



## **Poland WWII scare shows why top US general wants peace**

*This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.*

**Aaron Maté (AM):** Welcome to Push Back, I'm Aaron Maté. Joining me is Doug Macgregor. He is a retired Army colonel and a former senior Pentagon adviser. Doug, thanks for joining me once again.

**Doug Macgregor (DM):** Sure. Absolutely.

**AM:** Let me ask you your response to the news we got late last week. Out of nowhere, the top military officer in the U.S., General Mark Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, comes out in favour of diplomacy with Russia. And this comes just a few weeks after congressional progressives were bullied into retracting their call for the same thing, for talking to Russia to end this war. And now we have the top military officer in the country, General Milley, reportedly clashing with other Biden administration officials in calling for talks with Russia. So what to you is the significance of this and why is Milley, of all people, coming out in favour of talks with Russia?

**DM:** Well, first of all, General Milley has a reputation for not not doing something unless he's calculated the outcome and thinks it will benefit him. He leaked things from discussions with Trump, which were designed to benefit him. We have no idea whether or not they were true. He's now done the same thing with The New York Times. He essentially said, I think the Ukrainians have done all they can reasonably do and it would be a good time to negotiate. Effectively, that's what he said. And supposedly that's what he told President Biden. Of course, President Biden and Sullivan and Blinken and the rest of them all rejected it out of hand. So there are a couple of things that are very interesting. So the second point is, this is Milley talking out of school. He's a senior military adviser to the president. Frankly speaking, anything he says is confidential and should be kept quiet. He's entitled to think whatever he likes, hold whatever opinion he wants to, but once he expresses that to the president, quite

frankly, Aaron, that's where it ends. During World War Two, you had Admiral Leahy in the White House, it was the de facto equivalent of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Then you had King in the naval forces and Marshall with the ground and air forces. They did not go public and reveal anything that they discussed with the president, ever. Even after the man was dead. Okay. So we have pretty much held to that. You have very few exceptions where anybody is spoken out of school. Usually when a senior general does that, they remove him. Because that's not his job. He is to advise. He's not an opinion maker. He's not a policymaker. So now the third thing; what's he up to? Well, I can tell you that Milley is afraid. And he should be afraid. This is a man who has no personal experience in combat, but he knows the cold, hard facts. The cold, hard facts are that we don't have the ammunition on hand. We don't have the fuel on hand. We don't have the repair parts on hand. We don't have enough soldiers on hand to consider a confrontation with Russia. And he knows that under certain circumstances, we could end up in a confrontation with Russia. Now, a few weeks ago, we had General Petraeus, who's very Milley-like, similarly self-focused, but he blurted out this notion of a multinational task force. A quote unquote, "coalition of the willing", consisting largely of American forces, Polish forces and Romanian forces of about 90,000 troops, that somehow or other would stagger into western Ukraine at some point, and this would result in some sort of peaceful outcome. Well, Milley is not foolish. He knows that you're not going to get a peaceful outcome from that. The Russians have made it very clear. They will treat any interference with their operations as an act of war. And then secondly, he knows the truth. We are not in a position to sustain ourselves. Ukrainians have been firing 7000 artillery shells a day. The Russians have been firing 20,000. We just arranged with the Koreans to ship 100,000 155 millimetre shells to Ukraine. We bought it literally for the Ukrainians. Well, there's a problem that might work for about 14 days of artillery action. With the Russian, that's five days. What my point is, we're not in a position to confront them because we don't have the depth in the force. And Milley also knows something else. He knows what's coming. He's watched the Russians completely change their approach. They went into Ukraine with one hand tied behind their backs. They never used more than 20% of their ground force. And of that, only 110,000 troops initially in Ukraine. And then they went entirely on the defensive in August. And that's what they've done ever since, consolidated their position, pulled in their horns because the generals told Putin, the only way we can end this is if we do it militarily. If we're going to end it militarily that means massive offensives, more troops, more material, that's going to take time. And so the Russians have said, fine, we'll trade ground for time. We will consolidate our position, minimise our losses and let the Ukrainians expand themselves. Milley knows all of these things and he is concerned because he's talking to people who don't seem to be in touch with reality. That's the danger. And he doesn't want to walk to the president and say, Mr. President, our conventional forces are in danger of being annihilated. Because we staggered in there or we're dragged into this somehow. And the only way we can end this is to talk to the Russians and try to get out or opt for a nuclear response. And he doesn't want to go there. Nobody in Washington with a brain wants to go there. That was at the centre of the discussions between China and Washington or between Xi and Biden, making it very clear no nuclear weapons are going to be used anywhere. Absolutely not. So, I

think he's worried, very worried about the people he's dealing with and their lack of understanding of the realities of warfare.

