

EU Elites Are Freaking-out Over USA Dumping Them | Dr. Glenn Diesen

While the USA is finally working on achieving peace in Ukraine and ending the senseless bloodshed, EU kleptocrats are having a mental breakdown in Munich over the new US Vice President lecturing them on proper democratic values. The EU hasn't even begun to understand what hit them. I'm discussing these tectonic shifts with Professor Glenn Diesen, a professor at the University of Southeast Norway. Find Glenn on othe platforms_ Substack: <https://glenndiesen.substack.com> YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/@UCZFCDIHTe9HGxtIuVDpBz7g> Twitter: https://x.com/glenn_diesen?s=21

#M3

And we can do anything. This rigged election in Moldova can annul the election results in Romania. Everything is to protect democracy, and we're slaughtering democracy in the process. This is the core of ideological fundamentalism. It's not about what is democracy. We are democracy, and everything we do is in defense of it. This is, again, a fight of good versus evil, and there's a lot of radicalism that comes out in this.

#M2

Hello, everybody. This is Pascal from Neutrality Studies. And my guest today is once more my friend and colleague, Dr. Glenn Diesen, who's a professor at the University of Southeast Norway. Glenn, welcome back to the channel.

#M3

Thank you. It's good to see you again, Pascal.

#M2

Good seeing you too. And before we go into the topic of the second part of this talk, which is going to be the NGOs, we really need to address what's happening right now in Europe because things seem to be happening at light speed. Since we had the announcement that there was a phone call between Vladimir Putin and Donald Trump, now, at the Munich Security Conference, JD Vance gave a big talk and berated the Europeans for being very anti-democratic and shocked everybody there. New announcements are out that Mr. Lavrov and Mr. Rubio actually had a talk at that meeting, and now a meeting is being prepared between Trump and Putin in Saudi Arabia, and that the Americans are intending to do something that people on this channel have been saying for two years, which is

that the Americans and the Russians can make a peace and impose it on the rest. And this seems to be the way that things are going, and the Europeans are furious. Glenn, what do you make of the situation?

#M3

Well, as I said, a lot of this was predictable. If you see what the Europeans have done over the past few years, and especially the past three years, they have made themselves more and more dependent on the United States. When you make yourself this dependent, you also see that they've been failing to actually defend their very basic interests. And when you fail to defend your interests, you become even more dependent on the United States. Also, there will be opposition emerging at the periphery because any country that doesn't really pursue its national interest will leave a big vacuum. Now, what has happened is the Europeans are obviously realizing that they are no longer needed. The Americans don't really need to listen to the Europeans anymore.

I know everyone wants to make this sound like it's only Trump, but keep in mind there was Biden who blew up the Nord Stream pipeline, and he's the one who pushed this Inflation Reduction Act, which got a lot of the German industries to move across to the United States, and nothing was ever said in Europe. So indeed, the first instinct is always to make excuses for it. So I think this has been quite—it's been coming for a long time. So now, of course, instead of being rewarded for subservience, we see that the Americans effectively can dictate terms, and then of course they also come to Europe and express some contempt for how political opposition here is dealt with. And I know there's a lot of opposition to what Vance said, but if you read the newspapers, it's quite interesting to learn what the journalists want you to think.

But do listen to what he actually says, because what exactly are they disagreeing with? I heard a lot of angry talks afterward where they mentioned MAGA, Putinist, Christian fundamentalist, populist. But what exactly was it that he said that was so incorrect? So I think, yeah, a huge change is coming. And as always, I think the Europeans get very upset when reality strikes. I remember I had an interview with a Russian representative at the United Nations two weeks ago, and he was also saying, no, probably the Americans, now the Europeans won't have any role in the negotiations. Like, we don't want them there, they have no point, and the Americans as well, probably not. So this is predictable, but we live in our own little bubble.

