be to restore its deterrent. But is then the goal to go to war?

#Larry Johnson

Well, I don't know if you saw, Putin issued a response to the Germans the other day that was just scathing and sarcastic. The bottom-line message was, why would we want to invade you and then have to be responsible for a group of transvestite, transgender, blue-haired weirdos? What do we gain from that? Sorry, we don't need that. We don't want that. You can have it. That was his basic message to them. And it was, you know, it went on. It was, I recall, like eight or nine points. I thought it was actually brilliant of him, how he presented it, because it was entertaining, but it was also, you know, to the point. But Russia has to step back and look at... these attacks that Ukraine is carrying out are not being carried out because Ukraine's got the expertise to do it.

And the concern is you've had Ukrainian officials just of late talk about building a nuclear warhead. And there is a report out from a YouTuber by the name of Borzykman. You know, sometimes his reporting has been quite accurate, sometimes, you know, questionable. But he claims that a recent arrival of a British ship in Odessa carried these yellow barrels that looked to be containing radioactive material. I'm sure Russia is now all over that. But, you know, you can't put it past the Brits to try something that absolutely crazy, that they would run that risk. This is, you know, they are poking the bear. It's like they think they can throw a punch at Russia and Russia is not going to react. And I maintain that is a dangerous, dangerous assumption. Russia's been slow to anger. But, you know, once their dander is up, they're most formidable.

#Glenn

Well, one can understand why, well, especially the British, because they appear to be, with the Germans, among the most aggressive ones in this war. But one can understand, though, because they essentially designed a proxy war, almost a dream scenario during the Cold War. That is, to have the Ukrainians and Russians kill each other en masse, and the West would stand on the sideline. And that's essentially what's been created here, though. It's a war where the Europeans have said, well, we have to bring this war to Russian territory, which they now have. But Europe is a safe zone. So all the industrial production, all the missiles and drones, which they advertise that they're producing to attack Russia with, all of this is within European or EU territories and British territory. So this can't be touched by the Russians.

And essentially the Russians accepted this rule of the game. That is, the NATO countries can now launch long-range missiles and drones deep into Russia, and Russia is not allowed to touch NATO territory. I mean, this isn't sustainable, especially now that it's becoming so much more open and larger scale, and also, as you said, the clear indication of intent, that is, to fight the war once Russia has been weakened. But I was wondering, how do you see Putin has changed over time? Because last year he was all about diplomacy, encouraging all of this. Now we don't hear much about diplomacy anymore. The main speeches, they're about war. That is, you know, we will achieve our objectives, we have the military power. Yes, they have kept their arms open, or door open, for diplomacy, but they quite obviously do not believe that it will go anywhere.

#Larry Johnson

Yeah, no, I think he's been—I don't want to say forced, as if it's against his will—but he is cognizant of what the political pressures are. And whatever his personal desires for trying to avoid conflict, trying to avoid escalation, I think he recognizes it's reached a point now where the demands of the Russian public are such that they want stronger action. They want decisive strikes against Kyiv, up to and including killing Zelensky, killing Syrsky, killing the top leadership. I mean, you know, the reality is senior Russian officials and generals have been assassinated all along. And it's sort of this attitude: it's time for payback. But not just payback—you've got to cut the guts out of this thing and make it so that the Europeans also pay a cost.

So that's why I say, you know, when you listen to people like Medvedev, you know, he's, you know, I think his views are more in line with the majority of Russians than that of Putin. And so Putin, in a way, is playing a little bit of catch-up. Now, I don't deny that the military strategy is not being set by Putin. It's being set by Gerasimov. But again, it's up to, you know, the Russians have not asked me how to fight this war, and I'm not sure my advice would be all that salient. But I think we've now reached a stage where the Europeans must pay a price for enabling this violence. Otherwise, they will continue to escalate it to a point that it will lead to a nuclear strike. And that's the danger that, you know, in an effort to avoid it, Russia's taking the very actions that will actually make it more possible.

#Glenn

Well, one can understand, though, the restraint of Putin, because if they now begin to hit back against a NATO country, as, you know, Mark Rutte—not to take him too seriously—but would argue, then, you know, the response would be absolutely fierce. But these people seem to think this is a computer game of some sort, or at least that there's proper escalation control, that they can do this. And if the Russians retaliate, then they will be able to manage this. I just don't think anyone's going to be able to control the escalation once the Russians finally retaliate.