**AM:** So just if I understand you right, Milley is pre-empting other counterparts in the Biden administration who you think might want to push this into full scale U.S. military involvement?

**DM:** I think it's possible. Let's put it this way. I think this notion that Petraeus set forth is very attractive to the civilians. Remember, over the last 30 years, what we had, we've had a series of interventions pushed by secretaries of state. Secretary Albright was in the forefront of this sort of thing. Remember her famous conversation with General Powell? "Well, General Powell, you keep talking about this wonderful army. Why can't we use it?" And of course, Powell's argument was, Well, you don't use military power indiscriminately. You only use it when it's a last resort, when you are compelled to do so. But the lesson from Desert Storm for all of the neocons and globalists is: Look at this wonderful set of toys. We could take these toys anywhere we want. We can bully everybody into submission. Well, there's a problem. The problem is, Russia cannot be bullied into submission. Neither can China. And if we try to do it, we're going to lose in Eastern Europe. And that's something that Milley has figured out. He understands that. And he's afraid that Blinken and Klain and Sullivan and Biden don't understand that because they've drank the Kool-Aid. Now, what's the Kool-Aid? Ever since 24 February, you and I and everybody else have sat around listening to their "Ukrainian victory speech". Ukrainians are winning. The Ukrainians are winning. Just look, they're winning. Uh huh. Well, look at the map. They're not winning. And they've lost, over a hundred thousand killed and hundreds of thousands of casualties. Huge quantities of equipment have been lost, destroyed, stolen. They are on their last legs right now. They have nothing to offer. They're waiting around for the sledgehammer to show up and crush them. And so Milley says, you know, they have done about all we can expect. I think they should negotiate. And what does he get? "Absolutely not. We must crush the Russians. We must defeat them. They need to understand. We have to impart this lesson." It's insane.

**AM:** Well, you know, on that point, this is from CNN to the claim you make about how, you know, bureaucrats inside the State Department, civilians are more hawkish than the Pentagon. This is what CNN says, quote, One official explained that the State Department is on the opposite side of the pole from General Milley. That dynamic has led to a unique situation where military brass are far more fervently pushing for diplomacy than U.S. diplomats.

**DM:** Of course. Well, you know, we have been lying to the American people for at least two decades, probably 30 years. Why have we been lying? We've been telling them: "We're the greatest military in the world. No one can challenge us." Aaron, that was never true. And we dismantled most of our capability after 1991. Well, what we have today is a shadow of what existed 30 years ago, and we no longer have a monopoly on the technologies that delivered so much success for us. Most of that had to do with micro circuitry, which is critical to

precision. So the point is, the generals have been standing out there decorating themselves for Christmas every other week with new medals, telling everyone they're heroes and that we can do everything. And we can't. And they've had their bluff called. And I think Milley went in there to say, Look, you know, this is very dangerous stuff. We don't want to do this. We really need to end this before it gets out of control. And by the way, as we discussed shortly before we came on here, we've had a couple of stray missiles that went off course and struck just inside the Polish border. And two Poles were killed. And so now we have the Polish National Defence Council holding a meeting. Now I don't know what's going to come out of it. I suspect the Russians will say, Look, we're very sorry when of course, we'll do our best to avoid that in the future. Whether or not the Poles choose to accept it is hard to know. But I don't see any appetite in NATO whatsoever to mobilise that alliance to go into Russia and fight. I just don't see it. The Poles may be willing to do that. Some of the Romanians may be. But that's all contingent on us. We're the backbone. We're the centre. And we have to lead it.