And we have to be honest, why would the Europeans be included? They have made these outlandish demands, which are not serious in any way. Furthermore, for three years, they rejected even basic diplomacy. Forget about negotiations. They didn't even want to sit around the table with the Russians. Every now and then, you might have an OSCE meeting, but when the Russians speak, the Europeans stand up and leave the room in some kind of display of their wonderful virtue. So they didn't believe in this. Furthermore, now they even indicate that they don't like these negotiations. They have this mantra that Ukraine will determine everything, but that doesn't reflect reality at all. And they don't have any alternatives. They just oppose this.

So what would you do if you sit in Washington and you see that the Europeans will resist and fight any negotiation? And you don't really need to have them there because they're not really that relevant anymore. They kind of surrendered a lot of their sovereignty. So the common sense is they're being cut out, and that's what you're seeing. You kind of have to adjust to reality if you want to be part of reality. And as long as the Europeans live in this bubble where they get to essentially continue to dictate terms even after they've lost the war, it doesn't make any sense. It's like having Hitler in the bunker at the end, trying to tell Stalin what to do and what the post-war peace will look like. It doesn't make any sense at all, but this is where we are.

#M2

It is fascinating to me because it shows that the people in power, the people now at the Munich Security Conference and talking there, actually believe in this fiction. I was wondering about this for the last three years. Do they believe the narratives they create, or are they knowingly saying untruths, which they just use because they are convenient? But it seems either they actually believe them, or they are now so tightly locked into what they said that they created a core set for themselves that they cannot get out of. But it's just basic logic, isn't it? You go the easiest way or the way with the least resistance in order to achieve what you want. And if what the United States wants to achieve is getting out of the Ukraine war, then you don't go through the Europeans. So instead of dealing with, like, 25 or 30 states, you deal with the main other.

#M2

I usually say, if you make yourself into a poodle, don't be surprised that people treat you as a poodle. And that's the role of the Europeans, all of them at the moment, including the UK. This inability right now of Europe to understand its own position and see itself from the outside, because the Chinese see it too, the Indians see it too. The Global South is seeing it, and they've been saying something about this even, but the Europeans wouldn't listen.

They continue to lecture everybody about what's going on, not understanding that they're the ones captured in a really, really weird ideology that removes them far away from reality. This war now brings back the hard reality that Russia was systematically underestimated. Russia is capable of far more than what even our media and our leadership told us. Now, what does this do to the future of Europe within what's going to remain a system, right? I mean, Europe itself is not going to disappear from the globe, right? But it finds itself with another radically new paradigm, doesn't it?

#M3

Yeah, very much so, because this is the unraveling of this political West, which we've seen not just through the Cold War, but also after the Cold War as well. But I think you're very correct, and this is the whole narrative they built for themselves: that the Russians are backwards, they're fighting with

shovels, they're stealing washing machines to take the computer chips. We kind of have to buy into this because if not, then you can be accused of trying to talk up the Russian army. You know, you have two sets of narratives: the Russian one and ours, and you have to pick the right one if you want to have your legitimacy and be allowed to speak. This is the way it works. But we had these strange narratives from the beginning.

We said, no, we can't have diplomacy. As the EU foreign policy chief, Josep Borrell, says, I don't talk to war criminals, and Putin's a war criminal, so I don't talk to them. Okay, well, you know, this is the top diplomat. So what the EU said for three years is... We're not going to talk to the Russians. In other words, this will have to be resolved on the battlefield. Either Russia can capitulate or nothing. This is it because we're not talking to them. This is the only option. So win or capitulate. Now, if we had the honesty to recognize that Russia considers this to be an existential threat, one doesn't have to agree with it.

But if we recognize that this is obviously very genuine, they see this as a threat to their survival, and you now put them in a position where we won't talk to them, and we say we will fight this till the end—either capitulate or win. Now, of course, they're going to fight. But we can't even recognize that they know how to fight because they're so backwards, we say. That's one week. The next week, of course, they are all-powerful. But we have this crazy narrative that everyone has to follow. And even when we talk about peace, we kind of get used to the same ideas over and over again that, well, we have to send more weapons to Ukraine.