But the whole idea is the Russians do not dare until they do dare, as they did in 2022. And then it's completely unprovoked. And this is the time to stand up against the new Hitler. We know what the script will look like after the Russian retaliation, which is why it's quite dangerous. But what do you see being the thinking here on the European side, though? Because let's be honest, Europeans, yes, they are declaring the intent, but they hardly have the capabilities. Well, not yet. If the Russians wait much longer, then they might have more capabilities.

#Larry Johnson

Yeah, you used the word there—thinking? Implying that the Europeans are thinking? We've engaged in a rational thought process? I, for the life of me, don't know what they are thinking, because it's so illogical. You step back and say, okay, whether I'm Germany or Poland or France or the United Kingdom, do I need to pay more for oil and natural gas, or do I need to pay less? Is it better for my

country if I pay less? Well, in the world of logic, it's better if you pay less. But the choice, in particular with the Germans, is, no, no, no, we're going to cut off all ties with Russia, who supplies cheap oil and gas. We will stand by and do nothing while the United States blows up the Nord Stream pipeline, compelling us as Europeans that we now must buy more expensive liquefied natural gas from the United States.

And, in fact, we're going to ban any kind of economic interaction with Russia, which is going to weaken our economies, cause recessions, cause inflation, cause higher unemployment. And you're doing this consciously. They're doing this. They're choosing to do this. And then on top of it, they say, oh yeah, we're going to take on Russia and we're going to fight it and defeat it. And you're going... let me see if I got this straight. You, like the UK, you can't even fill a football stadium with your army, it's so small. Your once leading-edge prowess in the world of maritime operations, that's gone, that's history. Germany, with these factories that once churned out some of the most leading-edge military equipment, are shuttered.

And many of your factory jobs are now going overseas to the United States or other places. So here is Europe. They remind me of—think back to when you were in high school, or whatever you called the education before you go to college. And there are the sports teams, and then the guy who was the star soccer player, football player on that team, you know, when they're 17, 18—strong, virile, quite athletic. Well, now he's 60 years old, he weighs twice what he did back then, can barely run, but in his mind still thinks he's that 17- or 18-year-old football player. That's Europe. They still think that they're this military power that dominated the 19th century. And they're not. They're a hollowed-out shell of a continent where the military power is really inconsequential.

They're in the, you know, if you're going to take them to a dog show, they're in the Chihuahua class. And yet they're wanting to take on Germany, who's in the Rottweiler class. Sorry—Russia. I mean, yeah, Russia, not Germany, my mistake. But Russia's in—I was saying Rottweiler Germany—but now Russia is the Rottweiler class. I mean, they're this big dog. Europe, a bunch of yappy little dogs that, you know, they have no significant economic resources, right? They've lost their industrial edge. They're not doing anything that's on the leading edge of science and technology. They're not leading in space. I mean, there's not a single sector you can point to where Europe goes, yeah, the future could lie with them. You know, they're living on a legacy.

#Glenn

Yeah. Now, I've been trying to make sense of the European position as well, because I always make the point that I think that, yeah, the Russians are fighting an existential war, and the Ukrainians as well, I think, to a large extent. They can also end Ukraine, so they also have a reason to fear an existential threat. So they both make sense. The Americans, you know, they wanted to—well, they started this to knock out a key rival. It didn't work. They handed it over to the outsourcer, to the

Europeans. Also makes sense, but... Europeans really don't make much sense. One could try to engage people in this political leadership in discussions to dig out, to find out what exactly is the logic here, what you want to achieve, how you intend to achieve it based on your resources.

But if you look across all the countries in the EU, the politicians, the media, they only communicate in clichés, these emotional slogans. Anything that deviates from it is censored. I mean, there's a massive cost for anyone breaking with the narrative of the group. One gets the impression there's a mass psychosis forming. And if one would argue, well, if our territories are used to strike against Russia, wouldn't that push the Russians to retaliate, possibly resulting in nuclear war? Ah, that's Putinist. Because any word of caution sounds like one wants to restrain the attacks on Russia, and that means you're with the Russians. And no one can dissent.