**AM:** Let me ask you to speak more about the state of Ukraine's military. As you said earlier the conventional picture we get is that Ukraine is winning and to substantiate that pundits here will point to the Ukrainian victories in Kherson and Kharkiv. But meanwhile, you have admissions like this in The New York Times, quietly reported: Despite Russia's setbacks on the battlefield, the Russian military continues to wage an effective missile and drone campaign against Ukraine's infrastructure, according to U.S. defence officials and military analysts, exposing gaps in a heavily strained Ukrainian air defence network. And perhaps because of that, one U.S. official recently told Politico, quote, "Why not start talking about peace talks before you throw another 100,000 lives into the abyss?" It's striking that we're getting this kind of commentary from U.S. officials now that we were not getting, at least as far as I could tell, early on in the war.

**DM:** Well, the decision in Moscow to go on the strategic defence once they had seized the territory where most of the Russian speaking citizens live, has actually worked very well for Russia. And the Ukrainians have lost tens of thousands of soldiers in this unending series of attacks. Now people point to Kharkov and say, Well, look, they had success up there. Well, there were only 2000 Russians. It's flack. There's nothing to stop the Russians until they reach the river, which is just short of the Russian border. So the Russians said, Look, we need the 2000 men. We're not going to sacrifice them, pull them out, let the Ukrainians move in there. And, oh, by the way, while they're in there, we're going to kill as many of them as we can with the standoff attack. And that's what they did. The Ukrainians lost 30 to 40% of that force. And out of 30,000 men, that's a substantial loss. You had a similar situation up and down that front. And in Kherson it was different. In Kherson you had 30,000 Russian soldiers sitting in a town with a dam further up to the Dnieper River that if the dam broke, they would then be flooded literally in this city. They decided they didn't want the dam broken and they didn't want to risk those soldiers being flooded. And they knew they could hold it. That wasn't the question. They could easily hold the place. They had built enormous defences. But the Supreme Commander said, Mr. President, I want to get them out. We don't need this right

now. We can always go back and get it. Let's pull them out, rest them, refit them, and repurpose them for the major offensives that are coming later this year. The Russians have always regarded ground as something that is only useful if it confers an advantage on you. They have a long history of giving up ground, left and right when it made strategic sense to do so. They fought the Mongols that way. They fought the Huns that way. They fought the Turks that way. The Tartars, everyone. And frankly, they fought Napoleon and the French and later on the Germans that way in World War Two. Ground in and of itself doesn't have much value unless it gives you an advantage. If you have an advantage, stay with it. And that's what they've done up and down that line. They've adjusted the line so that they're holding terrain that they can easily defend because you want to defend with the least effort possible while killing as many of the people attacking you as you can. The Russians know how to do that. They've done that very well. This is not going to last because the Ukrainians have run out of manpower. They can't even fuel armoured forces anymore. They've had to pull most of the armour back because they don't have fuel for it. They can't go on like this. They can't evacuate people from the battlefield who were wounded. They've had too many people die of wounds. We're sending them 100 M113s in various conditions. Most of those will be used as ambulances to evacuate the wounded. Because in a high intensity battlefield, you can't fly helicopters in and fly people out. This is the sort of story that you had in Vietnam and Korea. You know, a MASH helicopter shows up, picks up the wounded, flies them out, and their lives are saved. That doesn't work. You have integrated air defences on the Russian side. That's why the Air Force is ineffective on the Ukrainian side. If we went in there with our air force, we would lose large numbers of planes very quickly. Again, our readiness rates in the Air Force aren't very good either, as has been recently announced. So I think our generals have finally come clean and said, Don't do this. Now, how far did they go in private? I don't know. But I think Milley is afraid that they'll be pushed into doing something. And so he's given it his shot and he wasn't happy with the response he got, so he thought he'd leak it. Perhaps now, in the days ahead, we'll get a clearer picture of just how bad it is on our side. That would be helpful. The American people need to know that while we don't have very large forces, and our forces are not in the best shape as a proportion of the force, we have more generals and admirals than we have had in our entire history. We have them falling out of the trees. We have so many headquarters with so many admirals and generals it's not even funny. It's a disgrace. It's a joke.

**AM:** This week, Bill Burns, the director of the CIA, sat down with his Russian counterpart, and the White House insisted that they're not talking about finding a way to end the war. They're not talking about a settlement. They're only talking about the need to de-escalate and avoid the use of nuclear weapons. Do you buy that?