This way, they will have an advantage at the negotiation table. But we said this for three years. They don't have any more manpower. We don't have any more weapons. So what exactly are we doing? We make this sound like we also sell this as a betrayal. We can't betray them. But what really is the betrayal here? The betrayal isn't to find peace when you know that every day the Ukrainians will only lose more men. They will lose more of their infrastructure. They will lose more of their territory. And still, we refuse to even speak with the Russians.

How is this not a sellout? The majority of Ukrainians want negotiations. They're willing to cede the territory and everything. So why is this a betrayal? For me, the massive betrayals were when we toppled the government. It was when we didn't implement Minsk. It was in 2019 when 73% of Ukrainians voted for the peace platform of Zelensky. And through NGOs, we pushed everything we could to reverse this election. And of course, in 2022, canceling or sabotaging the Istanbul peace agreements. This, for me, was a huge betrayal. And as Zelensky's former advisor Arestovych says, the people who refused to let us negotiate a peace three years ago still don't want to allow us to negotiate a peace today.

And this is, yeah, now walking away from this, we're calling this a betrayal. To me, it's just very crazy. Often we need outsiders to understand what bubbles we've come into because I remember the French confused the Chinese a lot. They went over there to talk to the Chinese, asking, "Can you help us get Putin to the negotiation table and finally end this war?" And it's like, yes, we want this

war over as well. Okay, well... But Putin, he's willing to talk. He never shut down diplomacy with anyone. But we don't want to talk to Russia at all. So we don't want any diplomacy. So what exactly do we expect the Chinese to do?

Oh, yeah, no, no, just put sanctions on them, break them. Yeah, again, we want to defeat the Russians. That's not negotiations. We have these peace summits like we had in Switzerland where we say, oh, we have a peace summit. They're wonderful. How to bring the peace. And we don't invite Russia. We don't talk about their security interests. Instead, we have people like the Polish president who talks about breaking the country into 200 pieces. And they're openly saying the objective of this is to mobilize the international community against Russia. What part of this is a peace summit? Again, we created these really absurd bubbles, but everyone had to accept it. Otherwise, yeah, you can be pushed out.

#M2

That's exactly the corner that, well, the Biden administration too, but the Europeans even more so, maneuvered themselves into when they started, and they did that very early on, equating Vladimir Putin with Adolf Hitler. And Adolf Hitler here is really just a word, a gap filler for devil, right? It's like pure evil, right? Pure good against pure evil. And if you do that, then there is no coming out, right? There is neither space for neutrality, as I study, right? There's no space for any other solution than utterly defeating it, right? And that's what you set yourself up for. And then if you're not capable of doing so, if you are materially unable, well, then you leave yourself with no way out. And now, so the question to me now is, will the Europeans actually accept that they have to swallow a pill that they're unwilling to swallow?

Let me put it this way. The Japanese, when they surrendered in '45, the emperor, on the recording that he created, said, like, we now have to suffer the... We have to suffer the... What was the word now? I forgot. The unimaginable or the insufferable or to endure the unendurable. You know, but make it clear that everything that has been said until now will come to pass right about the Americans. Now we have to accept this. Will the Europeans have to accept that the opposite of what they wanted to do will pass, or will they do something completely crazy? I mean, the UK and France have nuclear weapons. They do possess some ultimate rationale, but they would have to be quite crazy to even send troops to Ukraine, something like that, to try to work separately.

#M3

Well, the thing is, the craziness comes from many reasons. If you look at Pete Hegseth's comments, one of the reasons it shook the Europeans so much was not just the comments on Ukraine. Now, the Ukrainian issue was big. He made it very clear this is the position of Trump. And I think it was good that he delivered the message because Trump seems to improvise a lot. You never know if you should take literally what he's saying. But it was very clear that there will be no NATO membership as part of a peace agreement. Ukraine will not get its territories back. This is just common sense.