I mean, the idea that we have freedom of speech, dialogue, discussion—it's nonsense. There's none of that in Europe now. It's a loony bin. And there are no other objectives now than defeating Russia. All this talk about... they put forward some plans about opening diplomacy with Russia, but they set conditions which essentially mean Russia has to capitulate first. But beyond the hatred of Russia, though, do you think—you hinted towards the inability or its lack of place in the world? It doesn't have... I mean, it doesn't have the role it did in the past anymore. It doesn't really have a clear economic future. The partnership with the US is going away. Is this just desperation, you think, reflecting a wider problem?

#Larry Johnson

Well, there's actually a reality that's going to descend on Europe within the next two to three weeks, and this is the fallout from the shutdown of the Persian Gulf and Iran closing off the Strait of Hormuz. So there has been a dramatic loss of five significant...

#Larry Johnson

I'll call them commodities, but they are inputs into the global economy. At least 20% of the oil, 25% of the liquid natural gas, 25 to 30% of the sulfur and urea, which go for fertilizer, and over 40% of the helium, which is used for making computer chips, among other things. Well, right now on the oil front, the United States within two weeks will essentially have run out of a reserve supply of diesel and aviation fuel. So they won't have enough of the heavy or sour crude that's required to make diesel and aviation fuel available. It'll be sort of week to week depending upon what they can receive, because the United States is already a net importer of that.

Well, the same for Europe. Europe is a net importer of all classes of oil, and the shortages that are going to come will affect the economies dramatically. They're already sort of barely bumping along, staying maybe slightly above zero. But we're talking now that it'll be recession, if not depression,

territory. And oddly enough, Donald Trump talked about this two weeks ago at the G7, and that helped explain why he signed the MOU, because he recognized in four weeks we could be running on zero as far as the kind of crude oil that's needed to produce diesel and aviation fuel.

So Europe is in a worse situation than the United States because the United States at least has some independence, is independent, produces enough of the light oil that is used to produce gasoline. And it's actually been shipping some of that to Europe as well. But Europe doesn't have that. And it's on the issue of the heavy crude, the middle distillates part of the oil from which you get diesel and aviation fuel. And that is critical, that's going to be a critical shortage here. And we're not talking months, we're talking weeks. So, you know, we're going to have a dramatically different-looking world probably by July 15.

#Glenn

Yeah, not a great time for Europe to engage in a direct war with the world's largest nuclear power, it seems. Who also has ample supplies of oil and gas. Well, that's the big irony here — the assumption by the Europeans that if they just cut all the ties with Russia, then the Russian economy would collapse relatively shortly. I still make the point, as soon as they announced these sanctions initially, I was making the point that this is going to fail because I worked in Moscow. I worked on a program, or initially a department, that worked on this whole shift of Russia's economy from the West to the East.

That's what I mostly work on as well. And I knew that the Russians had made essentially their economy bulletproof. They were shifting their economy quickly to the East, and any sanctions would only be used as an opportunity to intensify this process. Right. So I knew that the Russians could diversify away from Europe, but Europe couldn't diversify away from Russia. But whenever I made this point, I was told, well, that undermines trust and public support in the sanctions. So that's a pro-Russian comment, and that makes you a Putinist. Yeah. So this is the level of debate we have in Europe.

And it is beyond ridiculous. But anyway, my point is, yeah, all of this cheap Russian gas and oil, which used to go to Europe, now goes to Asia. And as the Germans have begun to experience, their companies are following the Russian gas. When that gas goes to China, the German company packs up and goes there as well. So it's stupid on a lot of levels. I do want to ask about Marco Rubio in Anchorage, though. He made the point that what happened in Anchorage wasn't really a deal. It was more, you know, discussing formats, something that the Kremlin did not care much for.

#Larry Johnson

No, it's just, you know, Rubio is incompetent. You know, his job as Secretary of State, National Security Advisor—at least the last one to really occupy that role—was Henry Kissinger. And while Henry Kissinger may have been a war criminal, there's no denying the man had intellect and thought

in strategic terms. Sometimes he was a devious, evil bastard, there's no doubt about that. But, you know, he reckoned, you know, telling Nixon, OK, we're going to go to China, we're going to reestablish relations with communist China.