**DM:** You know, I don't know any more than you do. I think Bill Burns, given his background, may well have been told that under no circumstances will you discuss a cease fire. Because the first thing you have to arrange if you're going to hold talks is a cease fire. And that's something that everyone has resisted because, well, after all, Ukrainians are

winning right?! So you don't want a ceasefire. So I think they're probably telling you the truth. And again, even if you went to the Russians right now, I don't think you could get a cease fire, but you could certainly open negotiations. But how far are you going to get? I mean, remember, their initial demands, if you want to put it that way, were actually very simple. Ukraine has to be neutral. It can't be a member of NATO. No NATO forces in Ukraine. Number two, those two republics that have been separated from Ukraine, you need to grant them autonomy. They're Russians. Number three, Crimea needs to be recognised as legitimately Russian. It has been Russian since the 1700s, this business with Khrushchev where the drunken stupor gave the Communist Party in Kiev, you know, Crimea, is nonsense. And then finally go back to the Minsk Accords, give the Russians who live inside the country equal rights with other citizens. That was it. Now, all of a sudden, what do you think you're going to get from the Russians? I don't think you're going to get much. So I think they'll listen. But I think it would not take you very far.

**AM:** After Ukraine attacked the Kerch Bridge, linking Russia to Crimea, Russia responded with, I think, arguably its most devastating attacks on civilian infrastructure inside Ukraine to date. And we've seen more of that recently. And I'm just wondering, you know, if there's no ceasefire reached and there is another major Russian counteroffensive with these newly mobilised hundreds of thousands of troops, what do you think that will look like?

**DM:** Well, first of all, let me go back and correct you on one point. We keep saying civilian infrastructure. But if you're in a war and the electrical grid is supplying your troops and you destroy the electrical grid, it's not because you set out to harm civilians. You set out to deprive the military capacity of any access to energy. So I think we have to understand that the Russians have not deliberately targeted civilians. There's a lot of evidence, though, on the other side that high marks have been used to deliberately target Russian civilians in Donetsk, Luhansk and in Crimea and other places. We never talk about that because, you know, Ukraine is pristine, democratic and perfect, and Russia is evil, authoritarian and terrible. But the truth is, it's not a pretty sight on the Ukrainians side. On the Russian side, they've stuck pretty closely to anything of military rebellion. Now, to go back, once again, I was the director of the Joint Operations Centre during the Kosovo air campaign. And we very rapidly ran out, within the first week and a half of, let's say, military targets in the purest sense. That was we'd hit all of the airfields, we hit barracks, these kinds of things. It really wasn't much left over. And Yugoslavia, remember, was really almost a third world country in terms of development. They hadn't gotten very far. So then there had to be a meeting. What do we do? Do we hit the Yugo factory? Well, the Yugo Factory does produce vehicles for the Yugoslav army. Okay, hit the Yugo factory. But what about bridges over the Danube? Well, there are only two bridges that have been used by the military, but there are 23 bridges over the Danube. Could they be used by the Yugoslav army? Yes. So we hit all 23 bridges. My point to you is, when you go to war, what starts out as being exclusively civilian, as the war drags on and more of the nation is mobilised and more people are involved, the more you drift into the category of Now, wait a minute, this has potential military application. I think we took it

too far during the Kosovo air campaign. I don't think the Russians have gone quite that far yet, but I think once the major offensives begin, anything that presents resistance is going to be annihilated. They won't take any chances.

**AM:** Since you raised this past, when the NATO's force bombed the headquarters of a television station in Serbia was that done with the idea that that was a military target? Or was that accidental? Were you involved in it?

**DM:** The argument at the time was that it was quote unquote, "being used for Serbian propaganda", spreading falsehoods and lies about NATO and our intentions.

**AM:** And so that was deemed to be a legitimate military target because it was broadcasting information that contradicted the U.S. line?

**DM:** Yes, because that might stiffen resistance against us.

**AM:** And looking back on that, I mean, were you involved in that targeting? And looking back on that now, how do you feel about it?