They can lose hundreds of thousands more people trying, but it's not going to change anything. They're not going to get this back. And third, the U.S. is not going to be part of any security guarantees. We're not going to get pulled into a war.

So even if the Europeans send peacekeepers or someone to provide a security guarantee, it will have nothing to do with NATO Article 5. In other words, if they end up in a clash with the Russians, America will sit this one out. This was quite dramatic because this is America announcing it's leaving Ukraine, the Ukraine project, that the proxy war has been lost. Now, it's not only this, but it also made it clear that Europe is not our main strategic priority anymore. Again, this narrow view in Europe is that, well, they're populist, they're right-wing, but no, this is the shift of the international distribution of power. The world which was created or attempted to be created after the Cold War, one of unipolarity, is gone. In the unipolar world, the US could dominate every corner of the world. Now you have a shift, as Rubio also recognized. There's a multipolar world.

Security means something very different then. And as they recognize, if you're going to try to be a unipolar state, holding down all other rival powers, then they're all going to come together and collectively balance you. That's what they are worried about in Washington, that the Russians are working with the Chinese, the Iranians, everyone to collectively balance the United States, not just militarily, but economically. So the whole principle of how we conceptualize security in a unipolar system is that every state has to recognize that the U.S. is so powerful that they can't even imagine, that they can't even aspire to challenge it. That's security under unipolarity. You don't have to take into consideration what the Russians or Chinese think as long as they know that they can never challenge the United States.

This is the world government. This is the world policeman. Now, if you recognize this moment is over and you have a multipolar system, you have to recognize the traditional way you look at security, which is that of indivisible security. If you put your missiles and troops on the borders of Russia, they will have to respond in order to elevate their own security. So now we go from a system where we don't have to give a damn about if we undermine Russian security or not, which was very explicit in the 90s. This is a system we're setting up. And now we have to shift the system, and we do have to take them into account. Now, this can be very dramatic for the Europeans because, for the past 30 years, they grew up in a system where they said, as long as you stand next to the United States and do as you're told, we don't have to care about anyone.

We don't have to care about the Russians. We can create a Europe where the overwhelmingly largest country in Europe has no say at all, and this is a normal thing. And all of this is coming crashing down. So there has to be some recognition of what is happening in the international system, like the rise of the East, for example, and the relative decline of the West, especially Europe. This will shift how the world works. You don't have to like it, but you can't just retreat into this bubble where every time you have some opposition, it's because someone hates democracy or

someone is evil. And I think this is a key issue. Again, everything is a fight between good and evil. And I also know for a fact that this is very unique to Europe, but for very good reasons, which we can go back into.

#M2

The question, though, is whether the European system is able to correct that. Because what we have seen in the United States is actually this change that is coming and this realization that, no, we cannot do this, no, this is not in our interest, is actually a democratic one. Because Trump won on the peace platform, and he is now implementing that to his credit. And that's a shift that came from that democratic system, right? It's like, okay, we cannot do this. We changed the top. The top is now changing the policy and is recognizing all of these constraints that the US is running on, while Europe still pretends that the US is running on unlimited resources, which is so dramatic.

But is the system that we have in place in Europe, the political system, able to produce the necessary change? Because what we saw in Romania is that the moment a person who would recognize these constraints is about to come to power, the system actually crashes down and hammers him out, right? And they're trying to do that with Orban. They're trying to do that with other dissenters. Europe is trying to clean itself of the dissent to the epistemic bubble. What is your take?

#M3

Well, I think the main key weakness, if you want to see why the Europeans are unable to adjust to reality and also why the Europeans are not going to be able to accept what is happening and change the policies, is because, as you said before, how many are there now, 27 EU member states? I lose count sometimes. Anyways, how do you have consensus? How do you have everyone agree to the same ideas? Of course, you can marginalize the political opposition, which is one of the weaknesses of Germany, where Angela Merkel just squeezed out the opposition all the way to the periphery, the ones who are not considered to be acceptable, who don't fall in line. But it's something much deeper. Whenever the Europeans say, you know, what unites us?