Something you, Nixon, if you fought against communism, you made your career on that. And we're doing that because we want to weaken the Soviet Union, and we want to make sure that we split China off from that branch of communism and help the Chinese develop, if you will, a dependence upon us in the West. So there was clear strategic thinking behind this. Well, here's Rubio, just like, you know, he views Russia as—does not recognize the critical role that Russia is now playing in the creation of a new international economic, political, and military order.

This is coming into fruition—the war—just as Russia's decision to attack Ukraine because of the impending attack from the West, to preempt that, just as that accelerated the growth of BRICS as an economic power. The U.S. and Israeli attack on Iran, Iran's subsequent, if you will, defeat of the U.S. and Israeli attack, in part because of support received from both Russia and China—significant support that ranged from not just financial aid, weapons systems, ammunition, intelligence—and we saw a recent report that the backseater, the colonel who was flying in the backseat of the F-15 that got shot down south of Isfahan back in April, that he reported seeing these drones, this drone pack. And I don't recall if he said it was attacking his ship or whatever, but it was moving as one.

It looked like a jellyfish, but it was moving in a coordinated fashion. Well, that came from China. There's no other country in the world that does that like China does. The Chinese also provided missiles. Pepe Escobar and I learned from our Pakistani source that during some of the retaliatory strikes against Israel and the United States, and the use of Chinese missiles, there were Pakistani missile technicians, military technicians trained by the Chinese, sitting with the Iranians, helping them launch and use these weapons systems, which destroyed critical infrastructure for the United States in both Bahrain and Kuwait and at Muwaffaq al-Salti Air Base in Jordan. So what you're seeing now emerge is this new international military. It's going to be a security organization. It's going to be an economic organization.

And it's literally an alternative to this U.S.-dominated post-World War II hegemonic enterprise. And that's what the United States and Europe—I'm not sure they fully comprehend what's happening. But it's happening. And no matter how much they complain about it or say that it's not real or say that it's weak, they can say all that they want. The fact of the matter is, it is happening. And you look at the growth rate for China. You know, they set up this alternative to SWIFT. It's called CIPS, the Cross-Border Interbank Payment System. SWIFT is an analog. It's like using a buggy whip because it's email. It's like I'm bank A and you're bank B, and I say, dear Glenn, I'm sending you this wire transfer.

Please effect it and credit it to this account. And so I send it to you, but it goes into your spam folder, and you don't find it for three days. Okay, but eventually it would get through. That was CIPS. It's digital, immediate—transfer here, assets move. The number of banks signing up for that

has increased. I think the number is like 26 in the last month. So the point of all this is Europe is becoming increasingly irrelevant, right? They're not a huge market in terms of the rest of the world. They have been considered a potentially profitable one, although I will note the Chinese are making tremendous inroads in Europe with their electric vehicles. They're cheaper than Tesla, they're better in many aspects, they have better features, and the Europeans don't have an answer to it.

#Glenn

Yeah, no, they don't like it, but they don't know what to do. They keep referring to China as a threat because of it, which makes it very difficult because they can't defend their position. I mean, if you want to argue that China's a threat—a country that hasn't been in a war in more than four decades—and somehow the threat, defined as a military threat, derives from its electric vehicles being exported to Europe, it's quite extraordinary. It was interesting what you mentioned about Kissinger, though, because, as you said, he's the one who should take credit for breaking the Chinese off from the Soviet Union in the late 70s—but not in the 70s. But in 2014, Kissinger wrote some interesting articles.

He was making the point that this is after the NATO countries toppled the government in Kiev, that neither NATO nor the Russians should use Ukraine as a front against the other. It should be a bridge. And he also was quite critical of how the Western countries' rhetoric was essentially about defeating Russia instead of finding a formula for peace, having a common security structure, for example. Anyways, I think this is important because he had discussions with Trump in 2016 before Trump took the presidency. And I'm sure he was kind of communicating his own ideas about what to do this time, which is, you know, you see this huge Eurasian giant forming of Russia and China. In economic terms, Russia is now the junior partner.