**DM:** I was not part of the targeting. Remember, you have target tiers. These are people, mostly Air Force, who are exclusively committed to that mission. And initially, we had, as I recollect, six different levels of target tiers. So you had to go through six levels of examination before a target was nominated and approved. And again, the problem with nomination was very early on: well, we've run out of targets. There's not much else out there for us to hit. And so the direction was, Well, you better go back and find more targets or this air campaign ends in three weeks. So that's when you begin to start evaluating things as potentially hostile and dangerous. What I'm trying to say is we were very broad, very general and very generous with our use of military power against the Serbs. And tended, as I just explained to you, to evaluate things in ways that I think people in retrospect would view as raw. Now, is that a war crime? Well, one man's war crime is another man's great achievement. I mean, it's not that clear. It's in the so-called grey area. But from what I've seen thus far, again, from a distance watching the Russians, they've been much more prudent and meticulous about what they strike. Now, if they're going to knock out [inaudible], which I think they've started to do, in other words waterworks, knock out energy, knock out fuel depots for anything; Diesel, gasoline, for anything, not just military, but any kind of refining capability, production capability. That has to happen if you're going to bring down the level of capability directed against you. And I think we're going to see the Russians every day now and every night until the big offensive comes along, what I would call a nibble away at whatever is left. It is in the interests now to make the Ukrainian people freeze. It is in the interest now to make Europeans freeze. Especially Germans. We have made that happen and we have brought it on. The Russians didn't bring it on. We brought it on. And the Russians know that. This is not something that they intended. Quite the contrary. Go back to the

beginning of this operation, the special military operation, very limited, very targeted. And it was designed to produce an outcome. That didn't happen. The underlying assumptions were false. They never believed that we would ship in billions and billions of dollars of military equipment. I don't think they ever believed that we would send U.S. and British contractors, former or perhaps active duty in civilian clothes, to operate high motors and other complex systems. We don't even know the full length, the full extent of that sort of thing. I don't think they ever expected NATO staff to come in and supply Ukrainian staff on the operational and strategic levels. I don't think that they ever expected NATO headquarters to effectively direct the war from a distance. So the Russians grossly miscalculated. They've got to correct that miscalculation. That means they have got to be ruthless in order to bring this war to a close. And I think all of these things, frankly, are known to Milley, and Milley can't be the only person. And so I think that's what he did. He went in and he told the truth, and he wasn't very happy with what he got back.

**AM:** Yeah. I mean, what you mentioned there about how this war for Russia creates an imperative to freeze Ukrainians and freeze Europeans; if you're in a position to stop the war in Washington, I don't know why you wouldn't pursue that option unless you just simply don't care about Ukrainian and European lives.

**DM:** Well, Aaron, I haven't seen too much evidence for great concern in that department. Because if we were genuinely concerned about that, we would never have allowed this war to get this far. And as I've said before to you and your colleagues, I could never imagine any president of the United States involving ourselves in Eastern Europe in a war with Russia, number one. The only interest we have in that area, of real interest, is to end the fighting and to support a solution, whatever that takes. And I wrote an op ed very early on it, at the end of February suggesting we bring in neutrals; neutral forces, Finns, Indian, Austrian, Malays, whatever, bring them in. Let them create the force that stands between the Russians and the Ukrainians that establishes a cease fire line. And then let's talk and sort through this and find a solution. But nobody was interested in that. Now, all of a sudden, you know, we have at least one voice of realism, and I'm sure there are others in uniform and there saying it's time to stop. But I don't think we can.

**AM:** Do you think Russia made sufficient efforts in this regard? There was one time a talk, some talk from Putin about proposing peacekeepers for the Donbas. But, you know, from my vantage point, and maybe I'm wrong on this, I didn't see them make this a really big issue. I didn't see them go to the U.N. Security Council and say, you know, to avoid a war, we need to have international peacekeepers to protect the people, the Donbas, or else we're going to have to go in there and do it ourselves because no one else is doing it. And the U.S. is backing Ukraine as it shells, you know, these ethnic Russians in Ukraine, so we need an international peacekeeping force. Do you think Russia made a sufficient effort to do all it could to avoid the use of force?