Why do we all have the same policy? Like, how can you have 28 countries with different national interests and they all agree on everything? How is this possible? They say, well, what unites us is our values. And this sounds, you know, wonderful. We're not united by interests, but by values. But the problem here is that this creates rhetorical traps. I mean, how... And we saw this already from the 1990s when they wanted to expand the European Union. How can you get everyone to agree on this? Because obviously the French, for example, weren't that eager to do this. But what you do is you frame an issue as a set of values. So the European project is about enhancing democracy and freedom. Is everyone for promoting democracy and freedom? Yes. Okay.

So who will oppose the expansion of the EU? It becomes very, very difficult because now you say, well, expanding the EU is impossible. It's a virtue. It's a movement for good. It's morality. So if you oppose it, it's bad. It's almost evil. You take all this complexity of what it actually means to expand this economic bloc. Not only do you remove all the complexity, but also the ability to mitigate some of the possible problems that would occur. And a lot of problems have happened. Then you make it into an issue of good versus evil. We tend to do this in Europe now with more or less everything. Everything is a moral framing. Everything is always about democracy or evil. So if you talk about peace in Ukraine, like ending the war, what are the Europeans doing? Are they discussing, you know, what are the alternatives?

How can we bring an end to the war? Do we, you know, do we have any other plans? No, no. They just say that, well, either you continue the war and support democracy and freedom, or you give in to Hitler. And this is it. So everything is good versus evil. So you can't recognize reality and adjust to it anymore. And we've done this for so long. I remember in the 90s, we came out of Britain in '95, the concept of Eurospeak, which is exactly how you use this moral framing in your language. And, you know, look at the way we talk.

Whenever you centralize decision-making from elected parliaments to Brussels, they say, "Oh, it's European integration, it's ever more Europe, it's an ever closer union." And whenever states that are not even part of the EU have to begin to adhere to the external governance, that is, the rules of the European Union, they say, "Oh, they're making the European choice, they're confirming the European perspective." But we never say, well, what about actually responding to their elected representatives? Should democracy work? No, no, no. They have to show their shared values and European perspective. So we never talk about reality. We only have this language. We say, "Oh, this is a good thing, this is a bad thing." And you have this binary split.

And in this binary split, there is no room at all for dissent. The best example is Viktor Orban when he said, listen, this is mad. We're going to war, fighting a proxy war against Russia. We can't win this, and we're destroying Ukraine in the middle. This is very immoral. Let's at least talk with Ukraine and Russia to see what aspect there is for peace. You know, you betray democracy. You're a populist. You don't care about human rights. You're turning your back on the European dream. This is the language we have. And the whole purpose is not accidental, but the purpose is to detach from reality. It's because now you can't dissent. Everything is good versus evil. That's what the unity now is based upon, and it's very, very dangerous. And we think it's so good because we call it shared values, but it's very dangerous.

#M2

Yeah, and the crazy part of this moment, and it's really hard to wrap your head around it, but once you see it, it's impossible to unsee, is that we now really need the Vice President of the United States to come to Europe to warn us in Europe, "Guys, wake up, you are undermining the very thing

that you are screaming about at the top of your lungs." If you are not worried about elections in Romania being canceled over some rumor because the wrong guy won, and then you are happy about that, if you are thinking of starting to ban political parties, important political parties in Germany, then you're on the wrong track.

If you are starting to officially work against free speech with policies you create, then you're not on the democratic track. If you only accept the rules or ideas coming and being virtuous and good, they come from the center, and you completely disregard the member states and you disregard interests and legitimate discourse, then you are on a totalitarian track. That this now shocks the Europeans is deeply worrying because that's exactly what it is. Under the banner of "let's save democracy," the European Union is undermining every single principle that it stands for. And the best example was how they treated Georgia, which creates a new law according to its own constitutional process.