So reach out to the smaller one, play on its insecurities, and try to bring them over to our side of the ledger, which makes a lot of sense. But what happened? Well... you had the Russiagate hoax. Trump was a Russian agent. This was kind of the logic, because you can't say that it's a good idea to get along with Russia. I mean, this is how the Europeans still talk, though—not just the ridiculous people on social media, but the politicians, the journalists. This is still the thinking. So it doesn't bode well in terms of, yeah, the wider strategic thinking, which we now need. Yeah. But my last question was, Russia strikes Europe in retaliation to restore its returns—what does the United States do?

#Larry Johnson

The United States may want to jump into it, but they won't be able to. What the war with Iran has exposed are the limitations of U.S. military power. Because you have to step back and say, okay, what are we going to do? You know, do we have a naval force that we can send our aircraft carriers up into the Baltic Sea, for example, or into the Black Sea? No, we can't. So the aircraft carriers really are of no use in a military assault on Russia. So that leaves ground troops. We don't have ground troops. We've got 470,000 to, quote, invade Russia. So we cannot pose a credible ground threat to

Russia. Or if we did, if we were proposing doing that, just the time that would be required to assemble that force—in Poland or in Romania, in locations where they could go across the border.

The Russians, in the era of drones, short-range and intermediate-range ballistic missiles, would target and destroy those encampments. So that leaves air power. And, you know, again, what we're running up against now is, until the Strait of Hormuz is opened and the 20% of oil that disappeared from the market is back on the market—and that's going to be months, maybe a year or so—then there's not going to be enough aviation fuel to sustain the kind of combat operation that would be required against Russia. And at the same time, the United States' calculation that it could engage in attacks on Russia and that its own continental locations would be free? No, no, no, no. Russia's deployed the Burevestnik atomic cruise missile.

Russia this time would not hesitate to strike sites in the United States. I mean, this is an absolute worst-case scenario, a nightmare scenario. The reality is the United States has limited military assets. They're very expensive, but we don't have depth—strategic depth—with any of them. And what they've discovered, again, with Iran, is that Iran does not have the kind of missile defense systems that Russia does. And Iran survived what the United States unleashed on it. And I would say that Russia carries more potential counterweight, that they're able to respond with greater levels of violence to the United States or the Europeans than Iran could to Israel or the United States in the recent war. So no, it'd be a recipe for suicide in my view.

#Glenn

Well, it does appear that we are moving towards suicide in Europe, at least. That is, if you hear the hawks now in Moscow—and their voices grow louder every day, and they get more and more people on their side—their argument is essentially: go for full mobilization, kill Zelensky, destroy the entire government district in Kyiv, and while they're at it, go after all the European plants that build weapons that are used to attack Russia. And if something goes wrong, reach for the tactical nukes. And again, what's holding all of these hawks back is Putin. And this is the man whom the European leaders most of all want to get rid of.

#Larry Johnson

Because he is Hitler.

#Glenn

I mean, you couldn't make this up. It's so bizarre. There is no logic anymore. It's just pure insanity.

#Larry Johnson

It's pure insanity. Pure insanity. But, you know, they may get what they want, and they won't like what they get. Hey, let me leave you—I got, unrelated to this, but we'll call it breaking news. I have confirmed that the United States Central Command, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has issued the order for U.S.—remember all those U.S. military forces that were being deployed into the bases in the Persian Gulf and in Jordan and in Israel? The order is now—they've been issued the order—come home. So you're going to start seeing all of that combat aircraft withdrawn, all the personnel, 82nd Airborne—they're going to be withdrawn. You know, it took more than a month to deploy them, and it's going to take more than a month to redeploy them. But the point is, now that this order to redeploy has been issued, the chances of the United States reengaging Iran militarily have been reduced significantly.

#Glenn

Well, on those good notes, or good news—and there's not much of that recently—you know, we can wrap it up. Hopefully, you know, why not pack up the military bases in Europe as well, send them home, and perhaps then the Europeans become a little bit less cocky and we discover diplomacy. But yeah, that's for the future, at least.

#Larry Johnson

From your mouth to God's ears. Well, thanks again, Larry.

#Larry Johnson

It's always great to speak with you. All right, Glenn Diesen. Take care. Bye-bye.