**DM:** Well, I know that there are large numbers of Russians living in towns and villages in the Donbas who said that they were on the verge of being exterminated by members of the Azov regiment when Russian troops and tanks arrived just in the nick of time to save them from being gunned down in their town and village burned. So that was a real danger. I'm not sure that Putin probably had much faith or confidence in the United Nations, and I think that he probably is right on that. If you look at the recent vote, I mean, most people in the United Nations, if we say we want you to vote a certain way, are going to go along with us because we have ways to influence their lives, because we control the dollar based economy. We control finance, financial institutions. We control everything the IMF, the World Bank. And so are you going to stand up to the United States if you're somewhere in Central Africa or Latin America or Southeast Asia and say, Oh, I'm sorry, we don't agree with you, we think the Russians have a valid argument. We'll probably say, Well, look, we may sympathise with the Russians in this circumstance, but it's not in our interest to stand out. So we'll vote with the U.S. So I'm not sure he [Putin] was wrong to conclude that there was probably not much help there for him. I think his biggest problem was he didn't understand what is governing us today in Washington, this cabal of people, that it is determined, come hell or high water, to ruin Russia, to destroy the place and his regime. And then secondly, I think he did not appreciate the extent to which we were really running the show in Kiev, in Ukraine.

**AM:** And how extensive do you think that control is when it comes to the U.S...?

**DM:** ...It's absolute, it's absolute. If the president of the United States wanted a peace arrangement, negotiations to start, he would tell Zelensky to shut up and colour. Now there is a theory that Zelensky is surrounded by radical nationalists who will execute him if he does such a thing. I don't know. I can't confirm or deny that. But if he cares about Ukraine, then he may have to take that risk to save lives. Thus far, I haven't seen any evidence of his willingness to do that. Have you?

**AM:** No, I mean, we know from Fiona Hill that US officials have confirmed that there was the outline of a peace agreement between Ukraine and Russia back in April. Now, Hill didn't say why that was thwarted, but Putin has alleged and Ukrainian media actually was the first to report this based on sources close to Zelensky that Boris Johnson, then the U.K. prime minister, came over and told Zelensky that the West will not back up Ukraine if it makes a peace deal with Russia and basically ordered him to keep on fighting. And Zelensky has complied.

**DM:** We have to keep something in mind; that London and Washington are joined at the hip on this matter. The fact that Boris Johnson went there and said that was not something that would have happened without first being discussed in Washington. So I'm sure they were on board together. And London is, other than ourselves, the other most strident advocate for war with Russia. And as you've seen, the use of their special operations forces, their introduction of trainers and assistance wherever possible in Ukraine, training thousands of Ukrainian

troops in England, all of that sort of thing has been going on. And I don't think we should see it as Boris Johnson, I think we should just see London as part of that Washington axis acting on behalf of Washington.

**AM:** Let me ask you about a parallel issue that's unfolding amid the crisis in Ukraine, and that's Taiwan. Just recently, there was a report in The Washington Post titled "Congress seeks to arm Taiwan quickly as China threat grows". And the talk here is of a congressionally approved package for something like \$3 billion annually for military assistance to Taiwan. Your thoughts on this and the threat of a conflict breaking out there.

**DM:** Well, I was pleasantly surprised when Biden announced to the world that there is no imminent threat of invasion by China. And I think that's true. I don't see any evidence at all. The Chinese are interested predominately in stability because stability and peace are essential to business. China has just gone on the largest building spree in the history of mankind, building first world infrastructure all over that country. Going to war would destroy much of that infrastructure, and they know that. It would put them in a very difficult position in Asia. The Asian countries would be horrified. In fact, the easiest thing to do is if the Chinese want to attack Taiwan, and I don't see any evidence that they do, just stand by. Everyone will be on our doorstep the next morning as soon as the Chinese launch an attack. This is a lie. China is a competitor. China does things we don't like. But the problems that we have with China are not necessarily China's problems. You don't like fentanyl coming into the United States? Fine. Bring the 40,000 troops back from Poland. Put them on the Mexican border. Get the Coast Guard out of the South China Sea in the Persian Gulf. Put them in the Caribbean, in the Pacific, where they belong. And we can stop the fentanyl. It'll never be completely stopped, we know that, but you stop about 95 to 98% of it. In other words, deal with the problems that are our problems. And we could do that. It's not hard to do those things. And you have to change some of your laws in order to accommodate it. But it's a national emergency. If 100,000 Americans died last year, at least that number from fentanyl poisoning I would call that a national emergency, Aaron.