And the EU demands that that be completely scrapped, right? Because the EU says so. They decided not to elect parties that want to join Europe, that want to immediately adhere to, that want to go to the EU, and that they immediately want to join NATO. And they're told that this is a pro-Russian election. Every country having the choice to choose a European Union means to the EU at the moment, you have to choose this one. You have to implement our policies, or otherwise, we don't consider your choices as real. So it is a very, very totalitarian mindset, actually, under which these people operate, isn't it?

#M3

Well, it's very much so. And actually, I was going to either write an article or make a video on this concept, which we have in academia, which is that ideological fundamentalism is presented as, you know, you don't judge actors based on what they do in the international system, but on the political identity which they are assigned. So we are good, they are bad. But it's not about what is democratic, and you set clear metrics and see to what extent both sides are following democratic ideals. No, it's who you are. So we are democracy, so everything we do is to support democracy. So when you see more and more across Europe this call for more censorship and cancellation, well, we have to do it to protect democracy. We have to censor the opposition. In Germany, you know, the main opposition now is the AfD. I don't care if you like them or not.

They're the ones people have voted for. And so, well, we don't like it. They're a threat to democracy. So to protect democracy, we might have to ban the main opposition party. The media is talking about this. The government is talking about this. And these are some of the things that are raising concerns in the United States. And, again, if you have elected governments, be it Slovakia or Hungary, talking about peace, they are elected as well, then it's all, you know, it's capitulation. They're Putin's men now. And this was the whole idea behind the color revolutions as well. People have elected democracies, they have voted for the government, but we will support the civil society, which we prefer, because, you know, it's not who you vote for.

If you want to have a pro-EU, anti-Russian policy, it means now you're moving away from authoritarianism towards democracy. This is democracy. So it's not who you vote for anymore. And also, like I said before, in Ukraine in 2019, 73% voted for the peace platform. The Europeans said, well, that means that they might normalize relations with Russia. But this is capitulation. Oh, well, that's not democracy because democracy means you're moving away from Russia towards us. So now we have to undermine the democratic outcome and also push the country towards war. And as you all pointed out correctly, Georgia, you know, they had an election. It's free and fair. They wanted a government which said, yeah, we want to be part of the EU, but we don't want to make ourselves a frontline against the Russians.

Right. Well, that's not what we want. So, you know, we topple it. And when we try to topple the government, what is the language? Oh, it's to protect democracy. Because if you start to try to make peace with Russia, well, then you're not clearly choosing freedom, which is the EU, versus the authoritarian, which is Russia. And we can do anything. This rigged election in Moldova can annul the election results in Romania. Everything is to protect democracy, and we're slaughtering democracy in the process. This is the core of ideological fundamentalism. It's not about what democracy is. We are democracy, and everything we do is in defense of it. This is, again, a fight of good versus evil. And it's a lot of radicalism that comes out in this.

#M2

I was just waiting for this moment when Ursula von der Leyen or one of these people stands in front of the cameras and actually says, I am democracy. Like the good old French king, like "L'État, c'est moi" or "La démocratie, c'est moi." I'm just waiting for that.

#M3

Yeah, but that's what they said. Pistorius, he comes up after Vance and says, this is terrible. How can you say all this stuff about all the censorship and intolerance of opposition? You are taking the side of the authoritarians now. We are democratic. And he didn't counter any of the arguments that were made. He just said, more or less like you said now, we are democracy. If you criticize us, you criticize democracy, which means you're taking the side of the authoritarian. He didn't even try to protect or defend the political system in Russia or China. Vance just said, you know, you're betraying the values which you claim to uphold. What is the counterargument? We are a democracy. You can't say that. I mean, it's really, really crazy, but this is where we are. And given the fact we don't accept or permit any real opposition, any dissent for the same reason, we create this echo chamber bubble where all of this suddenly sounds normal. It's very absurd to watch.

#M2

We Europeans, at this point, need help from somebody to rescue us from ourselves, at least intellectually, so that we can start seeing this clearly again.