**AM:** And...

**DM:** ...but you don't go to war with China. That's stupid.

**AM:** Well, there seem to be some people in Washington, in both parties who want that.

**DM:** Well, they've never seen the Chinese up close. They don't know anything about the Chinese military or anything about Asia. They don't understand that part of the world. And they're fed a lot of nonsense. And remember, there's a lot of money behind this as well. Not just in the defence industry through lobbies in the city. In fact, Taiwan now has a lobby that operates here and they've modelled themselves in other foreign lobbies so that they too can come into our political process and influence it. Again, these are our problems. We've got to

deal with them, but nobody wants to deal with it because of the self-enrichment process that goes on inside the Beltway. And the ignorance, ignorance of what is real and what is not real, what's true and what's false. And it doesn't matter what you say because you're competing with a machine inside the Beltway that is interested in buying access and power. And it is very difficult to resist that if you work on the Hill.

**AM:** Well, speaking of which, as we're speaking, the fate of the House is still unclear, but it looks like Republicans will take control of the House. If that happens, do you expect to see any change of policy when it comes to funding for the proxy war in Ukraine?

**DM:** In the short term, no. Once again, too many people are invested in the dumb idea now. And they've been back and told Americans this is a great idea when it's a very bad one. And remember, Americans are treated largely to the diet of misinformation and nonsense through the mainstream media. I don't know if you ever saw it, but I was on with Stu Varney one morning and it must have been an accident. Somebody must have said, Bring McGregor on. He's a military guy. I guess he assumed that I would say, Yeah, let's go get those Russkies. We have to help these Ukrainians and win this war. I got on there and I said, No, I said, Zelensky is not a hero. And I tried to talk about the man's true origins and nature; picked up from nowhere, couldn't even speak a word of Ukrainian when he became president. His only language was Russian, and he was picked up by an oligarch put into the job. And Stu Varney said, Oh, all right. Well, thank you. I guess that's one way to look at it. And I've never been invited back. You know, come on, let's be frank. The Americans aren't hearing the truth. They're hearing what a select group of people who are extremely well financed on Wall Street, in the media, I would add Hollywood, too- just go down the list of wealthy people. We mentioned Bill Gates and others; they've all signed on for this. It's part of an agenda that they have, but it's not in the interest of the American people. And I don't know if you stood on the sidewalk in Seattle or Kansas City and said, Come here, come here, how many of you want to go to fight Russia for NATO and America? I don't think you'd get very many. And I think a lot of people would say: What is NATO? And another group would say: Where is Ukraine? And I don't fault people for that. We're Americans. We have a wonderful country. We live between two giant oceans. We are an island unto ourselves. And that has worked brilliantly for us. If we could give up the war making all the time, we could make a lot of money by doing business with everybody instead of selectively targeting people and punishing them. So to answer your question, no, I don't think you're going to see much change in the short run. Now over time, as our own economic system worsens and it becomes evident that we're careening into another financial crisis as large or worse than 2008, yeah, then I think people would have said, Oh, wait a minute, before you push that button and create another trillion dollars of money, where is all this going and why are we supporting this? That's when you may hear it. But it's because people here are hurting. They are hurting, but the hurt has to get worse. The worse it gets, the more they're going to complain and the more people are likely to listen.

**AM:** Doug, as we wrap up, any final words for us? And are you still concerned about the threat of nuclear war breaking out as a result of this conflict in Ukraine?

**DM:** I don't think so, at the moment. As someone who is part of these scientists for nuclear sanity or something, say that we're at the 20% mark, 20% potential for nuclear conflict. You can never rule it out completely, unfortunately. But I am somewhat relieved by some of the things that Biden said while he was in China, where this issue came up and he agreed wholeheartedly with Xi, there must be no use of nuclear weapons. Because I know the Russians absolutely don't want them. I mean, would you want to use a nuclear weapon in Guadalajara, Mexico, in the north, if you lived in Arizona and New Mexico? Of course not. No one in Russia wants nuclear fallout blowing over Russia. So the idea that the Russians want to do this or would do it is absurd. And they don't need to because they can do all the damage they want to with the precision guided missiles, munitions, rockets and artillery. They've got all that they need. So I hope not. I think not. But I hope not.

**AM:** Doug Macgregor, retired Army colonel, former senior adviser at the Pentagon. Thanks as always.

**DM:** Thank you, Aaron.

**END**